## AIRCRAFT SIZE AND TYPE IMPACTS ON REGIONAL AIR TRANSPORT DEMAND

## AIRLINE'S DILEMMA

## JETS AND TURBOPROPS OPTIONS



Note: Single class with pitch ranging from 30 " to $32^{\prime \prime}$.
Source: Manufacturers' website.

## AIRCRAFT SELECTION

* Performance
* Acquisition costs
* Operational costs
* Maintenance costs
* Seat capacity
* Limitations



## SUITABLE AIRCRAFT



## AIRCRAFT ENGINE TYPE


"Passengers have a clear preference for jets over turboprops, viewing the former as quieter, faster, safer and more comfortable"

Source: ARNOULT (2001) apud DRESNER, WINDLE and ZHOU (2002)
Photo by Gruber Maximilian

## AIRCRAFT ENGINE TYPE \& DEMAND



* Having lower fuel consumption, turboprops would increase demand through less expensive ticket prices.
* Flying faster, jets would increase demand through higher service frequency.
* Flying more, jets would diminish demand with greater ticket prices due to higher maintenance costs associated to higher flight cycles.


## AIRCRAFT SIZE



Most of recent articles reports how airlines meet demand selecting the right aircraft and not how the aircraft size affects demand.


## AIRCRAFT SIZE \& DEMAND

## 

* In order to supply demand, airlines have three options: use larger aircrafts, augment frequency or improve load factor.
* Since it is easier to fill small aircrafts, their operation is more profitable, allowing more frequency and thus, increasing demand.
* Operational costs (fuel, crew, airport tax) increase across aircraft size, but once they have more seats, ticket prices tend to be less expensive which increase demand.


## 

## HYPOTHESIS

* H1: Both jets and turboprops positively affect demand.
* H2: Jets enhance demand more than turboprops.
* H3: Small aircrafts enhance demand more than large ones.


## ECONOMETRIC MODEL



## REGIONAL FLIGHTS

## 64 airports

## 75 city pairs

2002-2012


## REGIONAL FLIGHTS



## RESULTS

|  | OLS | 2SLS | GMM 2 S | LIML |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ln yield | $\begin{aligned} & -0.1654 * * * \\ & {[0.027]} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.1976 * * * \\ & {[0.033]} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.2002 * * * \\ & {[0.032]} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.1977 * * * \\ & {[0.033]} \end{aligned}$ |
| $\ln \mathrm{n}$ of carriers | $\begin{aligned} & 0.2700 * * * \\ & {[0.020]} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.3134 * * * \\ & {[0.027]} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.3215 * * * \\ & {[0.026]} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.3136 * * * \\ & {[0.027]} \end{aligned}$ |
| ln av aircraft size | $\begin{aligned} & 0.3156 * * * \\ & {[0.033]} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.3905 * * * \\ & {[0.037]} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.3804 * * * \\ & {[0.037]} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.3906 * * * \\ & {[0.037]} \end{aligned}$ |
| ln population (geo~) | $\begin{aligned} & 2.4715 * * * \\ & {[0.339]} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.7056 * * * \\ & {[0.340]} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.6717 * * * \\ & {[0.339]} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.7058 * * * \\ & {[0.340]} \end{aligned}$ |
| ln gdp per cap (ge~) | $\begin{aligned} & 0.9264 * * * \\ & {[0.091]} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.8314 * * * \\ & {[0.096]} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.8202 * * * \\ & {[0.094]} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.8313 * * * \\ & {[0.096]} \end{aligned}$ |
| ln maxshcond | $\begin{aligned} & 0.0998 * * * \\ & {[0.017]} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.1068 * * * \\ & {[0.017]} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.1101 * * * \\ & {[0.017]} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.1068 * * * \\ & {[0.017]} \end{aligned}$ |
| pres young LCC | $\begin{aligned} & 0.2436 * * * \\ & {[0.021]} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.2351 * * * \\ & {[0.020]} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.2281 * * * \\ & {[0.020]} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.2350 * * * \\ & {[0.020]} \end{aligned}$ |
| pres major | $\begin{aligned} & 0.0925 * * * \\ & {[0.019]} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.0586 * * * \\ & {[0.020]} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.0570 * * * \\ & {[0.020]} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.0586 * * * \\ & {[0.020]} \end{aligned}$ |
| pres regional TP | $\begin{aligned} & 0.1085 * * * \\ & {[0.026]} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.1031 * * * \\ & {[0.026]} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.1032 * * * \\ & {[0.026]} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.1030 * * * \\ & {[0.026]} \end{aligned}$ |
| pres regional jet | $\begin{aligned} & 0.0787 * * * \\ & {[0.022]} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.0574 * * * \\ & {[0.022]} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.0544 * * \\ & {[0.022]} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.0574 * * * \\ & {[0.022]} \end{aligned}$ |
| pres mainline jet | $\begin{aligned} & -0.0003 \\ & {[0.027]} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.0347 \\ & {[0.027]} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.0317 \\ & {[0.027]} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.0347 \\ & {[0.027]} \end{aligned}$ |
| Adj_R2 | 0.8643 | 0.8661 | 0.8660 | 0.8661 |
| RMSE | 0.3203 | 0.3137 | 0.3139 | 0.3137 |
| F | 150.497 | 148.637 | 150.177 | 148.635 |
| KP | - | 391.3958 | 391.3958 | 391.3958 |
| KP_PValue | - | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |
| J | . | 5.2600 | 5.2600 | 5.2603 |
| J_PValue | - | 0.5109 | 0.5109 | 0.5109 |
| Weak_CD | - | 1. $8 \mathrm{e}+03$ | 1. $8 \mathrm{e}+03$ | $1.8 e+03$ |
| Weak_KP | - | 459.3777 | 459.3777 | 459.3777 |
| N_Obs | 14706 | 13970 | 13970 | 13970 |

Notes:

- Estimated coefficients (standard errors in brackets)
- P-value representation: ***p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.10


## CONCLUSION

* Both aircraft type and size are relevant for generating demand.
* Results suggest a demand generation criteria could be used when selecting an aircraft.
* Flying small aircrafts contributes more to demand than flying bigger aircrafts.
* Unlike expectations, data suggests TPs improve demand more than jets.
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