

# The Impact of Visibility on National Park Visitation\*

Iris Zhong

## Abstract

xx

## Warning: package 'tidyverse' was built under R version 3.5.3

## Warning: package 'ggplot2' was built under R version 3.5.3

## Warning: package 'tibble' was built under R version 3.5.3

## Warning: package 'tidyr' was built under R version 3.5.3

## Warning: package 'readr' was built under R version 3.5.3

## Warning: package 'purrr' was built under R version 3.5.3

## Warning: package 'dplyr' was built under R version 3.5.3

## Warning: package 'stringr' was built under R version 3.5.3

## Warning: package 'forcats' was built under R version 3.5.3

## Warning: package 'lubridate' was built under R version 3.5.2

## Warning: package 'stargazer' was built under R version 3.5.2

## 1 Literature Review

Allen et al. (2016) study the reasoning of the failure of a referendum on a congestion charging scheme in Edinburgh. Instead of using direct voting data, they conduct a survey after the referendum, which allows them to ask more specific questions. Researchers can gain detailed data by surveying, because the unit of measurement is each individual; however, a possible disadvantage of surveying is that respondents who turn in the questionnaire tend to have stronger attitudes towards the proposal, generating sampling bias. They

---

\*xx

conclude that people who use cars as the primary transportation mean, demonstrate a misconception of the pricing plan, or question the effectiveness of the scheme at reducing congestion are more likely to oppose it. Their findings can give insights to the similar failure in the Gwinnett referendum. Voters against the proposal could be those who rarely use public transportation and those who are not convinced by the effectiveness of expanding public transit in alleviating the traffic.

Another crucial factor is the accessibility of the proposed transit system. Kinsey et al. (2010) examine the relationship between the distance to the scheduled railway station and voter turnout by studying the Seattle monorail referendum. They introduce the concept of diffused and concentrated benefit/cost. People who live far from the monorail enjoy the diffused benefit of less traffic congestion, and bear the diffused cost of increased tax. People living close to the rail experience the same diffused benefit and cost, but they also gain the concentrated benefit of easily accessing the public good. Finally, those who live very close to the railway have the same benefits and costs, but they also face the concentrated cost such as inconvenience during construction. Since “people are more strongly motivated to avoid losses than to approach gains,” they expect a higher turnout rate in farther places with votes for “no,” which is verified from their analyses. Besides distance, they also find out precincts with a higher percentage of people of lower socioeconomic status or young people have a lower turnout rate. Interestingly, there is a significant interaction between partisanship and distance, which would be also tested in my study. In essence, the effect of distance on turnout is weakened by partisanship, and vanishes beyond a threshold of distance. Even though my dependent variable is voters’ responses rather than turnout, it can be inferred from Kinsey et al.’s findings that people farther away from the transit system would vote against the referendum more. However, the relationship might be non-linear and requires some form of transformation. Regarding the methods, they utilize the spatial lag model to correct for autocorrelation, which is proper to use in my project as well since both studies use precinct-level data.