

Germany's nationwide travel experiment in 2022: public transport for 9 Euro per month - First findings of an empirical study

Allister Loder^{a,*}, Fabienne Cantner^c, Lennart Adenaw^b, Nico Nachtigall^b, David Ziegler^b, Felix Gotzler^b, Markus B. Siewert^d, Stefan Wurster^e, Sebastian Goerg^c, Markus Lienkamp^b, Klaus Bogenberger^a

^a*Chair of Traffic Engineering and Control, TUM School of Engineering and Design, Technical University of Munich*

^b*Chair of Automotive Technology, TUM School of Engineering and Design, Technical University of Munich*

^c*Professorship of Economics, TUMCS for Biotechnology and Sustainability & TUM School of Management, Technical University of Munich*

^d*TUM Think Tank, Munich School of Politics and Public Policy*

^e*Professorship of Policy Analysis, Munich School of Politics and Public Policy, TUM School of Social Sciences and Technology, Technical University of Munich*

Abstract

In spring 2022, the German federal government agreed on a set of policy measures that aimed at reducing households' financial burden resulting from a recent price increase, especially in energy and mobility. These included among others, a nationwide public transport ticket for 9 Euro per month for three months in June, July, and August 2022. In transport policy research this is an almost unprecedented behavioral experiment. It allows us to study not only behavioral responses in mode choice and induced demand but also to assess the effectiveness of these instruments. We observe this natural experiment with a three-wave survey and a smartphone-based travel diary with passive tracking on an initial sample of 2,261 participants with a focus on the Munich metropolitan region. This area is chosen as it offers a variety of mode options with a dense and far-reaching public transport network that even provides good access to many leisure destinations. The app has been providing data from 756 participants until the end of September, the three-wave survey by 1,402, and the app and the three waves by 637 participants. In this paper, we report on the study design, the recruitment and study participation as well as the impacts of the policy measures on the self-reported and app-observed travel behavior; we present results on consumer choices for a successor ticket to the 9-Euro-Ticket that started in May 2023. We find a substantial shift in the modal share towards public transport from the car in our sample during the 9-Euro-Ticket period in travel distance (around 5 %) and in trip frequency (around 7 %). The mobility outcomes of the 9-Euro-Ticket however provide evidence that cheap public transport as a policy instrument does not suffice to incentive sustainable travel behavior choices and that other policy instruments are required in addition.

Keywords: public transport; fare-free; 9-Euro-Ticket; natural experiment

*Corresponding author

E-mail address: allister.loder@tum.de

1. Introduction

In transport policy research, it is quite unlikely to perform real-world population-scale experiments on travel behavior. There are few notable exceptions: strikes suddenly make one alternative mode unavailable (e.g., Anderson, 2014; Adler and van Ommeren, 2016; Bauernschuster et al., 2017; Larcom et al., 2017), a global pandemic changes travelers’ preferences for traveling (e.g., Molloy et al., 2021; Eisenmann et al., 2021; Christidis et al., 2022), or a bridge collapse altering the provided transportation network (e.g., Zhu et al., 2010). In 2022, the German federal government created a population-scale natural experiment by providing a drastically discounted nationwide travel pass in response to the cost-of-living crisis caused by the geopolitical crisis in Ukraine that started in February 2022 (Bundesfinanzministerium, 2022). The discounted nationwide flat-fare travel pass, called the 9-Euro-Ticket, priced at 9 Euro (approx. 9 USD in 2022), provided its holders to travel almost fare-free during June, July, and August 2022 all across the nation using all regional, local, and urban public transportation; the 9-Euro-Ticket was not valid for long-distance passenger services (e.g., high-speed rail services like ICE, TGV). Travelers could take their children up to six years with them free of charge. The 9-Euro-Ticket was also a measure to promote using public transport after the COVID-19 pandemic, where its usage declined drastically in Germany (Kolarova et al., 2021) and did not fully recover by early 2022.

The 9-Euro-Ticket rapidly became a “darling” of the public, and it attracted much interest. Various studies had been set up, collecting their own survey data (e.g., Krämer et al., 2022; AG and VDV, 2022) or using third-party mobile phone data (e.g., Gaus et al., 2023) to interfere impacts on travel behavior and customer preferences. It had to be noted that the government announced various measures to ease the cost-of-living crisis. Here, another transport-related measure was a fuel excise tax cut of 29.55 Euro-Cent per liter of gasoline and for 14.04 Euro-Cent per liter of diesel. However, due to market price fluctuations, this price cut was not felt much by drivers. Consequently, the only transport-related intervention of the government that played a decisive role in decision-making was the 9-Euro-Ticket.

This natural experiment is promising from a travel behavior and transport policy perspective as new policy instruments are required to achieve the needed decarbonization of the transportation sector, which includes making sustainable travel choices more attractive (Lindsey and Santos, 2020; Axsen et al., 2020). At the behavioral level, the 9-Euro-Ticket allows to reveal mode choice preferences under such an almost flat-fare scheme (Ben-Akiva and Lerman, 1985), rebound effects (Greening et al., 2000; Hymel et al., 2010), induced demand (Weis and Axhausen, 2009), and global travel and activity patterns when paths costs are almost zero (e.g., González et al., 2008; Alessandretti et al., 2018). The 9-Euro-Ticket is further a disruption to the currently fragmented fare structure in Germany: one single fare replaces fares in 60 different and not always contiguous transit districts. This simplification could also be a factor in attracting public transport users (Sharaby and Shiftan, 2012). Consequently, it is not surprising that based on the drastic fare reduction and simplification the media reported that the people’s sentiment toward public transportation has changed positively with the experience of the 9-Euro-Ticket. At the policy level, it allows the analysis of to which extent in Germany an almost fare-free flat-fare scheme is an effective and efficient policy instrument to promote sustainable mobility, in particularly as it can be seen as an incentive to change from the car to public transport to reduce automobile externalities (Parry et al., 2007; Santos et al., 2010). However, as this policy does not address car dependence (Banister, 2008) and evidence suggests that a ‘*coordinated package of mutually reinforcing transport and land-use policies that [...] (make) car use slower, less convenient, and more costly*’ is required to reduce the share of car trips (Buehler et al., 2016), especially limiting parking supply (Loder et al., 2022; Shoup, 1997; Topp, 1993), it can be expected that this policy cannot be the sole instrument to achieve sustainable mobility. From a policy analysis perspective it is interesting to observe the effect of public financial incentives (here reduction of ticket costs) in the transport sector, as one sort of policy instruments potentially initiating transformative change (Djeffal et al., 2022). While this sort of instruments played a rather limited role for the expansion of renewables, since regulatory and market instruments (like feed-in tariff system, Hoppmann et al. (2014)) shaped energy transition in many countries (Barnea et al., 2022), the role of public financial incentives in other fields, like the transport sector, is still unclear.

The 9-Euro-Ticket can be considered to make Germany’s local, regional, and urban public transport system almost fare-free as its price is very low and with a discount of more than 90 % compared to existing travel passes, while neglecting the added value through its nationwide validity. In addition, the 9-Euro-Ticket is a nationwide flat-rate travel pass. For both aspects, precedent around the world exists. Fare-free public transport exists or existed in more than 100 locations (Kebrowski, 2020). Fare-free public transport can be full or socially or temporally limited, e.g., to the elderly or to weekends. It is usually found in small urban areas with a population of less than 100 000, where recently larger areas have started fare-free public transport schemes as well. For example, Tallinn (Estonia) with a population of 400 000, made local public transport fare free in 2013. Here, a study reported that the increase in ridership that can be attributed to the fare innovation was 1.2 % when controlling for other effects (Cats et al., 2014). Right amid in the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic, three more locations started fare-free public transport. The entire country of Luxembourg (Carr and Hesse, 2020), population of 630 000, but so far no report on the outcomes exists; Cascais (Portugal), population of 220 000, reported an increase in 10 %, while the scheme is funded by parking fees (Köllinger, 2022); Augsburg (Germany), population of 300 000, defined a fare-free public transport zone in the city center (Andor et al., 2021), but so far no report on the outcomes exists. In an controlled experiment in Santiago (Chile), some workers got randomly assigned fare-free travel passes for two weeks (Bull et al., 2021). The authors find that travel increases by 12 %, while they find no evidence for mode or period substitution. The effect on public transport trips entirely explained by subway trips and by a residence location next to a subway station. In Templin (Germany), a similar pattern was observed with limited shift from the car, while a positive net benefit remains caused by a reduction in fatalities and casualties of pedestrians and cyclists (Storchmann, 2003). Generally, findings suggest that free-fare public transport schemes have the risk of generating additional travel demand, while do not necessarily encourage a shift from the car to public transport (Kebrowski, 2020; Storchmann, 2003). It is further argued that such schemes are rarely implemented in a response to solve economic, sustainability, or socio-economic problems, which would be usually expected when implementing a transport policy, but rather did the institutions have different targets in mind (Carr and Hesse, 2020; Kebrowski, 2020). In a recent but pre-pandemic survey in Germany, Andor et al. (2021) reports an increase of about 230 % in public transport usage, which serves as one reference for this study. Lately, in response to COVID-19, to promote sustainable transportation, and to improve air quality some transport operators in the US experiment with (partial) fare-free and heavily discounted schemes (Paget-Seekins, 2023).

At the beginning of public transport, fares were collected on a per-trip basis in cash, while the idea of a travel pass arose later, partly due to operating convenience. This introduction changed the product from a trip to access to a whole network. With the marginal cost for each trip becoming zero, its cost perception thus became similar to that for the car (White, 1984). If travelers have a choice between pay-per-use and a flat-rate ticket, many choose the latter despite not reaching the break-even point. This flat-rate bias can be addressed mostly to an insurance and convenience effect (Wirtz, Matthias et al., 2015). It is noted that travel choices and economic outcomes for operators depend on the fare structure and distribution of travel demand (Carbajo, 1988). Nationwide travel passes exist in many cities and even entire countries, e.g., in Switzerland with the well-known *abonnement général* (Becker et al., 2017) and since 2021 the *KlimaTicket* in Austria. The latter travel pass builds on the idea of travel passes for 1 Euro per day or 365 Euro per year, which has seen much interest worldwide and has been implemented, e.g., in Vienna. It is reported that the volume of sold annual travel passes grew substantially, but that no direct significant increase in ridership or change in modal split resulted (civity Management Consultants, 2021). Nevertheless, Vienna continued to employ accompanying measures to restrict car traffic and parking that together with an increasing awareness for the high cost of parking, led to a decrease in car travel and increase in public transport use (Buehler et al., 2016; Knoflacher, 2019).

The 9-Euro-Ticket can also be seen as a congestion management policy as it should attract people from cars, where the textbook rationale is that the subsidy for public transport results from road user charges (Small and Verhoef, 2007). Nevertheless, optimality in fare subsidy depends primarily on the objective function, e.g., social cost (e.g., Tirachini et al., 2014) or user cost (e.g., Loder et al., 2022). Basso and Silva (2014)

concluded that the substitutability between transit subsidy, like the 9-Euro-Ticket and congestion pricing, is large, but the contribution of transit subsidy could be severely diminished if other policies like congestion pricing are implemented first; otherwise, the authors concluded that “transit subsidies may indeed be a very good measure for reducing transport negative externalities and increase social welfare”.

In this paper, we describe our study to observe this natural experiment in Germany with a focus on the Munich metropolitan region. The study comprises a three-wave survey conducted before, during, and after the validity period of the 9-Euro-Ticket in June, July, and August, and a smartphone-based travel diary with passive tracking to automatically measure individual travel behavior from May to September 2022 (see Figure 1). The most relevant research questions of this transport policy experiment are: how did people change their travel behavior during the 9-Euro-Ticket intervention, who changed by how much, and how much do people value this ticket in the end. We present the recruiting and sample as well as present first findings on previously mentioned research questions.

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents the study design. Then, Section 3 reports on the recruitment of the sample as well as the participation during the study period; it also informs about the sample characteristics of our study. Thereafter, the results are presented in three sections: Section 4 presents the stated responses on changes in travel behavior throughout the study period; Section 5 reveals the changes in travel behavior collected through the smartphone; and Section 6 provides the consumer perspective on the 9-Euro-Ticket with the participants’ attitudes towards the ticket and their willingness-to-pay for a successor ticket to the 9-Euro-Ticket. The paper ends with a discussion and conclusions of findings and their wider policy implications.

2. Study design

We conceived the name “Mobilität.Leben” for the study (in English “mobility.life”) to characterize that our study intends to observe the impact of the cost-of-living crisis on mobility and the daily activities. The overall design of the “Mobilität.Leben” study is shown in Figure 1. It follows the rhythm of the behavioral intervention of the 9-Euro-Ticket and the fuel tax cut: it comprises a period *before* the intervention, one *during* the intervention, and a period *after* the intervention. In the three-wave panel study, a questionnaire is distributed to participants in each of the three periods. The structure and content of the questionnaires is detailed in Section 2.1, while the survey’s codebook will be made available upon publication. The travel behavior of participants is recorded before, during and after the period of the 9-Euro-Ticket and the fuel tax cut using an application for a smartphone-based travel diary with passive tracking. The smartphone application is described in Section 5.

2.1. Survey

The three-wave panel survey collects information of participants on their demographics (e.g., age, sex, employment status, education level), socio-economic status (e.g., household income), place and kind of residence (e.g., home location, heating system), personality traits (scales of the Global Preference Survey (Falk et al., 2018, 2022), as well as social and political attitudes (e.g., political left-right positioning, support of the 9-Euro-Ticket policy, climate change awareness). Regarding mobility tool ownership, participants report on household car ownership, season-ticket ownership before and after the 9-Euro-Ticket as well as the intention to buy and having the 9-Euro-Ticket in June, July and August. Given the cost-of-living crisis, the three questionnaires also feature questions on the financial situation of participants: how the household deals with the recent price increases, whether the household can save income or has to draw from savings, and whether the household is doing without consumption or investments to compensate for the price increases. In addition, the questionnaires include questions on energy consumption behavior and whether measures have been taken to conserve energy.




Figure 1: Design of the “Mobilität.Leben” study during summer 2022.

We measure the changes in travel behavior during the experiment in three different ways. First participants were asked in each wave to state their current travel behavior using mode use frequencies following the Mobilität-in-Deutschland (MiD) scale (Bundesministerium für Verkehr und digitale Infrastruktur, 2018a), i.e., how frequent do you use the car, public transport, bicycle etc. per week. Second, in the second and third wave participants were asked to state qualitatively whether they use public transport and the car more or less often compared to the previous wave, i.e., comparing travel behavior during and before, after and during, and after and before. Third, participants were asked in the second and third wave to state how many more or less out-of-home activities they currently perform using the car and public transport.

As the 9-Euro-Ticket was a fix-term transport policy, the question of a successor to the 9-Euro-Ticket was very prominent in the public debate. Thus, we included questions on the interest to buy a successor ticket and its maximum willingness-to-pay in the second and third questionnaire. Further, to better mimic the decision-making process to buy a successor ticket, we included a stated-preference experiment in the third questionnaire. Figure 2a shows a screenshot of one choice situation. In this experiment, participants had the choice to select either a local travel pass with regional validity (Lokalabo), a successor to the 9-Euro-Ticket (Deutschlandabo), a successor to the 9-Euro-Ticket that includes all long-distance services (Deutschlandabo incl. Fernverkehr), a distance fare or no travel pass (outside option). A distance fare was included to see whether participants have at least some interest in a public transport product. In the experiment, only the price attribute of each alternative is varied: we set the price levels for the Lokalabo to 19 and 29 Euro; for the Deutschlandabo to 49, 59, 69, and 99 Euro; for the Deutschlandabo including long-distance services to 249 and 349 Euro, and the price levels for the distance fare to 10 and 20 Euro per 100 km. Deploying a full-factorial design leading to 32 scenarios, each participant were shown eight choice situations.

2.2. Smartphone-based travel diary

For our study, a travel diary smartphone application, called "Mobilität.Leben", has been developed. Such an application has already been used in other travel behavior research projects, e.g., in Molloy et al. (2022). Figure 2b shows a screenshot of the developed app. Installed on iOS and Android devices, it automatically collects users' way-points, reports them to a backend server where the chosen transport mode is inferred using machine learning by a third-party provider. This data is returned to the smartphone application and users can approve or edit the mode. The smartphone application also records the time between trips as activities. The smartphone application suggests in some cases activity types, e.g. home, shopping, but in

Situation 1

Currently, the price for a Lokalabo (local travel pass) in the MVV (Zone M) is 59.10 euro per month.


From 2023, you can choose from the following public transport travel passes to satisfy your travel demand.

- **Lokalabo:** Allows you free travel on the territory of your local transport association (Verkehrsverbund) or regional public transport network.
- **Deutschlandabo:** Allows you free travel on local and regional public transport throughout Germany. This travel pass is the successor to the 9€ ticket.
- **Deutschlandabo incl. Fernverkehr:** Allows you free travel on local and regional public transport as well as long-distance services like ICE, IC and EC trains throughout Germany. This subscription is comparable to the BahnCard 100.
- **Distance fare:** You pay for each trip per kilometer in local and long-distance services up to a certain maximum price per month.
- **No pass.**

Which travel pass do you choose?

	Lokalabo	Deutschlandabo	Deutschlandabo incl. Fernverkehr	Distance fare	No pass
Price per month in euro	20	49	249		
Maximum price per month in euro				249	
Price per 100km in euro				20	
Your choice	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

(a) Screenshot of the stated-preference experiment in the third questionnaire.



(b) Screenshot of the smartphone-based travel diary with passive tracking.

Figure 2: Screenshots from the study “Mobilität.Leben”. (a) from the stated-preference experiment on the successor ticket; (b) from the study’s smartphone application.

most cases users have to enter the activity type manually. However, the smartphone application learns these activities, reducing in the best case the required users input to complete the travel diary. There is no need for further interaction with the app. Participants can pause the data collection at any time.

3. Recruitment and participation

3.1. Recruitment

The sample for the “Mobilität.Leben” study has been recruited following a two-pronged strategy. First, a media campaign in Munich started on May 23, 2022, resulting in 1,342 individuals having registered for the study. A compensation of 30 Euro was offered for participation when using the smartphone travel diary until September 2022 as well as completing all three questionnaires. Individuals who registered for the study had the choice between participating in the smartphone-based travel diary and the survey or only in the survey. Second, a professional panel agency was tasked with recruiting participants for the three-wave panel survey. These participants, however, were not using the smartphone-based travel diary. Individuals were offered a compensation for the participation directly through the panel agency. Here, 919 individuals have been successfully recruited. In total, 2,261 individuals started the “Mobilität.Leben” study. In the following, we refer to the *Tracking* sample as those participants from the Munich-based sample who use the smartphone-based travel diary and fill out the questionnaires and we refer to the *Survey-only* sample as those participants from the nation-wide and Munich-based sample who do not participate in the smartphone-based travel diary, but fill out the questionnaires.

It is important to mention that the 1,342 participants recruited through the media campaign are primarily located in the Munich metropolitan area. Consequently, we denote this part of our sample as the *Munich-based panel*. Contrary, the 919 participants recruited through the panel agency are from all over Germany. Consequently, we denote this part of our sample as the *nation-wide panel*. Generally, by asking the panel agency to recruit a representative sample, the *nation-wide panel* can be considered more representative for the entire nation than the *Munich-based panel*.

3.2. Outlier removal

To ensure the best possible data quality, we have taken several steps. First, at the beginning of all surveys we appeal to participants to answer the questions carefully and honestly. We also emphasize that they will only receive the total payment if they submit a fully completed survey. Second, we track the time spent on each of the surveys. For our analysis, we exclude respondents who completed the survey too fast. That is, we drop participants in the bottom 1% of the survey time distribution. Finally, we exclude participants who gave inconsistent responses about purchasing the 9-Euro-Ticket across the three different survey periods. Exclusion of these respondents does not impact our results. In total, these conditions apply to 117 individuals who are subsequently removed from the further analysis.

Thus, out of the 2,261 registered participants, 2,144 are further considered in this analysis (94.8%). Table 1 shows the considered sample the participation in the three waves. Here, completion means that all three questionnaires of the three-wave panel survey were completed. This results in 1,402 complete responses for the survey. Out of these, 637 also completed the smartphone-based travel diary with passive tracking by successfully providing at least one week of travel behavior in June, July, August and September.

3.3. Participation

The study participation is summarized in Table 1 and the smartphone-based travel diary usage is shown in Figure 4. Table 1 provides information on the number of recruited, the completion of each questionnaire as




Figure 3: Time series of the participation in the three-wave survey of the entire sample.

	Total		Munich-based panel				Nation-wide panel	
			Tracking		Survey only			
Registered	2,144	100.0%	871	100.0%	401	100.0%	872	100.0%
Completed 1st wave	2,025	94.4%	855	98.2%	298	74.3%	872	100.0%
Completed 2nd wave	1,631	76.1%	765	87.8%	217	54.1%	649	74.4%
Completed 3rd wave	1,436	67.0%	713	81.9%	180	44.9%	543	62.3%
Completed all three waves	1,402	65.4%	695	79.8%	164	40.9%	543	62.3%

Table 1: Partition in the three-wave panel survey of the entire sample and all relevant sub-samples.

well as the completion of all three questionnaires for the entire sample, the Munich-based panel, and the nation-wide panel. The Munich-based panel is further separated by participating in the smartphone-based travel diary (tracking sub-sample) or only in the survey (survey-only sub-sample). All participants from the Munich-based panel that use the smartphone-based travel diary are considered in Section 5, not only those who successfully completed the study.

It can be seen in Table 1 that the drop out rate is higher in the Munich-based survey-only panel where no incentive was provided compared to the Munich-based panel that uses the smartphone application (30 Euro incentive) and the nation-wide survey panel (incentive through panel agency). At the end of the study period in September, the study has not been completed by all participants. In total, 1,402 participants completed all three questionnaires. In the Munich-based panel that uses the smartphone application, around 80% who started the tracking completed all three questionnaires and around 70.0% completed the tracking and all three questionnaires. In the Munich-based survey-only panel, only around 40% completed all three surveys and in the nation-wide panel around 62%. Figure 3 shows the completion of the three questionnaires over time. It can be seen that most participants completed the survey rather quickly after receiving the invitation.




Figure 4: Study participation in the smartphone application *Mobilität.Leben*: the number of smartphones actively tracking and the number of mobile users per day.

Considering the smartphone application usage shown in Figure 4, it can be seen that the app’s activation across the sample happened during the introductory phase of the 9-Euro-Ticket in the early days of June. Note that an earlier activation of the smartphone app was barely possible as the natural experiment was announced at short notice by the government, leaving little time for recruitment weeks before the introduction of the 9-Euro-Ticket. Overall, as stated in Table 1, 920 participants successfully activated the application on their smartphone during our study; smartphone-based travel diary usage peaked in late June at around 820 users tracking in parallel. Here, some users already deleted the application, e.g., due to high energy consumption, or switch it off on some days, e.g., when leaving Germany. The number of active smartphones declined steadily towards around 700 users at the end of our study, while the observed wave pattern indicates that a fraction of the sample is frequently switching the tracking on and off. Figure 4 also features the number of mobile users on each day. Here, the typical weekly pattern is observed with more mobile people during the week compared to weekends.

3.4. Study sample

The characteristics of the final sample for the survey and the tracking is shown in Table 2; the table further provides information on the sample that started the tracking. We compare the socio-demographic composition of final sample and the sub-sample that completed also the smartphone-based travel diary with passive tracking to the 2017 German national household travel survey, *Mobilität-in-Deutschland (MiD)*, (Bundesministerium für Verkehr und digitale Infrastruktur, 2018a). We conclude that both samples have slightly more men than women compared to the MiD. Considering age groups, the age distribution of both samples differ only substantially in the age groups 25-34 and > 75 from the MiD. There are two reasons. First, the own recruiting via a media campaign originated at a university, where the recruitment of more young people seems reasonable. Second, the group > 75 is underrepresented likely as the study had only digital interfaces (survey and smartphone), where this age group is less familiar with; further, the numbers

cannot really be compared in this group as MiD only reports the total of surveyed people in the group > 75 without any further intervals. Thus, to better compare the age distribution, we compare our completed survey sample to official age distribution by gender in 5 using data from EuroStat (EuroStat, 2023). Here, we conclude that our sample has similar distribution to the general population with notable exceptions: in the group 75-85 we have too few and the share of female participants in the age group 25-34.

Table 2: Comparison of sample characteristics to the Mobilität in Deutschland (MiD) travel survey. Missing totals to one hundred percent in each category are missing values. The column “Tracking started” also contains all observations that started, including those eliminated as named in Section 3.4.

	MiD		Mobilität.Leben final sample					
	2017 %	-	Survey completed		Tracking completed		Tracking started	
			N	%	N	%	N	%
Total			1,402	100.00 %	637	100.00 %	920	100.00 %
Gender								
Male	48.86 %		779	55.56 %	339	53.22 %	491	54.37 %
Female	51.12 %		619	44.15 %	295	46.31 %	425	46.20 %
Diverse	0.03 %		4	0.28 %	3	0.47 %	4	0.43 %
Age								
18-24	9.15 %		103	7.35 %	59	9.26 %	97	10.54 %
25-34	15.26 %		299	21.33 %	171	26.84 %	262	28.48 %
35-44	14.29 %		263	18.76 %	118	18.52 %	166	18.04 %
45-54	19.60 %		239	17.05 %	99	15.54 %	130	14.13 %
55-64	16.32 %		292	20.83 %	108	16.95 %	160	17.39 %
65-74	12.01 %		173	12.34 %	64	10.05 %	84	1.52 %
> 75	13.05 %		27	1.93 %	12	1.88 %	14	0.76 %
Household size								
1	19.72 %		381	27.18 %	175	27.47 %	243	26.41 %
2	38.49 %		593	42.30 %	260	40.82 %	381	41.41 %
3	19.36 %		204	14.55 %	99	15.54 %	131	14.24 %
4 or more	22.42 %		224	15.98 %	103	16.17 %	165	17.93 %
Net household income								
< 1,500 Euro/month	-		177	12.62 %	73	11.46 %	114	12.39 %
1,500 to 2,499 Euro/month	-		256	18.26 %	82	12.87 %	123	13.37 %
2,500 to 3,999 Euro/month	-		394	28.10 %	180	28.26 %	245	26.63 %
> 4,000 Euro/month	-		547	39.02 %	283	44.43 %	409	44.46 %
Economic status								
Very low	7.33 %		65	4.63 %	37	5.81 %	62	6.74 %
Low	13.12 %		171	12.22 %	57	8.79 %	76	8.26 %
Average	43.64 %		322	22.82 %	112	17.58 %	164	17.83 %
High	29.94 %		513	36.45 %	251	39.40 %	341	37.07 %
Very high	5.97 %		303	21.70 %	162	25.43 %	234	25.43 %
Regional statistical spatial type								
Urban: Metropolis	18.14 %		653	46.58 %	407	63.89 %	600	64.47 %
Urban: Regiopolis, large city	14.61 %		112	7.99 %	20	3.14 %	29	3.15 %
Urban: Medium-sized city, urbanized area	24.74 %		275	19.61 %	113	17.74 %	154	16.74 %
Urban: Small-town area, village area	6.10 %		71	5.06 %	31	4.87 %	42	4.57 %
Rural: Central city	5.97 %		47	3.35 %	9	1.41 %	13	1.41 %
Rural: Medium-sized city, urbanized area	14.32 %		116	8.27 %	21	3.30 %	34	3.70 %
Rural: Small-town area, village area	16.12 %		115	8.20 %	29	4.55 %	39	4.24 %
Car ownership								
None	14.71 %		351	25.05 %	210	32.97 %	256	27.83 %
1 cars	47.26 %		667	47.57 %	291	45.68 %	364	39.57 %
2 cars and more	38.02 %		384	27.39 %	136	21.35 %	300	32.61 %
Travel pass ownership May 2022								
Yes	14.66 %		467	33.31 %	283	44.43 %	410	44.57 %
No	85.15 %		935	66.69 %	354	55.57 %	490	53.26 %




Figure 5: Comparing the Mobilität.Leben sample to EuroStat's population data for Germany for both sexes and age categories.

Regarding the household size, both our samples have more single households compared to the MiD that can be likely attributed, again, to the partial recruitment in an university environment with many individuals not yet having started a family.

The comparison of net household income in our sample to the MiD faces the methodological challenge that income is not directly reported in the national household travel survey, but rather a derived composite measure of a household's economic status that combines net household income and weighted sum of household members. In Table 2 we approximated this measure for our sample; we conclude that both our samples have a substantial oversampling of households with a high economic status. This could be a consequence from the Munich metropolitan area being focus region of our study, which is characterized by having wages and income above the nation's averages.

The focus on Munich is then further reflected in the distribution of our sample across the Germany's statistical spatial types, car ownership and travel pass ownership in May 2022. More individuals living in the metropolis and less in the countryside, resulting in less car ownership and higher travel pass ownership levels compared to the MiD.

3.5. Sample weighting

The recruited sample is not a random sample of the German population. Although it can be seen in Figure 5 that the complete survey sample does exhibit some similarity with Germany's general age distribution by gender, there are differences. Therefore, we calculate probability weights for the complete sample based on

Changes in car use frequency	Changes in public transport use frequency		
	Less	Unchanged	More
Less	3.88 %	8.88 %	7.43 %
Unchanged	8.78 %	31.84 %	19.65 %
More	3.90 %	9.23 %	6.36 %

Table 3: Cross tabulation of changes in car and public transport use frequency per week between the before and during the period.

age and gender in the categories shown in Figure 5. The obtain weights are reasonable in the range of 0.8 to 2 for all age groups below 76-85, while the latter age group has values from 5-12, reflecting the under representation of elderly in the sample.

4. Stated travel behavior

A three-wave panel survey allows us to investigate the travel behavior changes likely caused by the intervention of the 9-Euro-Ticket. We investigate the travel behavior changes by considering the weekly mode use frequencies in each of the three periods; to corroborate the findings we then analyze questions of currently more or less mode use compared to the previous period. Last, we present the self-reported substitution of car trips for public transport.

The weekly mode use frequencies are reported on a six-level scale: never, less than once a week, once a week, 2-3 days per week, 4-5 days per week, and almost daily. Figure 6 shows the responses of the complete survey sample (N=1,402) for bicycle, car, and public transport use for the periods of before, during, and after as defined in Figure 1. It can be clearly seen that public transport use increased substantially the during period, while car use did not see similar reductions. Table 3 shows how the sample distributes across the reported changes in mode use frequencies from before to the during the period of the experiment: Only 7.43 % of participants increased their public transport use frequency and decreased their car use frequency based on the categories shown in Figure 6; contrary, around one third, did not report any changes and 20 % reported unchanged car use frequency but an increase in public transport use frequency. In total, around 20 % of our sample increased car use frequency during the period compared to the before period. Hence, we can conclude that public transport use on a weekly basis was rather complementary to car use and not a substitute. Interestingly, Figure 6 presents evidence that the treatment of the 9-Euro-Ticket may have led to a slight increase in the sample’s overall public transport usage: the share of regular public transport users in our sample grew by around 4 percentage points. However, this increase was in the trip frequency categories for one to three days per week.

In the second (during period) and third (after period) questionnaire, respondents stated whether they currently use public transport and the car more or less frequent compared to previous periods. Given our study’s design, this leads to three cases:

- comparing the during period to the before period
- comparing the after period to the during period
- comparing the after period to the before period

Figure 7 shows the responses. Regarding car use, the majority of participants did not report any changes throughout the study. A third stated that they used the car less in the during period compared to the before period, while around 20 % stated that their car use increased in the after period compared to the




Figure 6: Mode use frequencies before, during, and after the 9-Euro-Ticket intervention.




Figure 7: Stated changes in travel behavior between two periods of the experiment.

during period. The presence of the 9-Euro-Ticket, which is partly intended to incentive changing from car to public transport, could be attributed to the stated changes. However, a likely 9-Euro-Ticket effect is more pronounced in public transport use: 40 % reported an increase in public transport use in the during period compared to the before period, while slightly less than 40 % reported less public transport use in the after period compared to the during period. The indication for activation of public transport caused by the 9-Euro-Ticket intervention as found in Figure 6 cannot be easily revealed from the qualitative responses shown in Figure 7. However, the decrease in public transport use in the after period compared to the during period is five percentage points smaller than the increase in public transport use in the during period compared to the before period could be seen as such.

To better understand how study participants substitute car use by public transport, we asked respondents to provide a self-assessment of the share of substituted car trips per week. Substitution is only meaningful if the respondent used the car before the introduction of the 9-Euro-Ticket in May. Thus, Figure 8 shows the self-reported substitution of car trips during and after the 9-Euro-Ticket period for all regular car users in May 2022. It can be seen that more than fifty percent of regular car users did not substitute any car trips, while only 20 % percent substituted more than 30 % of their weekly car trips during the 9-Euro-Ticket period. Nevertheless, after the 9-Euro-Ticket period, some respondents reported still substituting some car trips with around 10 % of the sample substituting more than 20 % of weekly car trips.

Overall, from the stated changes in travel behavior between the three study periods we can conclude that public transport use increased during the 9-Euro-Ticket period, but it did not substitute car use completely, suggesting induced demand. In other words, the survey data suggests that respondents behaved more multimodal during the 9-Euro-Ticket experiment. Nevertheless, the data further present indications that




Figure 8: Cumulative density of the share of substituted car trips by public transport for all respondents who used the car at least once per week in May 2022.




Figure 9: Travel pass ownership per month in the active tracking sample.

the 9-Euro-Ticket activated some participants to use public transport more and continue to substitute car trips in the after period, i.e., after the treatment of the 9-Euro-Ticket. However, these findings from the survey will be corroborated and extended using a smartphone-based travel diary in the next section.

5. Smartphone-based travel diary

This section analyzes the data recorded by means of the smartphone-based travel diary as introduced in Section 2.2. As described before, not all participants have concluded both the survey and tracking experiment. In this section, the considered sub-sample consists of 910 participants who recorded at least one trip on the smartphone application between May 24, 2022, and September 30, 2022. In other words, we investigate the travel behavior of all participants in this section irrespective of completing all questionnaires. Note that 920 participants successfully activated the app on their smartphones, but ten participants did not report any trips. Therefore, socio-demographic attributes relevant to travel behavior like age, income, gender, and place of residence for this sub-sample are not identical to the study sample reported in Section 3.4. However, we find no substantial differences to the characteristics reported in Table 2 and Figure 5 and thus omit their presentation for the sake of conciseness. In summary, male and female participants are also represented almost equally by the tracking sample. Participants between the ages of 20 and 40 are slightly over-represented and most participants live in households with comparatively high incomes. Most participants live in the southeast of Germany, with a clear concentration in the Munich metropolitan area and thus within a densely connected public transport service area. In the subsequent analyses, we do only consider trips conducted within the geographic borders of Germany.

Figure 9 shows the travel pass ownership for all monthly active app users of our study. In the months of June, July, and August this refers to 9-Euro-Ticket ownership, while in September it refers to regular travel pass ownership. Holders of a public transport travel pass are denoted as ticket holders (TH) and non-ticket holders (NTH). It is important to note that non-ticket holders may also use public transportation on a pay-per-trip basis. It is apparent that during the 9-Euro-Ticket period, most of our active tracking participants did have a permanent subscription, whereas, after the end of the ticket subsidies, less than half of the active users owned a permanent ticket.

To assess the impact of the 9-Euro-Ticket on our tracking sample’s travel behavior we partition the collected data into three parts following the study design shown in Figure 1: the first part includes all trips recorded




Figure 10: Modal share based on the traveled distance. From top to bottom: data derived from MiD (Bundesministerium für Verkehr und digitale Infrastruktur (2018b)) for metropolis regions; recorded data with our smartphone-based travel diary before, during, and after the 9-Euro-Ticket period

before the 9-Euro-Ticket was introduced on June 1, 2022; the second part contains all recorded trips during the validity period of the 9-Euro-Ticket between June 1, 2022 and August 31, 2022; the third part includes all trips between September 1 and September 30, 2022 and represents the time period directly after the 9-Euro-Ticket. Note that only trips from within Germany are considered. Figure 10 shows the modal share by travel distance of our tracking sample in each three study periods. For reference, we present the modal share for all metropolitan regions taken from the MiD survey. Reference data for Munich is only available for the city and the local transit district, but not the entire metropolitan area: Public transport share in the city is 36 % and in the transit district 28 %. To allow for a more concise presentation, we aggregate the means of transport as implemented in the smartphone-based travel diary in the following manner:

- *Public Transport*: subway, light rail, regional train, train, bus, tram
- *Bicycle*: bicycle, bike-sharing, e-bicycle, kick scooter
- *Individual Transport*: car, e-car, motorbike, taxi, uber, carsharing
- *Walk*: walk

Comparing the 2017 modal share from the MiD study to our collected data, we observe a higher use of public transport and a lower car use within all periods of the experiment. Comparing the modal shares of the three study periods, it can be seen that the introduction of the 9-Euro-Ticket had no clear impact on the share of distance covered by bicycles, but after the 9-Euro-Ticket ended, the share decreased slightly, most likely due to decreasing temperatures (Heinen et al., 2010) (the mean temperature in Munich was 20.2 °C in the time range before and during the 9-Euro-Ticket and decreased to 14.2 °C afterwards)¹. In contrast, the recorded share of walking clearly decreased in comparison between before and during the 9-Euro-Ticket albeit almost constant weather conditions. This could indicate that the hurdle to use public transport for smaller distances diminished for our sample group with the cheap ticket.

The observed shares of individual transport and public transport usage behave the other way around: before the 9-Euro-Ticket was introduced, the share of individual transport accounted for almost half of all traveled distances; it decreased during the time of the 9-Euro-Ticket and increased again after the 9-Euro-Ticket period to a value slightly less than before the 9-Euro-Ticket. The share of public transport usage within our sample group increased with the 9-Euro-Ticket and it decreased when the 9-Euro-Ticket program ended but not as much as it increased before (see Figure 9).

An overview of the daily traveled distances of participants that had at least one trip overall is given in Figure 11. Public holidays, weekends, and school holidays are indicated, revealing that a large part of

¹Calculated based on the public available LMU weather data for Munich <https://www.meteo.physik.uni-muenchen.de/DokuWiki/doku.php?id=wetter:stadt:messung>




Figure 11: Average traveled distance per day and active user

the observation period of this study is essentially non-working days for a large share of the population. Potential impacts of the 9-Euro-Ticket on travel behavior are thus overlapped by the influences of holiday trips and other likely infrequent leisure activities. A reoccurring pattern is given by the increased daily travel distance on non-working days: in each period of the experiment, traveled distances peak on weekends. The highest daily travel distances are observed on weekends which happen to be school holidays during the 9-Euro-Ticket period. This indicates that leisure activities likely play a major role in the use of the 9-Euro-Ticket; a hypothesis that can be further substantiated when considering the drop in relative peak heights at the beginning of September after the end of the 9-Euro-Ticket. The last week of the observation period is the only week analyzed in which the 9-Euro-Ticket was not valid while there were simultaneously no school holidays. It is the only week providing data to compare a non-holiday situation with the 9-Euro-Ticket to a non-holiday period without the 9-Euro-Ticket. In this week, however, a significant drop in the average daily traveled distance is recognizable, substantiating the hypothesis that the 9-Euro-Ticket had a generally positive effect on traveled distances. This assumption is fortified by the fact that all but one weekend peaks during holidays and/or the 9-Euro-Ticket exceed the standard deviation of the time series, whilst they stay below it in the recorded week after the holidays. This effect is visible, whereas we can not give a clear measure of the additional impact of Oktoberfest (the Munich beer festival) from September 17, 2022, to October 3, 2022, and the reduced perception of COVID-19 in society referring to transportation numbers.

Figure 12 shows how the average daily traveled distance for individual and public transport varies for ticket holders and non-ticket holders as defined in Figure 9. Non-ticket holders show a different travel behavior during the 9-Euro-Ticket phase and after this phase. During the ticket phase, in which the usage of public transport is almost free, they hardly travel using public transport. Instead, most travel distance is done by means of individual transport. The only exception to this observation is the sporadic usage of public transportation on weekends and public holidays which even then is significantly smaller than the peaks of individual transport of the same group. Only after the end of the 9-Euro-Ticket in September, non-ticket holders start to utilize public transport more often. While this seems like a noteworthy adverse effect at first glance, it is to be noted, that the size and composition of the non-ticket holder group can be assumed to change drastically after the end of the 9-Euro-Ticket (compare Figure 9). While between June and August, only a small share of the participants chose not to buy the cheap 9-Euro-Ticket, less than half of the tracked participants bought a public transport travel pass in September.




Figure 12: Average traveled distance per day and active user by means of transport and PT ticket ownership ((N)TH: (non) ticket holder)




Figure 13: Modal share by income group

To assess the impact of the 9-Euro-Ticket on the travel behavior of different income groups within our tracking sample, we analyze the respective modal share in the during and after periods in Figures 13a and 13b. In contrast to Figure 8, we do not analyze the period before the introduction of the 9-Euro-Ticket in this analysis. This is due to the further subdivision of trips by income groups that results in substantial differences in remaining total trip quantities, which would arguably lead to very small sample sizes. Instead, we use the MiD Bundesministerium für Verkehr und digitale Infrastruktur (2018b) as a reference and compare the results of our sample group to the national average for German metropolises. Due to the small contribution of walking to the total travel distance, this mode is not considered in this analysis. Values are normalized to the total distance covered by the remaining three means of transport. To account for the known differences in travel behavior between working and non-working days Gerike and Schulz (2018), we strictly distinguish between working days as well as weekends and public holidays (once more grouped as non-working days).

Generally, public transport use is higher on working days than on non-working days. The difference amounts to roughly ten percentage points throughout income groups. For both day types, public transport usage decreases with increasing income. Considering non-working days, the largest decrease in public transit usage of 25 percentage points occurs for the group 0-1500 Euro of monthly household income. All other groups' public transport usage on non-working days decreases by about 10 percentage points. On working days, all groups but the one with the highest household income show an equivalently declining public transport usage once the 9-Euro-Ticket was terminated. The group with a monthly income of more than 5,500 EUR is the only one without the relevant impact of the ticket on working days. It is worth noting that the mode choice of the latter group on non-working days, in contrast to working days, exhibits a change between the periods, as public transit usage was higher when the 9-Euro-Ticket was available.

We conclude that the travel behavior revealed with the smartphone-based travel diary shows a similar trend as the stated responses in Section 4. However, the tracking allows a more precise quantification of effects: the observed shift in the modal share by travel distance from car to public transport is around five percentage points. Results also suggest generally larger travel distances on weekends during the 9-Euro-Ticket period, particularly by ticket holders who use public transport. The presented data shows that the 9-Euro-Ticket has a stronger impact on increasing the use of public transport among lower-income groups, as compared to the highest-income group, who barely change their travel behavior on working days.

6. Consumer perspective on the 9-Euro-Ticket

The 9-Euro-Ticket is an unprecedented intervention to the German transportation system. As there has never been something similar before, it is of interest to understand important dimensions of the 9-Euro-Ticket as a consumer product too. Thus, we study in this section the public opinions of the 9-Euro-Ticket (Section 6.1), its support (Section 6.2), buying intention (Section 6.3), as well as the willingness-to-pay (henceforth WTP) for a successor ticket (Section 6.4).

6.1. Public opinion

In the first (i.e., before the introduction) and second (i.e., during the 9-Euro-Ticket) questionnaire of the panel survey, respondents stated their opinion towards the 9-Euro-Ticket using several statements on a disagree-agree scale. Figure 14 shows selected statements that have been frequently discussed in the public. We find that respondents have positive attitudes towards the 9-Euro-Ticket and that this positive view is persistent over time. For instance, we find that the majority of participants perceives the 9-Euro-Ticket as a relief for households as it had been intended by the federal government. Interestingly, we find an increasing agreement with the statement of the 9-Euro-Ticket is increasing the comprehensibility of the fare structure of public transport in Germany from the before to the during period. Here, participants seem to become more aware of this advantage during the availability of the ticket. Only one third of participants agrees with




Figure 14: Participants opinions about the 9-Euro-Ticket in wave one and two

the statement that the ticket leads to pointless travel and this does also not change substantially once the ticket is introduced. Half of participants agrees that the 9-Euro-Ticket facilitates traveling in Germany by public transport.

Furthermore, in the second questionnaire in the during period participants are asked to indicate what they consider to be the greatest benefit of the 9-Euro-Ticket (they could choose between price, flexibility and comprehensibility or indicate another advantage). Here, 54.3% mentioned price, while 24.5% mentioned flexibility and 16.3% mentioned simplicity.

6.2. Support

Based on the positive perception of the 9-Euro-Ticket in the first (before) and second (during) questionnaire we can expect high levels of support for the ticket. In our study, we assess support for the 9-Euro-Ticket using a five-point agree-disagree scale for the statement whether they consider the 9-Euro-Ticket is a good idea. Looking at the results in Figure 15, we find that the majority of participants at least support the ticket before its introduction. This already high support for the ticket substantially increases in the during period. In our sample, we find that only 10 percent disagree with the statement that the ticket is a good idea.

Interestingly, we find that age is a significant determinant of support, where older participants support the ticket significantly less. In addition to this age effect, we find a slightly significant income effect in the before period: participants in the second highest and highest income category support the ticket significantly less compared the lowest income category. This income effect disappears in the second wave, where we find no difference in support between income levels anymore.




Figure 15: Support for the ticket in the before and during period of the experiment.

Buying intention category	Actual buying behavior (Shares of the sample)								
	June			July			August		
	Total	No	Yes	Total	No	Yes	Total	No	Yes
Already bought	41.32	0.00	100.00	22.29	0.00	99.44	21.73	0	100.00
Intention to buy	28.09	14.76	85.24	47.23	15.09	84.91	46.33	13.98	86.02
No intention	25.38	78.59	21.41	23.15	76.01	23.99	23.02	78.44	21.56
Do not know	5.22	57.53	43.47	7.33	53.92	46.08	8.92	52.42	47.58
Total	100.00	27.09	72.91	100.00	28.65	71.35	100.00	29.53	70.47

Table 4: Buying intention vs. actual (stated) buying behavior for the three months of the 9-Euro-Ticket period.

6.3. Intention to buy it and actual buying behavior

Participants were asked before the introduction of the 9-Euro-Ticket about their preferences to obtain this. Table 4 compares the stated intention and the actual adoption in each of the three months of the 9-Euro-Ticket period.

It can be seen in Table 4 that from June to July and August, the share of already bought tickets is reduced by around 20 percentage points, while the share of participants having the intention to buy it increases by the same amount. As this question has been asked before the introduction of the 9-Euro-Ticket, we can conclude that a large part of our sample bought the 9-Euro-Ticket every month individually. We also find that in our sample the overall interest in the ticket seemed to have declined by a few percentage points from June from 73.22% to 70.47% in August. Overall we find that a large and consistent share (around 85% in each month) of participants that intended to buy the ticket actually bought it.

6.4. Willingness-to-pay for a successor ticket

We assess the willingness-to-pay (WTP) for a successor to the 9-Euro-Ticket in the during and after period of 9-Euro-Ticket. Given the substantially different income levels in the Munich-based and nation-wide panel




Figure 16: Cumulative distributions of the willingness-to-pay for a successor ticket to the 9-Euro-Ticket. On the left, Deutschlandabo on a continuous scale, and Deutschlandabo on a discrete scale on the right.

as seen in Table 2, we report the results separately for each panel to accommodate that higher incomes correlate with higher WTP.

In the second questionnaire in the during period, study participants were asked to state their maximum WTP for a nation-wide travel pass for all local public transport services, the so-called *Deutschlandabo*. In the third questionnaire in the after period, respondents were asked in a twofold way to state their consumer preferences for a successor to the 9-Euro-Ticket, i.e., the *Deutschlandabo*: first, based on the ongoing public debate on the pricing of the ticket, the maximum willingness-to-pay for a successor was asked on a discrete scale from 9 to 99 Euro at an 10 Euro interval; second, using the publicly discussed pricing points for the successor ticket a discrete-choice experiment with different ticket alternatives has been designed (see Section 2.1 for further details). Figure 16 shows the distributions of the three direct responses in maximum WTP, while Figure 17 shows the outcomes of the discrete-choice experiment for different price levels of the *Deutschlandabo*.

Figure 16 shows that in both samples, only 10% are willing to pay 100 Euro or more for a successor in the during period of the 9-Euro-Ticket with a median WTP of 30 Euro/month for the nation-wide panel and 50 Euro/month for the Munich-based panel. Interestingly, the median WTP increases for the Munich-based panel in the after period to 59 Euro/month, while being unchanged for the nation-wide sample. The average WTP for a Deutschlandabo as a successor of the 9-Euro-Ticket is 50.45 Euro which is close to the current average price paid for travel pass in Germany (around 55 Euro/month).

We compare the WTP for the Deutschlandabo based on the continuous scale (left side of Figure 16) by socio-economic attributes using a linear regression model on all complete observations. Table 5 shows the

Estimate	Model parameter	<i>t</i>
Constant	33.44***	(6.49)
Gender : Male (base)		
Gender : Female	0.11	(0.03)
Gender : Diverse	-14.10**	(-2.66)
Net household income : < 1,500 Euro / month (base)		
Net household income : 1,500 to 2,490 Euro / month	11.22**	(3.06)
Net household income : 2,500 to 3,999 Euro / month	13.54***	(3.77)
Net household income : > 4000 Euro / month	15.72***	(3.66)
Age : 18 – 24 (base)		
Age : 25 – 34	3.42	(0.90)
Age : 35 – 44	1.11	(0.26)
Age : 45 – 54	4.20	(0.93)
Age : 55 – 64	-2.59	(-0.65)
Age : 65 – 74	-1.13	(-0.25)
Age : > 75	5.08	(0.47)
Uses the car more than one day per week	1.57	(0.43)
Uses public transport more than one day per week	16.27***	(5.39)
Living in urban metropolis (according to RegioStar7)	-5.60	(-1.91)
Participant is part of the nation-wide panel	-6.40*	(-2.48)
<i>N</i>	1,333	
<i>R</i> ²	0.077	

t statistics in parentheses

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

Table 5: Ordinary least squares estimates of the willingness-to-pay model

resulting estimates. We find that the average WTP is around 33 Euro which translates to roughly 1 Euro per day. We find no significant differences between males and females, Intuitively, we find that that having an income higher than 1,500 Euro per month increases the WTP by 10 Euro to 15 Euro compared to the lowest income group (see Table 2). In our sample, we find no age effect. In addition, using the car frequently does not impact the WTP, but being a frequent public transport user before the introduction of the 9-Euro-Ticket increases the WTP by around 16 Euro. We further find that residing in an urban metropolis according to the RegioStar7 classification (see Table 2) decreases the WTP by around 5 Euro (almost statistically significant at the five percent level of statistical significance). This effect can be attributed to the fact that usually the price of a travel pass increases with distance to the core urban area. In other words, residents of this area are used to cheaper travel passes compared to residents in surrounding more suburban areas. Last, we control for the differences in the two panels and find that the WTP in the nation-wide panel is around 6 Euro less compared to the Munich-based panel, which can be explained by the higher income levels in and around Munich.

Figure 17 shows the outcomes of the discrete-choice experiment conducted in the after period of the 9-Euro-Ticket experiment. It can be seen that with an increase in the price for the successor ticket, the participants' interest declines substantially. Interestingly, while in the nation-wide panel participants choose with increasing prices for the 9-Euro-Ticket successor the cheaper Lokalabo (local travel pass) instead, in the Munich-based panel the shares of “no travel pass” and the “distance-based pricing” increase. The latter could be attributed to having the successor ticket as an “accessoire” if reasonably priced, but not as a mobility tool. Generally, when transit agencies offer a cheap local travel pass (Lokalabo), the travel pass ownership shares will substantially increase compared to existing travel pass ownership levels as shown in Table 2.




Figure 17: Shares of travel pass ownership choices in the discrete-choice experiment as a function of the price for the 9-Euro-Ticket successor ticket.

7. Discussion

(e.g., Krämer et al., 2022) or using third-party mobile phone data (e.g., Gaus et al., 2023)

The changes in travel behavior during the period of the 9-Euro-Ticket are as expected: a shift towards public transport, but despite a very low price, not all car trips have been replaced by public transport (c.f. Figure 8). Some findings suggest that some study participants increased their public transport usage after the 9-Euro-Ticket intervention compared to the period before the ticket, but it remains to be seen how this effect develops over time. With the introduction of a successor ticket in May 2023 priced at 49 Euro, it will be interesting to how the different pricing points and the non-temporary nature of the successor ticket make a difference in travel behavior compared to the 9-Euro-Ticket period.

The responses of our three-wave panel survey are in alignment with the general perception of the effects of the 9-Euro-Ticket in Germany, arguably due to relying on a professional panel agency to ensure a representative sample. Nevertheless, the rates of 9-Euro-Ticket ownership in the Munich-based panel at around 90 % seem rather high. This could result from a sample selection bias as the “Mobilität.Leben” study was marketed in the media as the 9-Euro-Ticket study, but given the good accessibility by public transport in the Munich metropolitan region, it can not be ruled out that these ownership levels are representative for the region. Unfortunately, no local data exists to validate this hypothesis.

This study bears limitations. The short time period between the announcement of the 9-Euro-Ticket and its start in June 2022 did not suffice to recruit a representative panel across the Munich metropolitan area. Despite relying on a professional panel agency for the three-wave panel survey to partially account for this in the survey, the sample bias in our tracking sample persists. Nevertheless, all relevant parts of the population are part of our sample and thus sample weights that account, e.g., for income and education, can be derived to reduce the bias. The short time period also limited the observation time before the start of the 9-Euro-Ticket with half of the sample having recorded no trip at all before the ticket’s introduction. Thus, appropriate methodological techniques must be selected when investigating the impact of the 9-Euro-Ticket on travel behavior like mode choice and induced demand.

Generally, the used innovative travel survey method of combining a panel survey with a smartphone-based travel diary has been proven successful. This study faces similar participation issues, e.g., self-selection bias, drop outs, and missing validation of trips and activities, as other studies have reported (e.g., Allström et al., 2017; Lutig et al., 2022), that can limit the validity of results. Nevertheless, with its focus, design and length, the study “Mobilität.Leben” will make contributions to travel survey methods and thus allow to improve future travel surveys using smartphone-based travel diaries together with panel surveys.

8. Conclusions

In this paper, we presented the first empirical findings of our study “Mobilität.Leben” that we established to observe the natural and forced experiment of the 9-Euro-Ticket in the summer months of 2022 in Germany. We showed the stated responses collected through a three-wave panel survey on the changes in travel behavior with focus on car and public transport usage. We corroborated these findings with the data collected through our smartphone-based travel diary with passive waypoint tracking. In our tracking sample we found a modal shift towards public transport from the car of around five percentage points of the average daily travel distance during the 9-Euro-Ticket period, which is similar to findings from another study (Gaus et al., 2023). We also found indications in the collected data that suggest that some participants increased their public transport usage after the 9-Euro-Ticket intervention compared to the period before. In other words, some participants might be activated to increase public transport usage through the 9-Euro-Ticket. We also investigated the willingness-to-pay for a successor ticket to the 9-Euro-Ticket during and after the 9-Euro-Ticket. When considering that the successor ticket started on May 1, 2023, priced at 49 Euro, we found that it will impact

travel pass ownership: in our nationwide panel ownership will increase only slightly, while in our Munich-based panel ownership levels could grow by up to 50%. We further found that if public transport operators provide an attractive local travel pass in addition to the successor ticket, ownership shares for travel passes could rise even further.

Future research will explore in depth the behavioral dimensions of the natural and forced experiment. Particular focus will be on investigating the impact of the 9-Euro-Ticket on mode choice and associated changes in the valuation of travel time as well as on analyzing induced demand effects. As it is known that crowding increases the value of travel time savings (e.g., Li and Hensher, 2011; Prud'homme et al., 2012; Wardman and Murphy, 2015), future research will also explore the impact of crowding. Given the special spatial feature of the 9-Euro-Ticket compared to the existing travel passes with limited spatial validity in Germany, particular focus will be given to travel behavior across administrative boundaries. With the desire of the 9-Euro-Ticket to be a strong policy instrument for reducing carbon emissions in the transportation sector, future research will also concentrate on estimating the nationwide carbon emission savings from the 9-Euro-Ticket policy in relation to the simultaneous fuel tax cut. Future research will also analyze the primary nature of the 9-Euro-Ticket of being a relief to the 2022 cost-of-living crisis and to what extent this subsidy policy had on the redistribution of income (Spence, 1977). Last, the travel survey method used in our study will be analyzed and compared to other approaches too. From a political science perspective it will be interesting to analyze the long-term impact of the 9-Euro-Ticket on the policy mix in the transport policy field, and to what extent demands in the population for a fundamental transformation of the transport sector (towards more public transport) will be promoted or inhibited.

In closing, before the start of the 9-Euro-Ticket in June 2022, many expected overcrowded trains. In the end, this did not occur on a regular basis everywhere in the country, but only a few trains to touristic locations, e.g., from Berlin to the Baltic Sea or from Munich to Lake Tegernsee. Additionally, congestion levels did drop, but congestion did not vanish. The 9-Euro-Ticket experiment shows that the effects of almost fare-free public transport in Germany are not substantially different from other experiences (e.g., Cats et al., 2014), allowing us to make the following key policy implication: the desire that attractive pricing alone suffices to incentive sustainable travel behavior and lift congestion did not materialize; other or additional policy instruments are required to meet our societies' sustainability goals.

Acknowledgement

Allister Loder acknowledges funding by the Bavarian State Ministry of Science and the Arts in the framework of the bidt Graduate Center for Postdocs. Fabienne Cantner and Felix Gotzler acknowledge funding by the Munich Data Science Institute (MDSI) within the scope of its Seed Fund scheme. The authors would like to thank the TUM Think Tank at the Munich School of Politics and Public Policy led by Urs Gasser for their financial and organizational support and the TUM Board of Management for personally supporting the genesis of the project. The authors thank the company MOTIONTAG for their efforts in producing the app at unprecedented speed. Further, the authors would like thank everyone who supported us in recruiting participants, especially Oliver May-Beckmann and Ulrich Meyer from M Cube and TUM, respectively.

References

- Adler, M.W., van Ommeren, J.N., 2016. Does public transit reduce car travel externalities? Quasi-natural experiments' evidence from transit strikes. *Journal of Urban Economics* 92, 106–119.
- AG, D.B., VDV, 2022. Abschlussbericht zur bundesweiten Marktforschung. Technical Report.
- Alessandretti, L., Sapiezynski, P., Sekara, V., Lehmann, S., Baronchelli, A., 2018. Evidence for a conserved quantity in human mobility. *Nature Human Behaviour* 2, 485–491. doi:10.1038/s41562-018-0364-x.

- Allström, A., Kristoffersson, I., Susilo, Y., 2017. Smartphone based travel diary collection: experiences from a field trial in Stockholm. *Transportation Research Procedia* 26, 32–38. URL: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S2352146517308657>, doi:10.1016/j.trpro.2017.07.006.
- Anderson, M.L., 2014. Subways, Strikes, and Slowdowns: The Impacts of Public Transit on Traffic Congestion. *American Economic Review* 104, 2763–2796. doi:10.1257/aer.104.9.2763.
- Andor, M.A., Fink, L., Frondel, M., Gerster, A., Horvath, M., 2021. Kostenloser ÖPNV: Akzeptanz in der Bevölkerung und mögliche Auswirkungen auf das Mobilitätsverhalten. *List Forum für Wirtschafts- und Finanzpolitik* 46, 299–325. URL: <https://link.springer.com/10.1007/s41025-020-00207-y>, doi:10.1007/s41025-020-00207-y.
- Axsen, J., Plötz, P., Wolinetz, M., 2020. Crafting strong, integrated policy mixes for deep CO2 mitigation in road transport. *Nature Climate Change* 10, 809–818. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41558-020-0877-y>, doi:10.1038/s41558-020-0877-y. publisher: Springer US.
- Banister, D., 2008. The sustainable mobility paradigm. *Transport Policy* 15, 73–80. URL: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0967070X07000820>, doi:10.1016/j.tranpol.2007.10.005.
- Barnea, G., Hagemann, C., Wurster, S., 2022. Policy instruments matter: Support schemes for renewable energy capacity in worldwide comparison. *Energy Policy* 168, 113093. URL: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0301421522003184>, doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2022.113093.
- Basso, L.J., Silva, H.E., 2014. Efficiency and Substitutability of Transit Subsidies and Other Urban Transport Policies. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy* 6, 1–33. URL: <https://pubs.aeaweb.org/doi/10.1257/pol.6.4.1>, doi:10.1257/pol.6.4.1.
- Bauernschuster, S., Hener, T., Rainer, H., 2017. When Labor Disputes Bring Cities to a Standstill: The Impact of Public Transit Strikes on Traffic, Accidents, Air Pollution, and Health. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy* 9, 1–37. URL: <https://pubs.aeaweb.org/doi/10.1257/pol.20150414>, doi:10.1257/pol.20150414.
- Becker, H., Loder, A., Schmid, B., Axhausen, K.W., 2017. Modeling car-sharing membership as a mobility tool: A multivariate Probit approach with latent variables. *Travel Behaviour and Society* 8, 26–36. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tbs.2017.04.006>, doi:10.1016/j.tbs.2017.04.006.
- Ben-Akiva, M.E., Lerman, S.R., 1985. *Discrete choice analysis: theory and application to travel demand*. MIT press, Cambridge, MA.
- Buehler, R., Pucher, J., Gerike, R., Götschi, T., 2016. Reducing car dependence in the heart of Europe: lessons from Germany, Austria, and Switzerland. *Transport Reviews* 37, 4–28. doi:10.1080/01441647.2016.1177799.
- Bull, O., Muñoz, J.C., Silva, H.E., 2021. The impact of fare-free public transport on travel behavior: Evidence from a randomized controlled trial. *Regional Science and Urban Economics* 86, 103616. URL: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S016604622030301X>, doi:10.1016/j.regsciurbeco.2020.103616.
- Bundesfinanzministerium, 2022. Maßnahmenpaket des Bundes zum Umgang mit den hohen Energiekosten. Ergebnis des Koalitionsausschusses. URL: https://www.bundesfinanzministerium.de/Content/DE/Downloads/2022-03-23-massnahmenpaket-bund-hohe-energiekosten.pdf?__blob=publicationFile&v=6.
- Bundesministerium für Verkehr und digitale Infrastruktur, 2018a. *Mobilität in Deutschland Ergebnisbericht*. Technical Report. Bonn. URL: <https://www.bmvi.de/SharedDocs/DE/Artikel/G/mobilitaet-in-deutschland.html>.

- Bundesministerium für Verkehr und digitale Infrastruktur, 2018b. *Mobilität in Deutschland Ergebnisbericht*. Technical Report. Bonn. URL: <https://www.bmvi.de/SharedDocs/DE/Artikel/G/mobilitaet-in-deutschland.html>.
- Carbajo, 1988. The Economics of Travel Passes: Non-Uniform Pricing in Transport. *Journal of Transport Economics and Policy* 22, 153–173. doi:10.2307/20052843.
- Carr, C., Hesse, M., 2020. Mobility policy through the lens of policy mobility: The post-political case of introducing free transit in Luxembourg. *Journal of Transport Geography* 83, 102634. URL: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0966692319304892>, doi:10.1016/j.jtrangeo.2020.102634.
- Cats, O., Reimal, T., Susilo, Y., 2014. Public Transport Pricing Policy - Empirical Evidence from a Fare-Free Scheme in Tallinn, Estonia. *Transportation Research Record* 2415, 89–96. URL: <http://trrjournalonline.trb.org/doi/10.3141/2415-10>, doi:10.3141/2415-10.
- Christidis, P., Navajas Cawood, E., Fiorello, D., 2022. Challenges for urban transport policy after the Covid-19 pandemic: Main findings from a survey in 20 European cities. *Transport Policy* 129, 105–116. URL: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0967070X2200292X>, doi:10.1016/j.tranpol.2022.10.007.
- Djeflal, C., Siewert, M.B., Wurster, S., 2022. Role of the state and responsibility in governing artificial intelligence: a comparative analysis of AI strategies. *Journal of European Public Policy* 29, 1799–1821. URL: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/13501763.2022.2094987>, doi:10.1080/13501763.2022.2094987.
- Eisenmann, C., Nobis, C., Kolarova, V., Lenz, B., Winkler, C., 2021. Transport mode use during the COVID-19 lockdown period in Germany: The car became more important, public transport lost ground. *Transport Policy* 103, 60–67. URL: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0967070X21000184>, doi:10.1016/j.tranpol.2021.01.012.
- EuroStat, 2023. Population on 1 January by age, sex and nuts 2 region. https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/databrowser/product/page/demo_r_d2jan.
- Falk, A., Becker, A., Dohmen, T., Enke, B., Huffman, D., Sunde, U., 2018. Global evidence on economic preferences. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 133, 1645–1692.
- Falk, A., Becker, A., Dohmen, T., Huffman, D., Sunde, U., 2022. The preference survey module: A validated instrument for measuring risk, time, and social preferences. *Management Science* .
- Gaus, D., Murray, N., Link, H., 2023. 9-Euro-Ticket: Niedrigere Preise allein stärken Alltagsmobilität mit öffentlichen Verkehrsmitteln nicht. *DIW Wochenbericht* URL: http://www.diw.de/sixcms/detail.php?id=diw_01.c.869729.de, doi:10.18723/DIW_WB:2023-14-1. publisher: DIW - Deutsches Institut für Wirtschaftsforschung Version Number: 2.0.
- Gerike, R., Schulz, A., 2018. Workshop synthesis: Surveys on long-distance travel and other rare events. *Transportation Research Procedia* 32, 535–541. doi:10.1016/j.trpro.2018.10.032.
- González, M.C., Hidalgo, C.A., Barabási, A.L., 2008. Understanding individual human mobility patterns. *Nature* 453, 779–782. doi:10.1038/nature06958.
- Greening, L.A., Greene, D.L., Difiglio, C., 2000. Energy efficiency and consumption — the rebound effect — a survey. *Energy Policy* 28, 389–401. doi:10.1016/S0301-4215(00)00021-5.
- Heinen, E., van Wee, B., Maat, K., 2010. Commuting by bicycle: An overview of the literature. *Transport Reviews* 30, 59–96. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1080/01441640903187001>, doi:10.1080/01441640903187001, arXiv:<https://doi.org/10.1080/01441640903187001>.

- Hoppmann, J., Huenteler, J., Girod, B., 2014. Compulsive policy-making—The evolution of the German feed-in tariff system for solar photovoltaic power. *Research Policy* 43, 1422–1441. URL: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0048733314000249>, doi:10.1016/j.respol.2014.01.014.
- Hymel, K.M., Small, K.A., Dender, K.V., 2010. Induced demand and rebound effects in road transport. *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological* 44, 1220–1241. doi:10.1016/J.TRB.2010.02.007.
- Kebrowski, W., 2020. Why (not) abolish fares? Exploring the global geography of fare-free public transport. *Transportation* 47, 2807–2835. URL: <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s11116-019-09986-6>, doi:10.1007/s11116-019-09986-6.
- Knoflacher, H., 2019. Wem gehört die Stadt? Plädoyer für einen Paradigmenwechsel in Stadtplanung und Verkehrspolitik. *DER NAHVERKEHR* 37, 51.
- Kolarova, V., Eisenmann, C., Nobis, C., Winkler, C., Lenz, B., 2021. Analysing the impact of the COVID-19 outbreak on everyday travel behaviour in Germany and potential implications for future travel patterns. *European Transport Research Review* 13, 27. URL: <https://etr.r.springeropen.com/articles/10.1186/s12544-021-00486-2>, doi:10.1186/s12544-021-00486-2.
- Krämer, A., Wilger, G., Bongaerts, R., 2022. Das 9-Euro-Ticket: Erfahrungen, Wirkungsmechanismen und Nachfolgeangebot. *Wirtschaftsdienst* 102, 873–879. URL: <https://link.springer.com/10.1007/s10273-022-3313-2>, doi:10.1007/s10273-022-3313-2.
- Köllinger, 2022. Cascais free public transit services result in 10% more users URL: <https://www.eltis.org/in-brief/news/cascais-free-public-transit-services-result-10-more-users>. <https://www.themayor.eu/en/a/view/two-years-of-free-public-transport-in-cascais-have-drawn-in-10-more-commuters-10052>.
- Larcom, S., Rauch, F., Willems, T., 2017. The Benefits of Forced Experimentation: Striking Evidence from the London Underground Network*. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 132, 2019–2055. URL: <https://academic.oup.com/qje/article/132/4/2019/3857744>, doi:10.1093/qje/qjx020.
- Li, Z., Hensher, D.A., 2011. Crowding and public transport: A review of willingness to pay evidence and its relevance in project appraisal. *Transport Policy* 18, 880–887. doi:10.1016/J.TRANPOL.2011.06.003. publisher: Pergamon.
- Lindsey, R., Santos, G., 2020. Addressing transportation and environmental externalities with economics: Are policy makers listening? *Research in Transportation Economics* 82, 100872. doi:10.1016/j.retrec.2020.100872.
- Loder, A., Bliemer, M.C., Axhausen, K.W., 2022. Optimal pricing and investment in a multi-modal city — Introducing a macroscopic network design problem based on the MFD. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice* 156, 113–132. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tra.2021.11.026>, doi:10.1016/j.tra.2021.11.026.
- Lutig, P., Roth, K., Schouten, B., 2022. Nonresponse analysis in a longitudinal smartphone-based travel study. *Survey Research Methods* , 13–27 Pages URL: <https://ojs.ub.uni-konstanz.de/srm/article/view/7835>, doi:10.18148/SRM/2022.V16I1.7835. artwork Size: 13-27 Pages Publisher: Survey Research Methods.
- civity Management Consultants, 2021. Gutachten 365-Euro-Ticket für Alle - Endbericht. URL: <https://www.vgn.de/5ef141c9-e1c4-655e-a3de-196f385b0e70>.
- Molloy, J., Castro, A., Götschi, T., Schoeman, B., Tchervenkov, C., Tomic, U., Hintermann, B., Axhausen, K.W., 2022. The MOBIS dataset: a large GPS dataset of mobility behaviour in Switzerland. *Transportation* URL: <https://link.springer.com/10.1007/s11116-022-10299-4>, doi:10.1007/s11116-022-10299-4.

- Molloy, J., Schatzmann, T., Schoeman, B., Tchervenkov, C., Hintermann, B., Axhausen, K.W., 2021. Observed impacts of the Covid-19 first wave on travel behaviour in Switzerland based on a large GPS panel. *Transport Policy* 104, 43–51. doi:10.1016/J.TRANPOL.2021.01.009.
- Paget-Seekins, L., 2023. Transit Ridership and Fare Policy in the Recovery from COVID: A Scan of Industry Responses and Plans, Paper presented at the 102nd Annual Meeting of the Transportation Research Board, Washington, DC.
- Parry, I.W.H., Walls, M., Harrington, W., 2007. Automobile Externalities and Policies. *Journal of Economic Literature* 45, 373–399. doi:10.2139/ssrn.927794.
- Prud'homme, R., Koning, M., Lenormand, L., Fehr, A., 2012. Public transport congestion costs: The case of the Paris subway. *Transport Policy* 21, 101–109. URL: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0967070X11001302>, doi:10.1016/j.tranpol.2011.11.002.
- Santos, G., Behrendt, H., Maconi, L., Shirvani, T., Teytelboym, A., 2010. Part I: Externalities and economic policies in road transport. *Research in Transportation Economics* 28, 2–45. doi:10.1016/j.retrec.2009.11.002.
- Sharaby, N., Shiftan, Y., 2012. The impact of fare integration on travel behavior and transit ridership. *Transport Policy* 21, 63–70. URL: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0967070X12000169>, doi:10.1016/j.tranpol.2012.01.015.
- Shoup, D.C., 1997. The High Cost of Free Parking. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 17, 3–20. doi:10.1177/016344300022005001.
- Small, K.A., Verhoef, E.T., 2007. *The economics of urban transportation*. Routledge, London. ISSN: 978-0-415-28514-8.
- Spence, M., 1977. Nonlinear prices and welfare. *Journal of Public Economics* 8, 1–18. URL: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/004727277900251>, doi:10.1016/0047-2727(77)90025-1.
- Storchmann, K., 2003. Externalities by Automobiles and Fare-Free Transit in Germany — A Paradigm Shift? *Journal of Public Transportation* 6, 89–105. URL: <http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/jpt/vol6/iss4/5/>, doi:10.5038/2375-0901.6.4.5.
- Tirachini, A., Hensher, D.A., Rose, J.M., 2014. Multimodal pricing and optimal design of urban public transport: The interplay between traffic congestion and bus crowding. *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological* 61, 33–54. doi:10.1016/j.trb.2014.01.003.
- Topp, H.H., 1993. Parking policies to reduce car traffic in German cities. *Transport Reviews* 13, 83–95. URL: <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/01441649308716836>, doi:10.1080/01441649308716836.
- Wardman, M., Murphy, P., 2015. Passengers' valuations of train seating layout, position and occupancy. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice* 74, 222–238. URL: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0965856415000154>, doi:10.1016/j.tra.2015.01.007.
- Weis, C., Axhausen, K.W., 2009. Induced travel demand: Evidence from a pseudo panel data based structural equations model. *Research in Transportation Economics* 25, 8–18. URL: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0739885909000328>, doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.retrec.2009.08.007.
- White, P.R., 1984. Development of the 'Travelcard' Concept in Urban Public Transport. *The Service Industries Journal* 4, 133–150. doi:10.1080/02642068400000067.

Wirtz, Matthias, Vortisch, Peter, Chlond, Bastian, 2015. Flatrate Bias in Public Transportation: Magnitude and Reasoning, in: Paper presented at the 94th Annual Meeting of the Transportation Research Board, Washington D.C.

Zhu, S., Levinson, D., Liu, H.X., Harder, K., 2010. The traffic and behavioral effects of the I-35W Mississippi River bridge collapse. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice* 44, 771–784. doi:10.1016/J.TRA.2010.07.001.