

<sup>1</sup> **Unpacking Household Budgeting Strategies through a  
2 Transportation Lens**

<sup>3</sup> **Kamryn Mansfield<sup>1</sup>, Katie Asmussen<sup>2</sup>**

<sup>4</sup> <sup>1</sup>University of Tennessee,

<sup>5</sup> <sup>2</sup>University of Tennessee,

6      **Abstract**

7      This is where we will put our abstract.

8      **Plain Language Summary**

9      This is a plain language summary

10     **1 Introduction**

11    Households juggle how to allocate their budgets: whether to invest in a reliable car,  
12    pay for quality childcare, secure housing in a good school district, or set money aside  
13    for leisure. These everyday choices shape how families live and move, reflecting the  
14    trade-offs they make to balance competing priorities. Transportation often sits at  
15    the center of these decisions, not only because it can be a significant expense, but  
16    also because choosing to buy and maintain a car versus relying on public transit  
17    represents a long-term commitment and a broader lifestyle choice. Its relative weight  
18    compared to housing, childcare, and other spending varies widely across families.  
19    The relationship between household budgeting and mobility is shaped not only by  
20    causal direction but also by how families prioritize and weight different needs. On  
21    one hand, mobility resources such as car ownership can structure the household  
22    budget: households with no or only one vehicle may spend far less on transportation,  
23    freeing up income for other essential or discretionary categories. On the other hand,  
24    underlying family structures and preferences can drive budget allocation choices  
25    that, in turn, shape transportation behavior. Larger families may prioritize child-  
26    care or invest in higher-quality housing in areas with better schools, limiting what  
27    remains for transportation. Others may emphasize frugality across all categories or  
28    deliberately substitute toward lower-cost transit options. Understanding both the  
29    direction of influence and the weight assigned to different budget categories is critical  
30    for transportation planning and policy, as these dynamics reveal how families navigate  
31    competing priorities under varying demographic and mobility contexts.

32    The purpose of this research is to explore how household budgets are structured  
33    around transportation decisions and how this impacts other spending categories.  
34    Using the Consumer Expenditure Survey (CEX), we will perform a Latent Class  
35    Analysis (LCA) to find groupings based on a household's transportation expenses.  
36    These groupings can help us find groups of spenders with similar patterns to help us  
37    predict transportation expenses based on the household's characteristics.

38     **2 Literature Review**

39    The literature relating to this study has been classified into four groups: (1) Family  
40    Choices and Activity Patterns, (2) Family Transportation Choices, (3) Family Spend-  
41    ing and Budgets, and (4) Family Transportation Budgets. The following sections  
42    describe the relevant findings from literature in each of these groups.

43    Table 1 summarizes the literature we reviewed

Table 1: Summary of the Literature

Title	Citation	Dataset	Findings
A family expenditure perspective on transport planning: Australian evidence in context	Morris & Wigan (1979)	Australian Expenditure Survey	transport takes about 017 percent of expenditures, at least part of the consumption expenditure by low income families is financed from savings, loans or other sources besides "income".
Variable Lifespan and the Intertemporal Elasticity of Consumption	Skinner (1985)	CEX	Changes in inflation will prompt changes in consumer expenditures
A sample selection model for prepared food expenditures	Nayga (1998)	CEX	Most of the variables analysed significantly affect prepared food expenditures. For example, results suggest that frozen meals expenditures are higher for households without children, for smaller households, and for households headed by a non-white individual
Transportation Costs and Economic Opportunity Among the Poor	Blumenberg (2003)	CEX	Cost comparisons fall short of finding if transportation costs are a barrier for economic opportunity among the poor
Analysis of Variations in Vehicle Ownership Expenditures	Thakuriah & Liao (2005)	CEX	For vehicle-owning households, of every additional dollar that households spend, 18 cents is spent on vehicles after controlling for socioeconomic, demographic, life cycle, and other factors relating to households.

Table 1: Summary of the Literature

Title	Citation	Dataset	Findings
Leisure Travel Expenditure Patterns by Family Life Cycle Stages	Hong et al. (2005)	CEX	Marrieds without children are more likely to spend on leisure travel than singles, whereas single parents and solitary survivors are less likely to spend on leisure travel than singles.
Transportation Expenditures and Ability to Pay: Evidence from Consumer Expenditure Survey	Thakuriah (Vonu) & Liao (2006)	CEX	Transportation expenditures made by households are better explained by permanent income levels of households than by annual incomes.
The Effects of Ethnic Identity on Household Budget Allocation to Status Conveying Goods	Fontes & Fan (2006)	CEX	Asian Americans allocate more of their budget to housing, African Americans allocate more of their budget to apparel, and Hispanics allocate more of their budget to both housing and apparel, but to a lesser extent than Asian Americans with respect to housing and African Americans with respect to apparel.
Do Transportation and Communications Tend to be Substitutes, Complements, or Neither?: U.S. Consumer Expenditures Perspective, 1984–2002	Choo et al. (2007)	CEX	New tech doesn't substitute Personal Vehicle travel probably

Table 1: Summary of the Literature

Title	Citation	Dataset	Findings
An analysis of the determinants of children's weekend physical activity participation	Rachel B. Copperman & Bhat (2007a)	San Francisco Bay Area Travel Survey	The "number of children" variable suggests an overall higher likelihood of participation in utilitarian active travel among households with many children relative to households with few children
An analysis of the social context of children's weekend discretionary activity participation	Sener & Bhat (2007)	Panel Study of Income Dynamics (PSID)	male children more likely to participate with their fathers than female children, African-American children less likely to participate in health-enhancing active recreation pursuits
An Exploratory Analysis of Children's Daily Time-Use and Activity Patterns Using the Child Development Supplement (CDS) to the US Panel Study of Income Dynamics (PSID)	Rachel B. Copperman & Bhat (2007b)	Panel Study of Income Dynamics (PSID)	The age of chilrend has an effect on the types of activities they pursue
Estimating Transportation Costs by Characteristics of Neighborhood and Household	Haas et al. (2008)	CEX and others	Their model can help in travel demand modeling

Table 1: Summary of the Literature

Title	Citation	Dataset	Findings
An analysis of children's leisure activity engagement: Examining the day of week, location, physical activity level, and fixity dimensions	Sener et al. (2008)	Panel Study of Income Dynamics (PSID)	Children in households with parents who are employed, higher income, or higher education were found to participate in structured outdoor activities at higher rates.
A comprehensive analysis of household transportation expenditures relative to other goods and serviCEX: An application to United States consumer expenditure data	Ferdous et al. (2010)	CEX	Adjustments are made with increased fuel priCEX
Measuring the Structural Determinants of Urban Travel Demand	Souche (2010)	IUTP database	urban density and cost of transport mode were statistically significant in their model
An empirical analysis of children's after school out-of-home activity-location engagement patterns and time allocation	Paleti et al. (2011)	Panel Study of Income Dynamics (PSID)	The results show that a wide variety of demographic, attitudinal, environmental, and others' activity-travel pattern characteristics impact children's after school activity engagement patterns.

Table 1: Summary of the Literature

Title	Citation	Dataset	Findings
Is the Consumer Expenditure Survey Representative by Income?	Sabelhaus et al. (2013)	CEX	the highest income thresholds are underrepresented in the survey
Relationship between Households' Housing and Transportation Expenditures: Examination from Lifestyle Perspective	Deka (2015)	CEX	More housing costs = more transportation costs, people who take transit spend less on transportation
An empirical investigation into the time-use and activity patterns of dual-earner couples with and without young children	Bernardo et al. (2015)	ATUS	the presence of a child in dual-earner households not only leads to a reduction in in-home non-work activity participation (excluding child care activities) but also a substantially larger decrease in out-of-home non-work activity participation (excluding child care and shopping activities),
Expenditures on Children by Families, 2015	Lino et al. (2017)	CEX	Many observations on the expenditures of children
Factors influencing travel mode choice among families with young children (aged 0–4): A review of the literature	McCarthy et al. (2017)	Lit Review	many factors influence decisions about mode choice when traveling with young children.

Table 1: Summary of the Literature

Title	Citation	Dataset	Findings
Relationships between Land Use, Transportation, Household Expenditures, and Municipal Spending in Small Urban Areas	Mattson & Peterson (2019)	CEX, Ammerican Community Survey	denser areas are more likely to use transit to commute. People in single-family homes tend to spend more money on transportation
An environment-people interactions framework for analysing children's extra-curricular activities and active transport	Leung et al. (2019)	Survey in Hong Kong Schools	childrens activities can differ a lot based on neighborhood environment and family sociodemographic background.
Relationships between density, transit, and household expenditures in small urban areas	Mattson (2020)	CEX, Ammerican Community Survey	single family homes spend more on transportation, higher income is correlated with higher transportation costs.
An Updated Estimation Model of the Cost of Raising Children in Texas	Osborne et al. (2021)	NHTS, CEX	Regardless of the method of calculation, we find that it is nearly impossible for two minimum wage earners to meet the basic costs of raising children in Texas, especially when child care is included

Table 1: Summary of the Literature

Title	Citation	Dataset	Findings
Parental Investments of Money for White, Black, and Hispanic Children in the United States	Hastings (2022)	CEX	. Both sociodemographic and economic factors play a substantial role in these differences, and the racial and ethnic gaps in parental investments of money are nearly eliminated when both are accounted for
The role of household modality style in first and last mile travel mode choice	Lu et al. (2022)	South-east Queens-land Travel Survey (SEQTS)	joint travel contributes least to modal shift from car to active transport when there is improved infrastructure of trains and things
A review of the socio-demographic characteristics affecting the demand for different car-sharing operational schemes	Amirnazmiafshar & Diana (2022)	NA	There are lots of factors that might affect people's willingness to use car sharing
Estimating Expenditures on Children by Families in Canada, 2014 to 2017	Duncan et al. (2023)	Survey of Household Spending (SHS)	The more income, the more spending on kids.
A New Approach to Understanding the Impact of Automobile Ownership on Transportation Equity	Molloy et al. (2024)	CEX	“Captive Riders” have less spending allocated to transportation than captive drivers.
Transportation Statistics Annual Report 2024	Bureau of Transportation Statistics (2024)	CEX and others	Lots of summaries

Table 1: Summary of the Literature

Title	Citation	Dataset	Findings
A STUDY OF SPENDING, SAVING AND INVESTMENT PATTERNS OF MARRIED COUPLES WITH CHILDREN(NON-DINK) IN MUMBAI	Hargunani et al. (2024)	Data from Mumbai	The data analysis reveals distinct spending, saving, and investment patterns among married couples, with a clear prioritization towards ensuring the well-being and future security of their families.”
Subsidizing Car Ownership for Low-Income Individuals and Households	Klein (2024)	Personal Survey Created by Dr. Klein	Having a car gave people more opportunities than before, and they usually had more time to spend with the family. At the beginning and end of the day.
Investigating the effects of ridesourcing on the dynamics of household car ownership	Bilgin et al. (2025)	United Kingdom Household Longitudinal Study	Suggests that households are less likely to acquire a car in the presence of ridesourcing, but car disposal is mainly driven by household compositions and residential relocation factors.

44      Source: Lit Review Table

45      **2.1 Family Choices and Activity Patterns**

46      There have been many studies done on the choices and activities of families (Rachel B.  
 47      Copperman & Bhat, 2007b; Leung et al., 2019; Sener et al., 2008; see Sener & Bhat,  
 48      2007). These studies often focus on the activities choices of households and children.

49      Paletti et al. (2011) performed a study where they wanted to characterize the activity  
 50      patterns of children after school. Their data were gathered from the Child Develop-  
 51      ment Supplement to the Panel Study of Income Dynamics which has household  
 52      demographics and time-use diaries for children. They looked at travel patterns  
 53      using combinations of three activity-travel scenarios: staying at school, going home  
 54      from school, and going somewhere else after school. They further identified specific  
 55      after-school activities (e.g. Organized activities at school, recreation at the home  
 56      of someone else, meals at restaurants, etc.) to use in a multiple discrete-continuous

extreme value (MDCEV) model. The MDCEV is a type of discrete choice model that works when multiple options can be chosen, and was used to find predictors of children's participation in the different after school activities. In their analysis, they found that 57.7% of children in the survey participated in at least one out-of-home activity after school. They also found that children's activities were connected to household income, family dynamics, environment, and other things. For example, children in households with higher income were more likely to participate in activities after school. Children with no siblings along with children having a working primary caregiver were more likely to stay at school or go somewhere besides home directly after school. Children living close to a large city were less likely to go somewhere after school, go home, and then go back out. The findings of this study show the variety of factors that might affect a family's activity, and therefore transportation, patterns.

Another study on family choices was done by Bernardo et al. (2015). They used the American Time Use Survey and a Multiple Discrete Continuous Nested Extreme Value (MDCNEV) model to examine the activities of dual-earner households. The variables they used relate to household demographics, respondent demographics, couple characteristics, and day of the week. Findings indicated that women are more likely to participate in out-of-home maintenance, shopping, and social activities than men. They also found that respondents with higher education and with children are more likely to work from home. One key finding of this study is that couples with children are much less likely to participate in out-of-home, non-work activities.

## 2.2 Family Transportation Choices

Among the studies on family choices is a group of studies that focus on family transportation choices (Amirnazmifshar & Diana, 2022; Rachel B. Copperman & Bhat, 2007a; Lu et al., 2022; Souche, 2010). These studies look at the connection between family mobility and family decisions.

McCarthy et al. (2017) is a literature review with some good findings, but I don't know if I should site the literature review or if I should find individual papers from the review to talk about.

A unique study to understand the effects car ownership has on household decisions was done by Nicholas Klein (2024). In order to understand how access to a car can effect a family in the United States, he interviewed 30 people in Maryland and Virginia who received a subsidized car. Two main findings of this study relate to travel behavior changes and access to opportunities. The people interviewed generally changed their travel behavior in similar ways after receiving a car. Before receiving the car, they would rely on public transit and others for transportation, but after receiving a car, they made many trips in their own cars, including some trips that they had to forgo before having a car. Another general conclusion Klein makes is that people had more access to opportunities after receiving a car. They had easier access to more potential jobs, but some also mentioned the ability to get more hours at the their current jobs. With less reliance on public transit, many respondents spent more time with their families at the beginning and end of the day.

Another study interested in car ownership was done by @bilgin\_investigating\_2025. They analyzed car ownership across multiple years using the United Kingdom Household Longitudinal Study dataset to see if ridesourcing availability affects car ownership. They used two fixed effects logit models: one to model the effect of ridesourcing on the decision to increase the number of cars in the household and the other to model the effect of ridesourcing on the decision to decrease the number of cars in the household. Their results suggested that households with more than one car are more likely to get rid of a car and less likely to add a car compared to households with one car. Even with this tendency, their models did not show a strong connection between the presence of ride sourcing and changes in car ownership. They concluded

109 that changes in household composition have a stronger impact on the change in  
 110 number of cars of a household.

### 111 **2.3 Family Spending and Budgets**

112 Another set of studies focuses on household budgets and household spending patterns  
 113 (Fontes & Fan, 2006; Nayga, 1998; Sabelhaus et al., 2013; Skinner, 1985). Many of  
 114 the studies reviewed had an emphasis on the budgets related to raising children.  
 115 Hargunani et al. (2024) analyzed family spending patterns in Mumbai and concluded  
 116 that many families focus their expenditures on the current and future wellbeing of  
 117 their children. This is evidenced by money spent on basic necessities and setting aside  
 118 money for the future.

119 The United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) has produced reports that use  
 120 the CEX to specifically analyze the costs of raising a child in the United States. The  
 121 most recent report (Lino et al., 2017) found the top expenditure for married-couple  
 122 families with two children to be housing. The rankings of other expenditures were  
 123 different depending on the age of children, but food, child care/education, and trans-  
 124 portation were always the next highest expenditures on children. Similar to the USDA  
 125 report on the cost of raising children, Osborne et al. (2021) modeled the cost of  
 126 raising children in Texas by following similar methodologies but using Texas-specific  
 127 data for housing and childcare costs. They looked not only at married-couple families,  
 128 but also at single-parent households and dual households where children spend time  
 129 with both parents in different locations. They found differing expenditures on children  
 130 among the different family make-ups and among different incomes.

131 Other studies with similar analyses have had similar findings. @hastings\_parental\_2022  
 132 used the CEX to compare expenditures between different racial and ethnic groups.  
 133 When controlling for both family characteristics and income, he found that there was  
 134 not a significant difference in total expenditures on children among racial and ethnic  
 135 groups. This suggests that income and family characteristics play a larger role in  
 136 family budgeting than race and ethnicity. Duncan et al. (2023) performed a study in  
 137 Canada using the country's Survey of Household Spending (SHS) to analyze family  
 138 expenditures. They found similar results as previously mentioned studies. Different  
 139 income groups had different amounts allocated to children, but housing was always  
 140 the highest expenditure with food, child care/education, and transportation being the  
 141 next highest expenditures.

### 142 **2.4 Family Transportation Expenses and Budgets**

143 There have been many studies on family budgets and transportation expenses (Blu-  
 144 menberg, 2003; Choo et al., 2007; Ferdous et al., 2010; Haas et al., 2008; Hong et al.,  
 145 2005; Morris & Wigan, 1979; Thakuriah (Vonu) & Liao, 2006).

146 One study focused on transportation budgets was done by Thakuriah & Liao (2005).  
 147 Using CEX data, they made multiple models to analyze the expenditures related  
 148 to vehicle ownership of households in the United States. In each model, they used  
 149 a variety of variables (income, household demographics, spatial factors, economic  
 150 factors, and family condition factors) to predict the amount of money a household  
 151 spends on vehicles. Their model results indicate 18 percent of additional household  
 152 expenditures is a vehicle expense. They results also indicate many factors influence  
 153 household vehicle expenses. The models showed that homeowners spend more on  
 154 vehicle expenses. They also showed that vehicle expenses are connected with the sex  
 155 of the head of household and the number of people in the household.

156 In a study by Deka (2015), they used two years of the CEX to see the connection  
 157 between housing expenses and transportation expenses. They created three least  
 158 squares models: one to describe expenditures in dollar amounts, one to describe  
 159 expenditures as percentages of income, and one to describe expenditures as shares  
 160 of total household expenditures. They found a positive association between trans-

161 portation expenses and housing expenses. Similarly, share of income on transportation  
 162 was positively affected by share of income on housing, but there was no significant  
 163 evidence showing the share of income on housing being affected by share of income  
 164 on transportation. Both housing and transportation expenditures were found to be  
 165 higher for those living in single-family detached homes and lower for those living in  
 166 older homes.

167 Mattson (2020) Mattson & Peterson (2019) - single family homes spend more on  
 168 transportation, higher income is correlated with higher transportation costs. - denser  
 169 areas are more likely to use transit to commute. People in single-family homes tend to  
 170 spend more money on transportation

171 Mattson & Peterson (2019) looked at how density, land use, transportation, and  
 172 household expenditures are related. They developed a regression model using CEX  
 173 data where transportation expenditures were estimated using type of housing, popu-  
 174 lation, family characteristics, and other factors. Similar to other studies, they found  
 175 that income is positively associated with transportation expenditures. Their model  
 176 showed single-family homes to have higher transportation expenditures than other  
 177 types of dwellings. Using data from the U.S. Census Bureau's Annual Survey of State  
 178 and Local Government Finances, they also created models to explore how land use  
 179 might affect municipal spending. In these models, increase in density was associated  
 180 with a decrease in many per capita operational costs, including fire protection, streets  
 181 and highways, parks and recreation, and others.

182 A similar study was published by Mattson (2020) where he modeled transportation  
 183 expenditures using CEX data. The results showed, like the previous publication,  
 184 that single-family dwellings spend more on transportation compared to other types.  
 185 He also found that larger household sizes and newer homes contribute to higher  
 186 transportation spending.

187 Molloy et al. (2024) - "Captive Riders" have less spending allocated to transportation  
 188 than captive drivers.

189 In their study, Molloy et al. (2024) look at CEX data through after proposing new  
 190 framework to look at transit users and vehicle users. In past studies, three cate-  
 191 gories have been used to analyze transportation users: "drivers" are those who own  
 192 a car, "captive riders" are those who use transit because they can not afford a car,  
 193 and "choice riders" are those who can afford a car but do not. Instead of having  
 194 one grouping for those that own cars, Molloy et al. (2024) propose splitting that  
 195 category into "captive drivers" and "choice drivers". Captive drivers would be those  
 196 in the population that are low income but have a car representing people with less  
 197 transportation freedom. They analyzed the CEX with this new way of classifying  
 198 transportation users and found that captive drivers carry the most transportation  
 199 burden. The transportation expenditures of captive drivers average more than 16% of  
 200 total household expenditures while the transportation expenditures of captive riders  
 201 was only around 7% of total expenditures.

202 Bureau of Transportation Statistics (2024) - Chapter 2 has a whole section where they  
 203 analyze household expenditures getting much of their data from the CEX.

### 204 3 References

- 205 Amirnazmiafshar, E., & Diana, M. (2022). A review of the socio-demographic  
 206 characteristics affecting the demand for different car-sharing operational  
 207 schemes. *Transportation Research Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, 14, 100616.  
 208 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trip.2022.100616>
- 209 Bernardo, C., Paleti, R., Hoklas, M., & Bhat, C. (2015). An empirical investigation  
 210 into the time-use and activity patterns of dual-earner couples with and without

- young children. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice*, 76, 71–91.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tra.2014.12.006>
- Bilgin, P., Mattioli, G., Morgan, M., & Wadud, Z. (2025). Investigating the effects of ridesourcing on the dynamics of household car ownership. *Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment*, 146, 104886. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trd.2025.104886>
- Blumenberg, E. (2003). Transportation Costs and Economic Opportunity Among the Poor.
- Bureau of Transportation Statistics. (2024). *Transportation Statistics Annual Report 2024* (pp. 219 pages, 35.3 Megabytes). Bureau of Transportation Statistics. <https://doi.org/10.21949/EOKQ-GF72>
- Choo, S., Lee, T., & Mokhtarian, P. L. (2007). Do Transportation and Communications Tend to be Substitutes, Complements, or Neither?: U.S. Consumer Expenditures Perspective, 1984–2002. *Transportation Research Record*, 2010(1), 121–132. <https://doi.org/10.3141/2010-14>
- Copperman, Rachel B., & Bhat, C. R. (2007a). An analysis of the determinants of children's weekend physical activity participation. *Transportation*, 34(1), 67–87. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11116-006-0005-5>
- Copperman, Rachel B., & Bhat, C. R. (2007b). An Exploratory Analysis of Children's Daily Time-Use and Activity Patterns Using the Child Development Supplement (CDS) to the US Panel Study of Income Dynamics (PSID).
- Deka, D. (2015). Relationship between Households' Housing and Transportation Expenditures: Examination from Lifestyle Perspective. *Transportation Research Record*, 2531(1), 26–35. <https://doi.org/10.3141/2531-04>
- Duncan, K. A., Frank, K., & Guèvremont, A. (2023). Estimating Expenditures on Children by Families in Canada, 2014 to 2017. <https://doi.org/10.25318/11F0019M2023007-ENG>
- Ferdous, N., Pinjari, A. R., Bhat, C. R., & Pendyala, R. M. (2010). A comprehensive analysis of household transportation expenditures relative to other goods and services: An application to United States consumer expenditure data. *Transportation*, 37(3), 363–390. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11116-010-9264-2>
- Fontes, A., & Fan, J. (2006). The Effects of Ethnic Identity on Household Budget Allocation to Status Conveying Goods. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*, 27, 643–663. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10834-006-9031-x>
- Haas, P. M., Makarewicz, C., Benedict, A., & Bernstein, S. (2008). Estimating Transportation Costs by Characteristics of Neighborhood and Household. *Transportation Research Record*, 2077(1), 62–70. <https://doi.org/10.3141/2077-09>
- Hargunani, C., Vernekar, S., & Vernekar, S. (2024). A STUDY OF SPENDING, SAVING AND INVESTMENT PATTERNS OF MARRIED COUPLES WITH CHILDREN(NON-DINK) IN MUMBAI, 20(1).
- Hastings, O. P. (2022). Parental Investments of Money for White, Black, and Hispanic Children in the United States. *Socius: Sociological Research for a Dynamic World*, 8, 23780231221103054. <https://doi.org/10.1177/23780231221103054>
- Hong, G.-S., Fan, J. X., Palmer, L., & Bhargava, V. (2005). Leisure Travel Expenditure Patterns by Family Life Cycle Stages. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 18(2), 15–30. [https://doi.org/10.1300/J073v18n02\\_02](https://doi.org/10.1300/J073v18n02_02)
- Klein, N. J. (2024). Subsidizing Car Ownership for Low-Income Individuals and Households. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 44(1), 165–177. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0739456X20950428>
- Leung, K. Y. K., Astroza, S., Loo, B. P. Y., & Bhat, C. R. (2019). An environment-people interactions framework for analysing children's extra-curricular activities and active transport. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 74, 341–358. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtrangeo.2018.12.015>

- 264 Lino, M., Kuczynski, K., Rodriguez, N., & Schap, T. (2017). *Expenditures on Children*  
 265 *by Families, 2015*. United States Department of Agriculture. <https://doi.org/10.22004/ag.econ.327257>
- 266 Lu, Y., Prato, C. G., Sipe, N., Kimpton, A., & Corcoran, J. (2022). The role of  
 267 household modality style in first and last mile travel mode choice. *Transportation*  
 268 *Research Part A: Policy and Practice*, 158, 95–109. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tra.2022.02.003>
- 271 Mattson, J. (2020). Relationships between density, transit, and household expendi-  
 272 tures in small urban areas. *Transportation Research Interdisciplinary Perspectives*,  
 273 8, 100260. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trip.2020.100260>
- 274 Mattson, J., & Peterson, D. (2019). Relationships between Land Use, Transportation,  
 275 Household Expenditures, and Municipal Spending in Small Urban Areas.
- 276 McCarthy, L., Delbosc, A., Currie, G., & Molloy, A. (2017). Factors influencing  
 277 travel mode choice among families with young children (aged 0–4): A review of  
 278 the literature. *Transport Reviews*, 37(6), 767–781. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01441647.2017.1354942>
- 280 Molloy, Q., Garrick, N., & Atkinson-Palombo, C. (2024). A New Approach to Un-  
 281 derstanding the Impact of Automobile Ownership on Transportation Equity.  
 282 *Transportation Research Record*, 2678(2), 366–376. <https://doi.org/10.1177/03611981231174444>
- 284 Morris, J. M., & Wigan, M. R. (1979). A family expenditure perspective on trans-  
 285 port planning: Australian evidence in context. *Transportation Research Part A: General*, 13(4), 249–285. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-2607\(79\)90051-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-2607(79)90051-7)
- 287 Nayga, R. M. (1998). A sample selection model for prepared food expenditures. *Ap-  
 288 plied Economics*, 30(3), 345–352. <https://doi.org/10.1080/000368498325868>
- 289 Osborne, C., Wu, E., & Benson, K. (2021). *An Updated Estimation Model of the Cost  
 290 of Raising Children in Texas*.
- 291 Paleti, R., Copperman, R. B., & Bhat, C. R. (2011). An empirical analysis of  
 292 children's after school out-of-home activity-location engagement patterns and  
 293 time allocation. *Transportation*, 38(2), 273–303. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11116-010-9300-2>
- 295 Sabelhaus, J., Johnson, D., Ash, S., Swanson, D., Garner, T., Greenlees, J.,  
 296 & Henderson, S. (2013). *Is the Consumer Expenditure Survey Repre-  
 297 sentative by Income?* (No. w19589). National Bureau of Economic Research.  
<https://doi.org/10.3386/w19589>
- 299 Sener, I. N., & Bhat, C. R. (2007). An analysis of the social context of children's  
 300 weekend discretionary activity participation. *Transportation*, 34(6), 697–721.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11116-007-9125-9>
- 302 Sener, I. N., Copperman, R. B., Pendyala, R. M., & Bhat, C. R. (2008). An analysis  
 303 of children's leisure activity engagement: Examining the day of week, location,  
 304 physical activity level, and fixity dimensions. *Transportation*, 35(5), 673–696.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11116-008-9173-9>
- 306 Skinner, J. (1985). Variable Lifespan and the Intertemporal Elasticity of Consump-  
 307 tion. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 67(4), 616–623. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1924806>
- 309 Souche, S. (2010). Measuring the structural determinants of urban travel demand.  
 310 *Transport Policy*, 17(3), 127–134. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tranpol.2009.12.003>
- 312 Thakuriah, P. (Vonu), & Liao, Y. (2005). Analysis of Variations in Vehicle Owner-  
 313 ship Expenditures. *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation*  
 314 *Research Board*, 1926(1), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0361198105192600101>
- 315 Thakuriah (Vonu), P., & Liao, Y. (2006). Transportation Expenditures and Ability  
 316 to Pay: Evidence from Consumer Expenditure Survey. *Transportation Research*  
 317 *Record*, 1985(1), 257–265. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0361198106198500128>