



MODELLING SHOPPING DESTINATION CHOICES:  
A THEORETICAL AND EMPIRICAL INVESTIGATION

by

PETER O. BARNARD

A thesis presented for the degree of Doctor of  
Philosophy in the Department of Economics, University  
of Adelaide, Adelaide, South Australia

September, 1986

Adelaide 4/12/86

This thesis contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in any university and to the best of my knowledge and belief, the thesis contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference is made in the text

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Peter O. Barnard." The signature is written in dark ink and is centered on the page.

PETER O. BARNARD

To my grandmothers Marion Hughes and Doris Marjory Barnard who have lived through times when (of necessity) greater concern was placed on the availability of funds to spend than where such funds might be best spent.

## ERRATA

In material like that contained in this thesis it is easy to generate errors. Below is a list of known errors at the time of final submission of the thesis. For drawing my attention to some of these errors I thank the two examiners and a number of colleagues who have reviewed the work subsequent to initial submission. Other of the errors listed have come to light in the process of preparing research papers from the thesis. I apologize to the reader for any remaining errors.

p. xi In line 11 'relationships' should be singular.

p. 32 In line 2 of the footnote 11A should read IIA.

p. 52 Equation (2.24) should read:

$$E_q = f_2(B_{qe}, p_{1q}, \dots, p_{Nq}, b_{1qe}, \dots, b_{Nqe}, a_{1q}, \dots, a_{Nq})$$

p. 53 Equation (2.25) should read:

$$T_q = f_3(E_q, b_{1qe}, \dots, b_{Nqe})$$

p. 61 Line 10 should read:

$$U_j(g_j^*, \bar{z}_j^*, L_j^*, B_j, \epsilon_j) > U_i(g_i^*, \bar{z}_i^*, L_i^*, B_i, \epsilon_i)$$

p. 62 Equation (3.10) should read:

$$g_i = - \frac{\partial V_i / \partial p_i}{\partial V_i / \partial Y} = g_i(p_i, B_i, t_i, c_i, Y, \epsilon)$$

p. 64 In the footnote, line 1,  $b_i$  should be replaced with  $B_i$ .

p. 69 In line 1 of equation (3.24)  $p_1$  should be replaced with  $p_i$ .

p. 77 Equation (3.47) could have been derived by multiplying equation (3.39) by  $p_j$  and taking logarithms, rather than the convoluted derivation used in the text.

p. 78 Lines 14/15 should read: 'where  $v_q$  is an individual specific error term assumed to be distributed iid extreme value type 1'.

p. 123 Line 8 should read:

$$AVGCONV_d = \sum_q^{Q_d} GCONV_d / Q_d$$

p. 163 Equation (5.6) should read:

$$E(A^* | N) = \int_0^\infty N A [F(A)]^{N-1} dF(A)$$

p. 163 Lines 3/4: the sentence, 'E(A\* | N) will be a decreasing function of N' should be omitted.

p. 163 Equation (5.7) should read:

$$\begin{aligned} f(N) &= E(A^* | N) - E(A^* | N-1) \\ &= \int_0^\infty A [F(A)]^{N-1} \left[ N [1 - F(A)] + F(A) \right] dF(A) \end{aligned}$$

pp. 168/169 A line is missing from the bottom of p.168. The correct wording for the paragraph following equation (5.15) is: 'The model described by equations (5.13) - (5.15) was first constructed (in a different context) by Sheffi (1979). It is one of a family of models that may be applied to ordinal data. Other members of this family are the exploded logit model of Beggs et al. (1981) and the ordered logit model described, for example, in Maddala (1983, pp. 46-49)'.

p. 168 An examiner has astutely observed that the model of equations (5.13) - (5.15) is equivalent to the sequential logit model (see e.g. Maddala 1983, pp. 49-51) jointly estimated and with parameter restrictions imposed. This examiner has also pointed out that the iid property shared by error terms in a logit model is an especially strong assumption in this context.

p. 173 The heading of Table 5.7 should read: 'SIMULTANEOUSLY ESTIMATED SEQUENTIAL LOGIT MODEL OF CHOICE SET SIZE'.

p. 180 Equation (6.1) should read:

$$V_{q(sp)} = \bar{V}_{q(sp)}(Z_{q(sp)}, \alpha) + \epsilon_{q(sp)}$$

p. 201 The footnote should read, 'Note that  $\sigma_{u_j \eta_j^*} = \sigma_{u_j u_j} \rho_{u_j \eta_j^*}$  since

$$(\sigma_{\eta_j^* \eta_j^*})^2 \text{ is equal to } 1'.$$

p. 215 Internal consistency check (iv) should read:

$$\frac{\text{PAR}(11)}{\text{PAR}(4)} = \frac{\alpha_5 \mu}{\alpha_1 a_1} = \frac{\text{PAR}(12)}{\text{PAR}(5)}$$

pp 215/16. Generally on these pages  $\mu$  has been omitted from the estimated parameters where an obvious cancellation exists. For example, for consistency check (i) estimated parameters from the MNL model are  $\text{PAR}(3)/\mu$  and  $\text{PAR}(4)/\mu$ . However,  $\text{PAR}(3)/\mu$  has simply been presented as  $\text{PAR}(3)$ .

$$\frac{\text{PAR}(4)/\mu}{\text{PAR}(4)}$$

p. 217 The last term of the RHS vector should read:

$$\frac{1}{\text{PAR}(5)} \alpha_1 a_1 \text{PAR}(12)$$

p. 219 Line 4 of equation (7.34) should read:

$$- \alpha_2 a_1 (\alpha_5 - 1) * a_2 (\alpha_5 - 1) p_{iq}$$

p. 220 Line 2 of equation (7.39) should read:

$$= v_{iq} \alpha_1^{-1} \alpha_5 p_i + \alpha_1^{-1} \alpha_2 p_i^{-1}$$

p. 221 Line 4 of equation (7.40) should read:

$$- \alpha_1^{-1} \alpha_2 p_i^{-2}$$

p. 246 Line 3 should read:

$$(\sigma_{u_j u_j})^2 = \frac{1}{Q} \sum (E_{iq} - X_{iq} \beta)^2 + (\sigma_{u_j \eta_j^*})^2 \frac{1}{Q} \sum [J(\alpha, Z_{iq}) \phi[J(\alpha, Z_{iq})] / D(\alpha, Z_{iq})]$$

p. 286 The reference with authors listed as 'NAKANISKI, M. and L.F. COOPER' should be 'NAKANISHI, M. and L.F. COOPER'.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF FIGURES	(v)
LIST OF TABLES	(vi)
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	(ix)
ABSTRACT	(xi)
NOTATION	(xiii)
CHAPTER I      HISTORICAL AND POLICY SETTING AND STUDY AIMS	1
1.      MOTIVATION FOR STUDYING MODELS OF SHOPPING BEHAVIOUR	1
2.      A RESUME OF METHODS USED TO PREDICT SHOPPING ACTIVITY	4
2.1    Regression Based Traffic Generation Analysis	4
2.2    Trade-Area Analysis	6
2.3    Gravity Models	6
2.4    Discrete Choice Models (DCMs)	9
3.      AN OUTLINE OF THIS REPORT	11
CHAPTER II     MODELS OF SHOPPING DESTINATION CHOICE: A REVIEW CONCENTRATING ON MULTINOMIAL LOGIT FORMS	13
1.      INTRODUCTION	13
2.      SHOPPING DESTINATION CHOICE MODELLING OBJECTIVES	14
3.      BASIC MNL MODELS OF SHOPPING DESTINATION CHOICE : AN OVERVIEW	18
4.      DESTINATION CHOICE SETS IDENTIFICATION	28

5.	QUASI-DYNAMIC MODELS OF SHOPPING DESTINATION CHOICE BEHAVIOUR	39
5.1	Simultaneous Models of Travel Patterns	40
5.2	Sequential Models of Travel Patterns	42
6.	INTEGRATED MODELS OF SHOPPING DESTINATION CHOICE AND SHOPPING EXPENDITURE	50
7.	CONCLUDING COMMENTS	54
CHAPTER III	A THEORETICAL MODEL OF SHOPPING DESTINATION CHOICE AND ITS RELATIONSHIP WITH SHOPPING EXPENDITURE	
1.	INTRODUCTION	55
2.	SHOPPING CENTRE AND EXPENDITURE CHOICE: THE GENERAL THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	57
3.	ISSUES IN THE SPECIFICATION OF THE QUALITY INDICES AND FORM OF THE CONDITIONAL INDIRECT UTILITY FUNCTIONS	63
3.1	Quality Variable Inclusion	64
3.2	A Note on Functional Form	67
4.	A MODIFIED HANEMANN MODEL OF SHOPPING DESTINATION AND EXPENDITURE CHOICES WITH ACCESSIBILITY TREATED AS A QUALITY VARIABLE	72
5.	A FULL CONDITIONAL INDIRECT UTILITY MODEL	80
6.	CONCLUSION	85
APPENDIX 3A:	PROOF OF ROY'S IDENTITY WHEN APPLIED TO A QUALITY ENHANCED CONDITIONAL RANDOM INDIRECT UTILITY FUNCTION	87
CHAPTER IV	DATA DESCRIPTION AND SOME BASIC MODELS OF FOOD SHOPPING MODE/DESTINATION CHOICES	
1.	INTRODUCTION	90
2.	DATA	90

3.	BASIC MODE/DESTINATION CHOICE MODELS FOR FOUR CATEGORIES OF FOOD SHOPPING	105
3.1	General Data Analysis	105
3.2	Relationship Between Reported and Network Travel Time Values	111
3.3	Analysis of Attitudinal Destination Attractiveness Measures	121
3.4	Variable Definitions	121
3.5	Estimation Results for Basic Simultaneous Mode/Destination Food Shopping Choice Models	127
3.6	Policy Simulation	138
4.	SUMMARY	143
	APPENDIX 4A: THE SHOPPING QUESTIONNAIRE	144
CHAPTER V	CHOICE SET SPECIFICATION IN DISCRETE SHOPPING DESTINATION CHOICE MODELS: AN EMPIRICAL EXPLORATION WITH THE MAJOR GROCERY SHOPPING DATA SUBSET	
1.	INTRODUCTION	149
2.	EFFECTS OF CHOICE SET MIS-SPECIFICATION ON PARAMETER ESTIMATES OF MNL MODELS	150
2.1	Effect of Choice Set Mis-specification on MNL Parameter Estimates: Theory	151
2.2	Effect of Choice Set Mis-specification on MNL Parameter Estimates: Empirical Evidence	154
3.	AN INVESTIGATION OF STORE CHOICE SET DETERMINATION	160
3.1	A Theory of Store Choice Set Determination	162
3.2	Empirical Results on Store Choice Set Determination	169
4.	CONCLUSION	175



CHAPTER VI	MODELLING MICRO LEVEL LINKAGES BETWEEN FOOD SHOPPING ACTIVITIES	
1.	INTRODUCTION	176
2.	AN OUTLINE OF AN APPROACH TO MODELLING URBAN FOOD SHOPPING BEHAVIOUR	177
3.	ANALYSIS AND MODEL ESTIMATION	183
4.	CONCLUSION	193
CHAPTER VII	AN INTEGRATED EMPIRICAL MODEL OF GROCERY SHOPPING STORE CHOICE AND LEVEL OF EXPENDITURE	
1.	INTRODUCTION	194
2.	STATISTICAL ISSUES OF SAMPLE SELECTIVITY	195
	2.1 The Heckman/Lee Selectivity Correction Factor	196
	2.2 The Hay-Dubin and McFadden Selectivity Correction Factor	203
	2.3 Summary	205
3.	MIXTURE MODELS VERSUS SAMPLE SELECTIVITY MODELS	205
4.	ESTIMATION OF AN INTEGRATED STORE CHOICE / SHOPPING EXPENDITURE MODEL	211
	4.1 Towards an Estimable Model and the Diewert Conditions	212
	4.2 Estimation Results	225
5.	CONCLUSION	237
	APPENDIX 7A: THE HECKMAN-LEE TWO STAGE SELECTIVITY CORRECTION METHOD: DERIVATION OF THE VARIANCE/ COVARIANCE MATRIX FOR THE CONTINUOUS CHOICE MODEL	239
	APPENDIX 7B: LISTING OF A COMPUTER PROGRAM TO CALCULATE THE HECKMAN-LEE SELECTIVITY CORRECTION FACTOR AND THE CORRECTED VARIANCE/COVARIANCE MATRIX FOR THE CONTINUOUS CHOICE MODEL	247
CHAPTER VIII	SUMMARY OF THE MAJOR CONTRIBUTIONS OF THIS REPORT AND SOME SUGGESTIONS ON POSSIBLE FUTURE RESEARCH	268
REFERENCES		274

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure No.		Page
2.1	A Suggested Nested Modelling Structure for Shopping Destination Choice	24
2.2	Schema of Modelling Structure Adopted by Kitamura and Kermanshah 1984	48
3.1	Indifference Curves and Budget Line for the Unconditional Utility Function of Equation (3.15) with $N = 2$	66
4.1	Map of Study Area	92
4.2	Example of Some Mode and Store Information Collected from Shopping Questionnaire	96
4.3	Example Diary Page	98
4.4	Analysis of Survey Response by Household Characteristics	102
4.5	Analysis of Survey Response by Person Characteristics	103
4.6	Notional Relationship Between Choice and Different Attribute Measurements	112
4.7	Graph of Power Function $R_i = N_i^{\delta_2}$ for Different Values of $\delta_2$	116
4.8	Illustration of the Choice Set for a Hypothetical Individual	136
6.1	Possible Food Shopping Tour Arrangements	182
6.2	Classification of Major Selected Food Shopping Arrangements by Sample Households	184
7.1	Illustration of Estimated and True Regression Lines, $y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x$ , When Inclusion of Sample Points Depends on the Value of a Selection Variable	198

## LIST OF TABLES

Table No.		Page
2.1	A Listing of Major Empirical Studies Concerned with MNL Modelling of Shopping Destination Choice	21
4.1	Household Categorized Responses to 1980 Adelaide Activity Diary Survey	100
4.2	Comparison of Attitudinal Destination Attribute Measures for Different Supermarket Chains	106
4.3	Comparison of Attitudinal Destination Attribute Measures for Different Meat Store Types	107
4.4	Comparison of Attitudinal Destination Attribute Measures for Different Greengrocery Store Types	108
4.5	Modal Information: Various Food Shopping Trip Purposes	110
4.6	Variable Mnemonics and Definitions for the Regression Analyses of Tables 4.7A and B	114
4.7A	Non-linear Regression Analyses of Perceived Car Travel Time for Various Food Shopping Purposes	117
4.7B	Linear Regression of Perceived Walking Times for Various Food Shopping Purposes	118
4.8	Mean and Standard Deviations of Destination Attractiveness Measures for Chosen and Non-chosen Stores	122
4.9	Variable Mnemonics and Definitions	123
4.10	Major Grocery Shopping Mode/Store Choice: Basic Simultaneous Logit Model Results	130
4.11	Minor Grocery Shopping Mode/Store Choice: Basic Simultaneous Logit Model Results	131
4.12	Meat Shopping Mode/Store Choice: Basic Simultaneous Logit Model Results	132
4.13	Greengrocery Shopping Mode/Store Choice: Basic Simultaneous Logit Model Results	133

4.14	Major Grocery Shopping Mode/Store Choice: Nested Logit Model Results	139
4.15	Model Predictions of Changes in Modal Use Resulting from Simulated Policy Changes	140
4.16	Average Direct Store Choice Elasticities	141
5.1	Major Grocery Shopping Mode/Store Choice Nested Logit Model Results Using Analyst Assigned Choice Sets	156
5.2	Major Grocery Shopping Mode/Store Choice Nested Logit Model Results Using Respondent Reported Choice Sets	157
5.3	Major Grocery Shopping Mode/Store Choice Simultaneous Logit Model Results Using Analyst Assigned Choice Sets	158
5.4	Major Grocery Shopping Mode/Store Choice Simultaneous Logit Model Results Using Respondent Reported Choice Sets	158
5.5	The Expected Value of the Maximum Store Attractiveness after Sampling N Stores from a Standardised Probability Distribution	164
5.6	Store Choice Set Determination: Probability Store j lies within the Reported Choice Set of Individual q	170
5.7	Logit Model of Choice Set Size	173
6.1	Shopping Frequencies for Major Food Items	178
6.2	Generation of Food Shopping Alternatives (From the Example Displayed in Fig. 4.2)	186
6.3	Estimation Results: Shopping Travel Pattern Model	189
6.4	Comparison Between Tour Model and Separately Estimated Models for Each Type of Food Shopping	192
7.1	Estimated Store Choice Model: Maximum Expenditure Store Data Set	227
7.2	Estimated Store Choice Model: All Stores Data Set	228
7.3	Estimated Shopping Expenditure Model: Maximum Expenditure Store Data Set	229

7.4	Estimated Shopping Expenditure Model: All Stores Data Set	230
7.5	Internal Consistency Checks of the Integrated Store Choice/Shopping Expenditure Model Systems	232
7.6	Discrete Choice Model Direct Elasticity Estimates	234
7.7	Shopping Expenditure Elasticity Estimates	235

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis has been materially assisted by a number of individuals and organisations.

In terms of intellectual input, David Hensher provided the main supervisory function for the thesis. I am especially grateful for the time David put into supervising the thesis as this was done in an honorary capacity. His suggestions were invaluable in improving aspects of the work reported herein. My supervisor at the University of Adelaide, Alastair Fischer, carefully read a draft of the thesis, provided encouragement to complete this work, and oversaw the administrative arrangements associated with thesis submission. John Taplin guided the early stages of the thesis.

Sustenance during my time at the University of Adelaide was provided by a South Australian Department of Transport scholarship. The South Australian Department of Transport also part sponsored the survey used for the empirical work in this thesis. I would particularly like to thank the Director General of Transport for South Australia, Derek Scrafton who at all times indicated a willingness to support the project both financially and by more abstract means.

The Australian Road Research Board not only were a part sponsor of the survey used in this thesis but also provided a convivial and stimulating employment environment over the concluding phases of this thesis.

Bob Botterill provided computer assistance in a number of areas, especially in the development of the program of Appendix 7B.

The thesis was typed, in the most part cheerfully, by Adriana Strohmeier, Virginia Young and Marion Donaghey. Special thanks goes to Jan Brownridge who organised the final production of the thesis and who's views on the importance of this work would seem to exceed my own.

Finally I thank my family and close friends for their support over the years that I have been involved in this study.

## ABSTRACT

In this thesis major contributions are made in two areas of study. The contribution made to retail planning is to generalise the Huff model, which has been extensively applied to forecast retail expenditure levels at stores and shopping centres. The contribution made to travel demand analysis is to demonstrate, in the context of shopping travel, that discrete travel choice models, founded on economic random utility theory incorporate to a substantial extent the decisions of travellers regarding activity participation at trip ends. The relationships between travel and activity decisions has been a major area of debate in the transport literature over the past decade.

Both of these contributions arise from the specification of a comprehensive economic theory of shopping destination choice. This theory is so structured to take advantage of findings from mainstream economic consumer theory. An important relationship long ago unearthed in economic consumer theory, Roy's identity, is used to establish a close link between shopping destination choice and retail expenditure.

The empirical counterpart to this theoretical link is an inter-related model of shopping destination and expenditure choices. The relationship between these choices is recognised by, firstly specifying theoretically compatible submodels for the destination and expenditure decisions, and secondly, demarcating the system within the set of sample selectivity models. The estimation of this system is modestly pioneering in a strictly econometric sense.



This thesis also contains a number of minor contributions to the study of shopping destination choice behaviour. Prominent amongst these is a detailed analysis of reported variations amongst individuals in the range of store choices available, with particular reference to the impact these exert on parameter estimates associated with multinomial logit models of shopping travel. Another relatively minor contribution is an analysis of travel linkages between categories of food shopping.

The empirical setting of the study is Adelaide, Australia with the data being derived from a specially conducted survey.

The thesis concludes with some suggestions for further research.

## NOTATION

Listed below is the principal set of notation used in this thesis. An attempt has been made to utilize a consistent set of notation throughout. The global set of notation defined below, however, should only be used as a guide. Generally, a detailed definition is provided locally. For instance  $E_{iq}$  is defined below as conditional shopping expenditure at destination  $i$  by individual  $q$ ; however, is used in Chapter 7 to refer specifically to expenditure on grocery items. In all cases the local definition overrides the global definition. Much of the local notation is not defined below.

In line with common practice, for each of the  $X_q$ ,  $Z_q$ ,  $G_q$  and  $B_i$  vectors, capital letters have been used to denote the vector and small letters to denote elements in the vector. This, however, does not apply to other vectors.  $X'_q$  is used to refer to the transpose of vector  $X_q$ , etc. Subscripts delimit bounds for the variable or vector. Thus, for example, given that  $X_q$  refers to a row vector of explanatory variables pertaining to individual  $q$  included in a continuous choice model,  $X_{iq}$  is as  $X_q$  but refers especially to alternative  $i$ , etc. The  $q$  subscript is always used to refer to an individual ( $q = 1, 2, \dots, Q$ ) and the  $i$  and  $j$  subscripts used to refer to choice (particularly, mode/destination) alternatives ( $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ ). When  $i$  is broken into its components,  $d$  is used as the destination subscript and  $m$  as the mode subscript. In Chapter 6  $sp$  and  $(sp)'$  are used to refer to shopping patterns.

For mathematical operations  $\sum$  and  $\Pi$  are conventionally used to signify summation and multiplication and 'log' used to refer to the natural logarithm. The symbol  $\hat{\phantom{x}}$  is used with respect to estimated parameter values.

- $A_d$  = a vector of variables describing the attractiveness of shopping destination  $d$ .
- $a_1, a_2$  = parameters associated with the translation of perceived shopping prices into real shopping prices.
- $B_d$  = a vector of quality variables associated with the consumption of shopping goods from destination  $d$  ( $=b_{d1}, b_{d2}, \dots, b_{dK}$ ).
- $C_{qj}^*$  = the expected retail expenditure by consumer  $q$  associated with mode / shopping destination  $j$ .
- $C_m$  = the set of choice sets containing  $m$  alternatives.
- $C_i$  = consumption of good  $i$ .
- $c_i$  = the monetary cost of travel associated with alternative  $i$ .
- $D_{qi}$  = a vector of variables representing the separation of consumer  $q$  from mode / shopping destination  $i$ .
- $D(\ )$  = logit function.
- $E_{iq}$  = retail expenditure conditional upon the choice of mode / shopping destination alternative  $i$  by individual  $q$  ( $= p_i q_{iq}^* = (pq^*)_{iq}$ ).
- $E(a)$  = the expected value of  $a$ .
- $E(a|b)$  = the expected value of  $a$  conditional on  $b$ .

- $F_{qi}$  = a function relating the separation ( $D_{qi}$ ) and shopping destination attribute variables ( $A_{qi}$ ) to consumer destination choices.
- $G$  = a vector representing consumption of retail goods from shopping destinations, 1, 2, ..., N ( $= g_1, g_2, \dots, g_N$ ).
- $g_i^*$  = demand function for consumption of shopping goods conditional upon choice of mode / destination alternative  $i$ .
- $I_q$  = a polychotomous variable defined for individual  $q$  with values 1 to  $N_q$  and  $I_q = j$  if alternative  $j$  is chosen by individual  $q$ .
- IV = inclusive value.
- $J_q$  = the set of objectively available choice sets for individual  $q$ .
- $J( )$  = a function which transforms a variable from any well specified distribution to a standard normal variable.
- $k_{iq}$  = a binary variable taking value 1 if  $I_q = i$  and 0 otherwise.
- $L$  = leisure time.
- $L_i^*$  = demand for leisure time conditional upon the choice of mode / shopping destination alternative  $i$ .
- $O$  = a vector of socio-economic, etc. variables.

- $P_{iq}$  = the probability that individual  $q$  will select alternative  $i$ .
- $P(j \in N_q)$  = the probability that alternative  $j$  is an element in the choice set  $N_q$ .
- $\text{Prob}\{I_q=j\}$  = the probability that individual  $q$  will choose alternative  $j$ .
- $P_d$  = a real price index associated with retail purchases at destination  $d$ .
- $P_{dq}^*$  = a perceived price index associated with retail purchases at destination  $d$  by individual  $q$ .
- $S$  = a vector of size related destination attractiveness measures.
- $T$  = total available time.
- $t_i$  = the travel time concomitant with alternative  $i$ .
- $U$  = direct utility function.
- $U^*$  = bivariate direct utility function.
- $U_i$  = the conditional direct utility function associated with alternative  $i$ .
- $u$  = error term associated with a continuous choice model defined with respect to the population at large.
- $V$  = indirect utility function.
- $V^*$  = bivariate indirect utility function.

- $V_i$  = the conditional indirect utility function associated with alternative  $i$ .
- $\bar{V}_i$  = the 'representative' component of  $V_i$ .
- $v$  = error term associated with a continuous choice model after allowing for the conditionality of data used for model estimation.
- $\tilde{v}$  = an error term associated with a continuous choice model after allowing for data conditionality and the difference between estimated and true selectivity correction factors.
- $W(\ )$  = a function relating socio-economic characteristics to retail expenditure levels.
- $X_q$  = a row vector of explanatory variables associated with a continuous choice model and pertaining to individual  $q$ .
- $Y$  = income.
- $Z_{qi}$  = a super row vector of explanatory variables defined with respect to individual  $q$  and alternative  $i$ , contained in a discrete choice model and thus associated with the representative conditional indirect utility functions ( $= A_{qi}, D_{qi}$ ).
- $\bar{Z}$  = the Hicksian composite commodity.
- $\bar{Z}_i^*$  = demand for the Hicksian composite commodity conditional upon the choice of mode / shopping destination alternative  $i$ .

- $\alpha$  = a parameter vector of parameters contained in a discrete choice model and thus associated with the representative conditional indirect utility functions ( $= \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_R$ ).
- $\beta$  = a parameter vector associated with a continuous choice model ( $= \beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_P$ ).
- $\gamma_d$  = a parameter vector associated with the quality index for the  $d$ th shopping destination ( $= \gamma_{d1}, \gamma_{d2}, \dots, \gamma_{dK}$ ).
- $\epsilon$  = a vector of unobserved influences on utility,  $\epsilon = \epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \dots, \epsilon_N$ , which also form error terms in a discrete choice model.
- $\eta_j$  = a discrete choice model error term associated with the Heckman/Lee selectivity correction method,  $\eta_j = \text{Max } V_i - \epsilon_j$  ( $i = 1, 2, \dots, N, i \neq j$ ).
- $\eta_j^*$  =  $\eta_j$  transformed into a standard normal variable.
- $\mu$  = the logistic scale factor.
- $\xi_i$  = an indicator function with  $\xi_i = 1$  if  $g_i > 0$  and  $\xi_i = 0$  if  $g_i = 0$ .
- $\pi$  =  $\pi \approx 3.1416$ .
- $\rho_{ab}$  = the correlation between random variables  $a$  and  $b$ .
- $\rho^2$  = McFadden's pseudo -  $R^2$ .
- $\sigma_{ab}$  = the covariance between random variables  $a$  and  $b$ .

- $(\sigma_{aa})^2$  = the variance of  $a$ .
- $\tau_{ji}$  = the difference between the representative components of the conditional indirect utility functions associated with alternatives  $i$  and  $j$ ;  
 $\tau_{ji} = \bar{V}(Z_i, \alpha) - \bar{V}(Z_j, \alpha)$ .
- $\phi$  = the density function of the standard normal.
- $\Phi$  = the cumulative distribution function of the standard normal.
- $\psi_d$  = the quality index associated with shopping destination  $d$ .
- $\omega_{ji}$  = a discrete choice model error term associated with the Hay/Dubin and McFadden selectivity correction method,  $\omega_{ji} = \epsilon_i - \epsilon_j$ .
- $\Omega_q$  = the full objectively determined choice set for individual  $q$ .