



9TH INTERNATIONAL FORUM ON TOURISM STATISTICS

November 19-21, 2008

OECD, Rue Andre Pascal, 75016 Paris

Italian Households on Travel: Who are they? Where, when and how do they travel?¹

Barbara Baiocchi
babaiocc@istat.it

Barbara Dattilo
dattilo@istat.it

Italian National Statistical Institute



¹ The paper reflects the joint efforts of the authors and their own opinions. Nevertheless, in detail the paragraphs 3, 3.1, 5, 5.1 and 7 have been written by Barbara Baiocchi; paragraphs 1, 2, 4, 4.1 and 6 by Barbara Dattilo.

Session 1: Changes in tourism behaviour and demand

ABSTRACT

Tourism is a phenomenon which is usually analysed from both an individual (tourists) and number of events (trips/nights) point of view. However, it can also be studied from another important perspective: travelling households.

In this paper, domestic and outbound tourism flows of residents in Italy are analysed from the demand side, making use of data produced through a CATI quarterly telephone survey called 'Holidays and Trips', carried out by Istat.

By applying a specific data procedure that identifies the household typologies and by analysing the kinship relations in the nucleus, households become the core of the tourism flows, therefore, making it possible to study their strategic role and how they affect this sector of the national economy. As a matter of fact, travel behaviours seen from a household's point of view may present characteristics that can reveal new features of tourism demand.

The distinction between households who travel and those that don't as well as knowing how those members travel (such as the choice of means of transport, accommodations, organisations, etc.) allow us to gathered precious information from the tourism field. Moreover, identifying who household's members travel with, the period and the destination chosen by the households, and their main purpose for travelling are other fundamental components which help us understand the dynamics of tourism flows.

In conclusion, a helpful instrument for policy makers could be knowing how different household typologies travel. As a matter of fact, the analysis of tourism flows by household typologies, could be a source for evaluating tourism needs, analysing changes and emerging markets, studying the economical impact on the tourist areas. Finally, the analysis of the time series could show "if" and "how" households have modified their travelling style (e.g. the use of internet for bookings).

INDEX

1. Introduction.....	page	3
2. The survey <i>Holiday and Trips</i> and its informative potential in estimating travel behaviours of Italian households.....	"	3
3. Types of households and tourism flows.....	"	4
3.1 Households on holidays.....	"	5
4. Couple's members and lone parents: how much do they travel for holidays and who are they.....	"	6
4.1 Characteristics of the couples and lone parents' holidays.....	"	7
5. How much do children travel for holidays: analysis per type of household.....	"	14
5.1 Characteristics of the children's holidays.....	"	14
6. One-person households on holidays..	"	20
7. Closing comments	"	21
References	"	22

1. Introduction

The phenomenon of tourism is usually analysed from two perspectives: tourists and number of events (trips/nights). This paper studies it from another important perspective: travelling households². Households become the core of the national tourism flows when a specific data procedure is applied that identifies both the family nuclei³ with the kinship relations and the types of households⁴. In this analysis, a ‘travelling household’ is a household that resides in Italy and in which at least one member has travelled once or more.

In 2006, one fourth of households residing in Italy have travelled at least once in each quarter of the year, percentage that rose to 53.7% during the summer quarter (July – September)

The *Holidays and Trips* survey data show the travel choices and behaviours of the different types of households, in particular, members who have travelled and with whom and some individual characteristics. It also provides data on the characteristics of the trip, such as period and destination, main purpose, means of transport, accommodation and type of organisation.

The distinction between households who travel and those who do not travel, together with the analysis of the above-mentioned aspects, provide precious information that helps better understand the dynamics of tourism flows.

As trips made up by households mostly regard the leisure component of the national tourism, this paper will focus mainly on that trips.

Holidays will here be examined from two perspectives: parents and children’s (distinguished into couples with children and lone parents), and the partners (married and non-married) living in couple without children. Travelling one-person households will also be object of some comments.

The main structural variables of the persons who travelled and the main characteristics of the trips will be described for each perspective.

2. The survey *Holidays and Trips* and its informative potential in estimating travel behaviours of Italian households

The travel behaviours of Italian households are one of the aspects that can be examined through Istat household survey *Holidays and Trips* (H&T). Implemented by the Italian Statistical National Institute (Istat) in 1997, it helps improve the availability of the information in the tourism field on a national level and to comply with the European Directive 95/57/EC.

The H&T survey is carried out on a quarterly basis, on a sample of 3,500 Italian households per quarter (14,000 households per year). Information is gathered on each household member (because all ages are considered, the sample refers to about 9,500 persons every quarter, corresponding to 38,000 persons per year).

This survey estimates and analyses the domestic and outbound tourism flows of Italian residents, both business and personal trips. According to the variables required by the Directive and by the additional ones introduced to satisfy better the needs of the users, it also provides a wide range of

² The definition of household refers to the *de facto* household, which is a set of persons who usually live together in the same house and who is linked by relations based on marriage, kinship, affinity, adoption, guardianship or affection.

³ By family, we indeed intend:

a. A couple, either married or cohabitating, with or without children who have never been married, do not cohabit and have no children of their own;

b. One parent only with one or more children who have never been married, do not cohabit and have no children. The components of a *de facto* family who do not satisfy such requisites are considered as “isolated members”.

The definition of family is, therefore, more restrictive than that of household. A household can coincide with one family (with or without isolated members) or it can be made up of more families (with or without isolated members), or it can be a non-family (persons alone, families made up of two sisters, for example, or of a parent with a child who is separate, divorced, widow, etc.).

⁴ The household type is determined according to the type and number of families within the household (no family, one family or more) and on two structural variables of the components of the household (kinship of each person with the other member and the civil status).

data on the travel types and behaviours and on the socio-demographic characteristics of tourists and non tourists.

The H&T survey data also allow analysing the Italian households who travelled in 2006, in addition to the usual statistics on tourism flows regarding travels, overnight travels and tourists.

The informative potential of the survey increased when the households have been classified in different types and families based on the characteristics of the members (kinship of each person with the other members, civil status, and year of marriage). In particular, the survey allows studying the travel behaviours and choices of the households considered as analysis unit, and of the household's components no longer singularly but as subjects that interact with the other members.

3. Types of households and tourism flows

Italy counts about 23 millions and 200 thousand households⁵ (average 2006-2007), where each household counts on average 2.5 components. *Couples with children* in one family households represent the highest share of households (40.5%). *One-person households* represent more than one fourth of the total (26.4%) while *couples without children* in one family household account for 21.3%. *Lone parent households* (in one family) present more contained shares, equal to 8.6% of the total. The other types of '*non-family*' households (parents with non-single children, group of relatives, group of parents and other non-relative persons, group of non-relative persons) and *households with two or more families* account for just a residual share of the total (2% and 1.2% respectively).

In 2006, overall households that reside in Italy spent 107 millions and 895 thousand overnight trips, for a total of 719 millions and 763 thousand nights spent on a trip. At least one fourth of all households took a trip in each quarter of the year, with a quarterly seasonal aspect characterised by a higher tourism flow during the summer months. The share of households in which at least one member travelled (with overnight stay) accounted for more than half of all households (53.7%) between July and September, but dropped to 32.4% between April and June, 29.3% between January and March and 26% between October and December (see table 1). The resident population followed similar trends, registering a higher share of tourists during the summer months (July to September) during which 50.1% travelled at least once (with overnight stay).

Table 1 – Households who travelled by quarter and type of household - Year 2006
(share for 100 households)

Households	Quarters			
	January- March	April- June	July- September	October- December
Households with at least 1 trip	29.3	32.4	53.7	26.0
Households with at least 1 personal trip	25.4	29.7	52.4	21.9
Households with at least 1 personal short trip (1-3 nights)	15.9	17.2	16.4	14.6
Households with at least 1 personal long trip (4 nights or more)	13.6	15.9	46.6	10.7
Households with at least 1 business trip	8.4	6.3	5.8	7.4
Households that do not travel	70.7	67.6	46.3	74.0
Total Households	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: Istat, Survey *Holidays and Trips*.

In 2006, 87% of all trips were taken for personal reasons -with a 40.5% of 1-3 nights personal trips and 46.6% of 4 or more nights personal trips counted on the overall amount of trips- and just a small share for business (13%).

The percentage of households in which at least one member travelled for personal reasons was higher in the summer quarter (52.4% of all households) and lower in the remaining periods of the year (29.7% in the spring, 25.4% in the winter and 21.9% in the autumn). As for the duration of a personal trip, the share of households in which at least one member took one or more short personal

⁵ The data source for 2006-2007 average data is the '*Daily Life Aspects*' survey (Istat, 2007)

trips (1-3 nights) remained quite constant all through the various quarters of the year (between 14.6% and 17.2%), while for one or more long personal trips (4 nights and more), it was higher in the summer (46.6%) than in the other quarters (between 10.7% and 15.9%).

Households in which at least one member took a business trip accounted for a residual part of the tourism flows, that is, 8.4% of the total households in the first quarter, 6.3% in the second quarter, 5.8 in the third and 7.4 in the fourth.

The share of households that did not travel at all went from 46.3% in the summer quarter to 74% in the autumn quarter (see table 1)

When analysing the tourism movement of the households, it is important to identify how the various members travel, whether alone or together with some other members. This household dimension almost exclusively pertains to the leisure segment, being much less relevant in the business segment. Business trips indeed mainly involve the personal sphere of each member of a household; only in few cases, do several members participate in them together. As for leisure travels, to know that members of a same household participate together in the same trip represents an additional interesting informative element to characterise tourism flows.

Consequently, we are going to focus on the leisure component (which will be also called holiday component in the following) of the Italian tourism.

3.1 Households on holidays

According to the analysis, each type of resident household followed a similar seasonal trend as regards holiday moves as that of households for all trips -both personal and business ones- registering a higher incidence of holidaymaker households between July and September and a lower one between October and December. The April to June quarter, a period characterised by a favourable calendar as regards national holidays, also registered important shares of holidaymakers on the total of resident households, though being more contained than in the summer period. For example, when considering the quarterly shares of holidaymakers with one family on the total of households residing in Italy, 41.9% travelled in the summer, 24% in the spring, 19.9% in the winter and 17.7 in the autumn (see table 2).

Table 2 - Households who travel for leisure by quarter and household typology - Year 2006
(share for 100 households)

Type of households	Quarters			
	January- March	April- June	July- September	October- December
NO FAMILY HOUSEHOLDS	5.4	5.4	10.1	4.1
<i>One-person households</i>	5.1	5.1	9.8	4.1
ONE FAMILY HOUSEHOLDS	19.9	24.0	41.9	17.7
<i>Couples with children</i>	13.2	15.6	27.9	11.9
<i>Couples without children</i>	4.6	5.6	8.9	4.1
<i>Lone parents</i>	2.0	2.7	5.1	1.7
TWO OR MORE FAMILIESHOUSEHOLDS	0.1	0.3	0.3	..

Source: Istat, Survey *Holidays and Trips*.

Non-family households -except for one-person households- and two or more families households represent a minimum part of the total of resident households, even more so when considering the respective share travelling for leisure (under 0.3% of all households in both cases). Therefore, we have decided to leave aside these types of households.

Quarter after quarter, the different one family household types present different propensities at travelling for personal reasons: on the total of households of the same type, couples with children (CYC) register the highest shares in every quarter, followed by lone parent households (LPH), couples without children (CNC) and one-person households (OPH), who present the lowest shares (see table 3). During the high-tourism period (July to September), in two thirds of CYC, at least

one member of the nucleus travelled (66.1%); the share of holidaymaker households is slightly lower among LPH (59.4%) and lowest among CNC (41.5%) and OPH (37.6%).

Table 3 - Households who travel for leisure by quarter and household typology - Year 2006
(share for 100 households with the same characteristics)

Type of households	Quarters			
	January- March	April- June	July- September	October- December
NO FAMILY HOUSEHOLDS	19.8	19.6	37.4	15.2
<i>One-person households</i>	19.7	19.6	37.6	15.7
ONE FAMILY HOUSEHOLDS	27.6	33.5	58.0	24.5
<i>Couples with children</i>	31.4	37.1	66.1	27.9
<i>Couples without children</i>	21.2	27.2	41.5	18.8
<i>Lone parents</i>	25.2	31.5	59.4	21.8
TWO OR MORE FAMILIES HOUSEHOLDS	20.1	30.8	55.9	8.1

Source: Istat, Survey *Holidays and Trips*.

4. Couple's members and lone parents: how much do they travel for holidays and who are they

In 2006, considering parents both in CYC and LPH, and partners in CNC, the highest number of persons travelling for holiday⁶ was registered in the summer and spring: 52.4% of the parents living in CYC, 41.3% of lone parents and 39.9% of partners in CNC from July to September; 25.3% of partners in CNC, 23.7% of parents living in CYC and 19.1% of lone parents from April to June (see table 4).

In almost every period of the year, the share of holidaymaker parents living in CYC was higher than that of partner living in CNC and that of lone parents. The share of tourists as regards partners living in CNC was quite similar in every period to that of parents living in CYC than of lone parents, except in the summer when the share of holidaymakers was closer to that of lone parents. Parents in LPH were those who travelled less than the others in each quarter.

As for the age, considering the various types of household to which they belong, persons aged 44 and less usually travel more than persons aged 45 and over. However, when analysing in detail the share of persons who travel more, the various types present some differences. In the 15-34 age class, the share of partners in CNC who travelled at least once was higher than that of parents in CYC, in every period; the same went for the 35-44 age class, except in the third quarter (the shares of travelling persons aged 15-34 are: 35.4% of all partners in CNC vs. 16.2% of all parents in CYC in the first quarter, 44.5% vs. 27.7% in the second quarter, 77.4% vs. 65.8% in the third quarter, 40.3% vs. 17.2% in the fourth quarter; the shares of travelling persons aged 35-44 are: 33.7% of partners in CNC vs. 23.5% of parents in CYC in the first quarter, 29% vs. 27.6% in the second quarter, 55.9% vs. 62.3% in the third quarter, 25% vs. 19.8% in the fourth quarter). Moreover, the percentage gap in relation to the high-tourism quarter -which is the third one- was less evident in the case of partners in CNC than in CYC. Besides having a higher tourism mobility for leisure, partners in CNC also have a higher capacity of distributing their holidays over the year than parents in CYC.

In the age 15-34 class, lone parents were those who travelled the most in spring, with the 50.4% of all parents in LPH. In the 35-44 age class, lone parents were those who travelled more during the high-tourism months (April to September), registering higher values (34.3% in the second quarter and 72.2% in the third quarter) than those of partners living in the other two types of households.

The behaviour of partners aged 44 and over, with or without children, was similar and their differences more subdued. Lone parents remain those who took less holidays than the others.

⁶ A person who has travelled for personal reasons (holidaymaker) is a person who made at least a holiday trip in the reference period.

Table 4 - Persons who travel for leisure by quarter, type of household, class of age and type of participation to the trip - Year 2006 (share for 100 persons with the same characteristics)

Type of households and Class of age	Quarters			
	January- March	April- June	July- September	October- December
PARENTS IN COUPLES WITH CHILDREN				
15-34	16.2	27.7	65.8	17.2
<i>of which: lone couple without children/isolated members</i>	-	4.1	0.8	4.5
<i>of which: all member of the household together</i>	15.4	21.8	58.8	11.1
35-44	23.5	27.6	62.3	19.8
<i>of which: lone couple without children/isolated members</i>	3.0	1.5	4.0	2.2
<i>of which: all member of the household together</i>	18.9	21.9	53.1	14.5
45-64	19.0	21.0	45.0	20.5
<i>of which: lone couple without children/isolated members</i>	7.8	10.1	17.7	10.4
<i>of which: all member of the household together</i>	6.7	7.1	20.4	6.0
65 or more	8.7	15.9	30.8	11.3
<i>of which: lone couple without children/isolated members</i>	4.4	10.3	21.4	7.7
<i>of which: all member of the household together</i>	2.7	4.7	7.7	2.0
Total	19.3	23.7	52.4	19.2
MARRIED/PARTNER IN COUPLES WITHOUT CHILDREN				
15-34	35.4	44.5	77.4	40.3
<i>of which: all member of the household together</i>	31.8	40.3	72.4	35.9
35-44	33.7	29.0	55.9	25.0
<i>of which: all member of the household together</i>	30.5	26.5	55.3	21.0
45-64	19.1	30.3	47.1	19.6
<i>of which: all member of the household together</i>	16.1	24.5	44.3	15.3
65 or more	11.1	16.3	26.6	9.6
<i>of which: all member of the household together</i>	9.8	14.7	25.4	8.1
Total	18.6	25.3	39.9	17.4
LONE PARENTS				
15-34	..	50.4	56.3	..
<i>of which: all member of the household together</i>	..	50.4	56.3	..
35-44	18.1	34.3	72.2	15.3
<i>of which: all member of the household together</i>	8.7	4.8	47.5	9.9
45-64	16.8	21.9	43.9	19.1
<i>of which: all member of the household together</i>	7.1	5.1	17.1	7.2
65 or more	5.6	10.9	23.7	8.4
<i>of which: all member of the household together</i>	2.3	5.7	9.3	3.9
Total	13.0	19.1	41.3	14.3

Source: Istat, Survey Holidays and Trips.

The share of men and women holidaymakers was quite similar all year round, both as regards parents in CYC (on the total of parents in CYC, distinguished per gender) and partners in CNC (on the total of partner in CNC, distinguished per gender). The quarterly shares per gender of lone parents were at the disadvantage of women – except in the fourth quarter (see table 5).

4.1 Characteristics of the couples and lone parents' holidays

Participation of other household members

Whatever the type of household considered, when partners travel with the whole family, the shares of travelling partners change based on the age. In each quarter, tendentially the share of those travelling with the whole family at least once decreased with the increasing of the age of couple, for any type of household, though it was less evident for lone parents. On the contrary, the decision to travel without children/isolated members – for CYC– increased with the increasing of parents' age in almost every quarter (see table 4).

Table 5 - Persons who travel for leisure by quarter, type of household and sex - Year 2006
(share for 100 persons with the same characteristics)

Type of households and Sex	Quarters			
	January- March	April- June	July- September	October- December
PARENTS IN COUPLES WITH CHILDREN				
male	19.2	23.2	51.9	18.9
female	19.4	24.1	53.0	19.5
Total	19.3	23.7	52.4	19.2
MARRIED/PARTNER IN COUPLES WITHOUT CHILDREN				
male	18.9	24.4	39.7	17.2
female	18.3	26.1	40.2	17.6
Total	18.6	25.3	39.9	17.4
LONE PARENTS				
Male	30.4	22.8	48.6	13.8
Female	10.1	18.4	39.9	14.4
Total	13.0	19.1	41.3	14.3

Source: Istat, Survey *Holidays and Trips*.

The share of parents in CYC and partners in CNC who travelled alone (at least once), without the partner, was rather modest all year round (not more than 4% of all households of the same type), unlike the share of persons who travelled at least once with their partner only (between about 5% and about 11% of CYC and between about 15% and about 38% of CNC in the four quarters) or with the whole family (eg. shares reached 35.4% of all CYC and 38% of all CNC between July and September) (see table 6). Hence, Italian households with couples tendentially choose not to divide the couple during the holidays, and preferred to travel as much as possible with the whole family in every period of the year. Lone fathers were more inclined to travel alone compared to the mothers, while LPH who travel all together did so more only in some periods of the year: 14.5% of lone-fathers households (LFH) and 20.5% of lone mothers households (LMH) in the summer, and 15.6% of lone fathers households in the winter.

Table 6 - Persons who travel for leisure by quarter, type of household and type of participation to the trip - Year 2006 (share for 100 households with the same characteristics)

Type of households and Class of age	Quarters			
	January- March	April- June	July- September	October- December
PARENTS IN COUPLES WITH CHILDREN				
Lone father	2.4	2.4	4.0	2.2
Lone mother	2.1	1.7	2.8	2.2
Lone couple without children/isolated members	4.9	6.4	11.2	6.7
All member of the household together	11.5	13.8	35.4	9.2
Total of parents who travel living in couples with children	19.3	23.7	52.4	19.2
MARRIED/PARTNER IN COUPLES WITHOUT CHILDREN				
Lone husband/common-low husband	3.0	1.5	1.6	2.5
Lone wife/common-low wife	2.6	3.7	2.4	2.9
Lone couple without isolated members	16.5	23.0	38.5	15.1
All member of the household together	16.3	22.1	38.0	14.6
Total of spouses/partners who travel living in couples without children	18.6	25.3	39.9	17.4
LONE PARENTS				
Lone father (a)	14.8	20.6	28.8	5.0
Lone mother (b)	6.2	11.6	17.1	6.2
All member of the household together in lone father household (a)	15.6	2.2	14.5	1.5
All member of the household together in lone mother household (b)	3.9	7.4	20.5	7.1
Total of parents who travel living in single-parents	13.0	19.1	41.3	14.3

(a) per 100 lone father households.

(b) per 100 lone mother households

Source: Istat, Survey *Holidays and Trips*.

Main purpose of the trip

In line with the now consolidated choices in Italy, partners living in couple -with or without children- and lone parents mainly took a trip in 2006 to relax (leisure, recreation and holidays) rather than to visit friends and relatives or for other reasons (e.g. health treatment, religion, pilgrimage, others), all over the year.

The third quarter registered the highest shares of household travelling for this reason at least once (43.9% of all parent in CYC, 33.8% of all lone parents and 31.8% of all partners in CNC) (see table 7). In particular, as regards parents in CYC and partner in CNC the highest percentages were reached in summer by those who travelled all together: 30.9% of CYC and 30.4% of CNC. Parents in LPH instead, registered the highest value in the case of lone-father travelling without any other members (26.8% of all LFH) or when lone-mother travelled with other members (20.4% of all LMH). The case of a LPH travelling all together reached only the 15.6%.

In the fourth quarter, instead, the share of parents who travelled for relax/leisure (10.4% of all parents in CYC, 7.5% of all lone parents) was similar to that of visiting friends/parents (9.3% and 7.3% respectively). Moreover, in this quarter, lone parents mostly travelled to visit friends and relatives rather than to relax, both when a father or a mother travelled at least with another member (7.2% vs. 1.5% of all LFH and 5.9% vs. 3.8% of all LMH) and when they travelled with the whole family (3.9% vs. 2.9% of all LPH).

In each quarter, as for visiting friends/parents, those living in CYC do it mostly with the whole family rather than alone.

Duration

In the third quarter couples (with or without children) and lone parents chose holidays that lasted 4 nights and more rather than 1 to 3 nights (46.5% of all parents in CYC for long trips vs. 14.1% for short ones, 34.8% of all parents in CNC for long trips vs. 13.4% for short ones and 34.3% of all lone parents for long trips vs. 12.7% for short ones), whatever the way other members participate in the trip (see table 7). Compared with the other forms of participation in the trip, the highest shares of tourists for long holidays were presented when families travelled all together but only for CNC and CYC (in the third quarter: 33% of all CNC and 32.1% of all CYC). Lone parents reached hardly 15.6% when travelling with the other members, whereas higher value were reached in case of lone father travelling alone (25.1% of all LFH), lone mother/father travelling at least with a member (19.8% of all LMH and 15.9% of all LFH)

Differences of trip duration reduced a lot in the other periods of 2006 for each type of household (not more than 6.3 percentage points). However, short personal trips were preferred to long ones mainly in the fourth quarter, in nearly every type of household and the form of participation in the trip. In this quarter lone mothers travelling with at least one child/isolated member reached the highest percentage of short trips (6.9%) whereas only lone fathers travelling with at least one child/isolated member preferred to take a long trip rather than a short one (8.7% vs. 7.2%). Quite high shares of short holidays were registered also when couples and lone parents travelled with the whole family (in this fourth quarter: 9.4% of all CNC, 6.2% of all CYC and 4.7% of all LPH).

Couples who travelled with the whole family presented rather similar shares of short and long trips in the first and second quarters (for CYC: 6.3% of short trips and 6.2% of long trips in the first quarter, 7.7% and 7% in the second quarter; for CNC: 9.6% of short trips and 9.4% of long trips in the first quarter, 12.3% and 12.7% in the second quarter). Lone parents who travelled with the whole family preferred to take long trips in the first quarter (3.4% of long trips vs. 2.2% of short trips) and short trips in the second quarter (4.6% of short trips vs. 2.1% of long trips).

Table 7 - Persons who travel for personal purpose by quarter, some characteristics of the trip, some types of household, some types of participation to the trip - Year 2006 (share for 100 persons with the same characteristics)

Purpose, duration and type of participation to the trip	Quarters			
	January- March	April- June	July- September	October- December
PURPOSE				
PARENT IN COUPLES WITH CHILDREN				
Leisure, recreation and holidays	13.3	16.7	43.9	10.4
<i>of which: lone couple without children/isolated members</i>	3.9	4.9	9.2	4.7
<i>of which: all members together</i>	8.0	9.8	30.9	4.4
Visiting friend and relatives	6.4	6.8	10.3	9.3
<i>of which: lone couple without children/isolated members</i>	1.0	1.5	2.2	1.8
<i>of which: all members together</i>	3.6	4.2	5.2	5.2
Other ^(a)	0.8	1.2	2.1	1.2
<i>of which: lone couple without children/isolated members</i>	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.6
<i>of which: all members together</i>	0.3	0.4	1.0	0.3
MARRIED/PARTNER IN COUPLES WITHOUT CHILDREN				
Leisure, recreation and holidays	11.2	16.7	31.8	11.4
<i>of which: all members together</i>	10.2	15.0	30.4	9.8
Visiting friend and relatives	7.6	8.8	9.3	6.8
<i>of which: all members together</i>	6.4	7.4	8.8	5.6
Other ^(a)	1.4	1.7	2.2	1.9
<i>of which: all members together</i>	1.0	1.6	1.8	1.8
LONE PARENT				
Leisure, recreation and holidays	7.9	12.1	33.8	7.5
<i>of which: lone father without other members</i>	5.4	15.2	26.8	5.0
<i>of which: lone father with at least another member</i>	9.0	1.0	15.9	1.5
<i>of which: lone mother with at least another member</i>	2.5	5.4	20.4	3.8
<i>of which: all members together</i>	3.4	3.6	15.6	2.9
Visiting friend and relatives	5.4	5.9	9.6	7.3
<i>of which: lone father without other members</i>	9.4	5.4	2.0	-
<i>of which: lone father with at least another member</i>	6.6	1.0	3.9	7.2
<i>of which: lone mother with at least another member</i>	0.9	3.7	7.3	5.9
<i>of which: all members together</i>	1.7	2.9	5.0	3.9
Other ^(a)	0.5	1.7	1.0	0.6
DURATION (in nights)				
PARENTS IN COUPLES WITH CHILDREN				
1-3 nights	12.1	13.5	14.1	13.5
<i>of which: lone couple without children/isolated members</i>	3.6	3.7	4.3	4.7
<i>of which: all members together</i>	6.3	7.7	7.2	6.2
4 plus nights	9.4	12.2	46.5	7.8
<i>of which: lone couple without children/isolated members</i>	1.7	3.4	8.6	4.7
<i>of which: all members together</i>	6.2	7.0	32.1	3.8
MARRIED/PARTNER IN COUPLES WITHOUT CHILDREN				
1-3 nights	10.6	13.9	13.4	10.8
<i>of which: all members together</i>	9.6	12.3	12.8	9.4
4 plus nights	10.7	14.6	34.8	9.4
<i>of which: all members together</i>	9.4	12.7	33.0	7.8
LONE PARENT				
1-3 nights	6.3	12.8	12.7	11.1
<i>of which: lone father without other members</i>	5.4	8.8	8.6	4.8
<i>of which: lone father with at least another member</i>	5.9	1.0	3.9	7.2
<i>of which: lone mother with at least another member</i>	1.6	6.3	9.6	6.9
<i>of which: all members together</i>	2.2	4.6	5.8	4.7
4 plus nights	8.4	7.2	34.3	4.8
<i>of which: lone father without other members</i>	9.5	11.8	25.1	0.2
<i>of which: lone father with at least another member</i>	9.7	2.2	15.9	8.7
<i>of which: lone mother with at least another member</i>	2.5	2.8	19.8	2.2
<i>of which: all members together</i>	3.4	2.1	15.6	1.6

(a) "Others" stands for health treatment, religion, pilgrimage, other purposes.

Source: Istat, Survey *Holidays and Trips*.

Principal destination

Parents -with or without children- and partners in CNC mainly chose to travel in Italy in all periods of the year, whatever the form of participation in the trip. For instance, during the two high tourist periods, in the summer there were 45.7% of all parents in CYC, 35.8% of all parents in LPH

and 35.2% of all partner in CNC and, in the spring, 20.6% of all partner in CNC, 20.2% of all parents in CYC and 15.3% of all parents in LPH.

In particular, when parents travelled with the whole family the highest shares were registered in the third quarter, but only for parents CYC and partners in CNC: 33.8% of CNC and 31% of CYC (see table 8). In this period lone parents reached lower share than the others (17.4% of all LPH) whereas the highest share of tourists was in case of lone mothers travelling at least with a member (23.4% of all LMH in the summer)

Foreign countries registered higher shares of holidaymakers in the third quarter than in others periods. As regards parents in CYC and partner in CNC, the shares reached the top of the year when members travelled together: 8.6% of CNC and 6.2% of all CYC, both in the third quarter. In the case of LPH, the highest shares were registered always in the summer, when lone fathers or lone mothers travelled alone (7.4% of all LFH and 3.7% of all LMH) whereas LPH travelling abroad with the whole family involved hardly 2.2% of all LPH. Moreover couples living in CYC travelling without children reached 3.1% (of all CYC).

In any case, also in the other periods of the year, the shares of whole families travelling abroad were more consistent for CNC than for CYC or LPH (respectively 3.6%, 1.7% and 1% in the first quarter; respectively 5%, 2.8% and 1.8% in the second one; respectively 3.4%, 1.3% and 2.2% in the fourth one), thereby showing a slight seasonal periodicity in the spring for CYC and CNC.

The higher shares of the CNC travelling abroad and those of lone fathers/mothers travelling without other members compared with the other data, could depend on a higher mobility to go abroad in “low-season” periods for those households not bound by parental obligations or obligation towards their partner.

Main type of accommodation

When households travel, they mainly chose private accommodation, having registered in 2006 shares between 9.9% of LPH in the fourth quarter and 31.2% of CYC in the third quarter (see table 8), which is the period when the highest shares were also reached by tourists in the other two types of households (25.7% of all parents in LPH and 23.2% of all partners in CNC).

Each type of household who decided to travel with the whole family preferred private accommodation except in the second quarter in the case of CYC and CNC who chose collective establishments more than private ones (12.7% vs. 10.7% of all partners in CNC and 7.6% vs. 6.9% of all parents in CYC).

Couples travelling without children/isolated members chose collective establishment instead of private ones in almost every period (2.7% vs. 2.4% in the second quarter, 4% vs. 2.5% in the third one and 6.7% vs. 6% in the third one, except in the fourth one, when there was 3.1% vs. 3.7% of all parents in CYC of each quarter). As for the lone parents travelling alone, lone fathers preferred private accommodation in every quarter (except for the third one in which they preferred collective one), while lone mothers did not really show to prefer one type of accommodation to another (except for the first one when they chose private one).

Principal means of transport

In Italy, cars are the main means of transport for travelling (whether parents/partners alone or with other aggregated households members), prevailing more or less clearly on all other means all year round (except for few cases). The highest incidence was registered in the summer: 42.2% of all parents in CYC, 27% of all partners in CNC and 22,9% of all lone parents (see table 9).

When parents/partners travel with all the family the shares decreased: 28.7% of all parents in CYC, 26.4% of all partners in and 12.5% of all lone parents.

The airplane was chosen mostly by LPH in the summer (8% of all parents in LPH), particularly by lone fathers travelling alone in the summer (14,3% of all LFH), and by partners in CNC all year round (3.4% in the first quarter, 4.9% in the second one, 6.5% in the third one and 3.8 in the fourth one).

Table 8 - Persons who travel for personal purpose by quarter, some characteristics of the trip, some types of household, some types of participation to the trip - Year 2006 (share for 100 persons with the same characteristics)

Destination, type of accommodation and type of participation to the trip	Quarters			
	January- March	April- June	July- September	October- December
DESTINATION				
PARENT IN COUPLES WITH CHILDREN				
Italy	17.3	20.2	45.7	15.8
<i>of which: lone couple without children/isolated members</i>	4.1	5.8	8.9	5.2
<i>of which: all members together</i>	10.2	11.5	31.0	8.1
Abroad	3.0	4.3	10.3	4.1
<i>of which: lone couple without children/isolated members</i>	0.9	0.8	3.1	1.6
<i>of which: all members together</i>	1.7	2.8	6.2	1.3
MARRIED/PARTNER IN COUPLES WITHOUT CHILDREN				
Italy	14.8	20.6	35.2	14.5
<i>of which: all members together</i>	12.9	18.2	33.8	12.3
Abroad	4.1	6.0	9.4	4.2
<i>of which: all members together</i>	3.6	5.0	8.6	3.4
LONE PARENT				
Italy	10.7	15.3	35.8	10.0
<i>of which: lone father without other members</i>	9.8	20.6	21.3	0.2
<i>of which: lone mother without other members</i>	5.6	8.4	14.2	4.5
<i>of which: lone mother with at least another member</i>	2.8	6.6	23.4	6.2
<i>of which: all members together</i>	4.6	5.0	17.4	4.1
Abroad	2.7	4.2	6.4	4.3
<i>of which: lone father without other members</i>	5.0	-	7.4	4.8
<i>of which: lone mother without other members</i>	1.1	3.6	3.7	1.7
<i>of which: lone mother with at least another member</i>	1.2	2.6	3.0	2.3
<i>of which: all members together</i>	1.0	1.8	2.2	2.2
ACCOMMODATION				
PARENTS IN COUPLES WITH CHILDREN				
Collective establishment	9.2	13.6	27.9	6.9
<i>of which: lone couple without children/isolated members</i>	2.7	4.0	6.7	3.1
<i>of which: all members together</i>	5.2	7.6	18.4	2.4
Private accommodation	11.6	11.2	31.2	13.3
<i>of which: lone couple without children/isolated members</i>	2.4	2.5	6.0	3.7
<i>of which: all members together</i>	7.1	6.9	20.2	7.0
MARRIED/PARTNER IN COUPLES WITHOUT CHILDREN				
Collective establishment	9.8	14.2	22.1	9.1
<i>of which: all members together</i>	8.8	12.7	20.5	7.7
Private accommodation	11.4	12.5	23.2	10.6
<i>of which: all members together</i>	10.0	10.7	22.5	9.0
LONE PARENT				
Collective establishment	2.4	9.0	23.5	5.0
<i>of which: lone father without other members</i>	1.0	3.9	26.8	-
<i>of which: lone mother without other members</i>	0.6	6.0	10.1	3.6
<i>of which: all members together</i>	1.6	2.8	8.8	1.4
Private accommodation	10.6	10.8	25.7	9.9
<i>of which: lone father without other members</i>	13.8	16.6	13.8	5.0
<i>of which: lone mother without other members</i>	5.6	6.1	9.0	2.6
<i>of which: all members together</i>	4.0	4.1	13.3	5.0

Source: Istat, Survey *Holidays and Trips*.

Organisation of the trip

In 2006, tendentially, parents and partners who travelled preferred to book accommodation and/or transport of their holidays, according with happened in terms of trips. The only two exceptions were obtained for parents living in LPH in the first quarter and for those living in CYC in the fourth quarter, who both preferred not to book their trips (9.5% of all lone parents had no reservation at least once whereas 4.2% of all lone parents had at least a reservation, in the first quarter; 11.8% of all parents in CYC did not make any reservation at least whereas 8.9% of all parents in CYC had at least a reservation, in the fourth quarter) (see table 9).

In the third quarter, parents in CYC were the most organised (32.5% of all parents in CYC, 26.1% of all parents in LPF, 23.7% of all partners in CNC), whereas in the second quarter the

highest share of persons who booked their trips was for partners in CNC (17% of all partners in CNC, 14.6% of all parents in CYC and 11.2% of all lone parents).

Table 9 - Persons who travel for personal purpose by quarter, some characteristics of the trip, some types of household, some types of participation to the trip - Year 2006 (share for 100 persons with the same characteristics)

Destination, type of accommodation and type of participation to the trip	Quarters			
	January- March	April- June	July- September	October- December
TRANSPORT				
PARENT IN COUPLES WITH CHILDREN				
Air	2.3	2.9	6.1	3.0
<i>of which: all members together</i>	1.0	1.6	3.0	1.1
Sea	0.8	0.7	3.2	0.5
<i>of which: all members together</i>	0.8	0.5	2.3	0.1
Car	14.6	17.5	42.2	13.2
<i>of which: all members together</i>	9.0	11.0	28.7	7.3
Other mode ^(a)	3.5	3.9	5.7	3.6
<i>of which: all members together</i>	1.6	1.1	2.6	1.0
MARRIED/PARTNER IN COUPLES WITHOUT CHILDREN				
Air	3.4	4.9	6.5	3.8
<i>of which: all members together</i>	2.9	4.3	6.0	2.9
Sea	-	1.6	4.3	1.2
<i>of which: all members together</i>	-	1.4	4.3	1.1
Car	12.9	14.8	27.0	10.4
<i>of which: all members together</i>	11.4	13.3	26.4	9.6
Other mode ^(a)	3.8	7.0	8.2	4.3
<i>of which: all members together</i>	3.2	5.9	7.0	3.1
LONE PARENT				
Air	1.8	4.5	8.0	5.0
<i>of which: lone fathers without other members</i>	5.0	3.9	14.3	-
<i>of which: all members together</i>	0.7	1.8	2.1	2.6
Sea	0.7	1.0	4.1	-
<i>of which: all members together</i>	0.2	0.3	1.0	-
Car	9.6	9.1	22.9	4.5
<i>of which: all members together</i>	4.6	3.6	12.5	2.2
Other mode ^(a)	1.7	6.2	10.5	5.7
<i>of which: all members together</i>	..	1.1	5.1	1.8
ORGANISATION				
PARENTS IN COUPLES WITH CHILDREN				
Any type of reservation	10.7	14.6	32.5	8.9
Direct reservation	8.4	10.7	24.8	6.5
<i>of which: all members together</i>	5.1	6.6	17.1	2.7
Use of travel agent/tour operator	2.5	4.3	9.0	2.6
<i>of which: all members together</i>	1.2	2.1	5.4	0.9
No type of organisation	10.4	10.1	26.3	11.8
<i>of which: all members together</i>	6.3	5.9	16.3	6.3
MARRIED/PARTNER IN COUPLES WITHOUT CHILDREN				
Any type of reservation	11.1	17.0	23.7	10.5
Direct reservation	9.0	13.5	16.5	8.5
<i>of which: all members together</i>	7.5	12.0	15.7	6.7
Use of travel agent/tour operator	2.1	4.1	8.5	2.7
<i>of which: all members together</i>	2.0	3.4	7.6	2.6
No type of organisation	9.7	10.5	20.6	8.9
<i>of which: all members together</i>	8.8	9.2	20.1	7.7
LONE PARENT				
Any type of reservation	4.2	11.2	26.1	9.7
Direct reservation	3.0	8.1	19.1	7.2
<i>of which: all members together</i>	1.8	2.1	9.8	4.1
Use of travel agent/tour operator	1.2	4.4	7.9	2.6
<i>of which: all members together</i>	-	1.3	2.9	0.5
No type of organisation	9.5	8.9	22.6	5.6
<i>of which: all members together</i>	3.8	3.5	9.0	2.3

(a) "Other mode" stands for other land means of transport: railway, bus, coach and others.
Source: Istat, Survey *Holidays and Trips*.

In any case, when parents/partners decide to book, they prefer to do it by themselves. As a matter of fact, the shares of those who used a travel agency/tour operator were always lower than the shares of those who booked their holidays directly, in each quarter. This behaviour was maintained when persons travelled with the whole family whereas it was not constantly replaced for the other types of participation in the trip. In the third quarter there was the highest gap between the two types of organisation in the case of parents in CYC travelling with the whole family (17.1% of all parents had at least one direct reservation whereas 5.4% all of parents made at least one reservation by using a travel agency, of all parents in CYC).

5. How much do children travel for holidays: analysis per type of household

In 2006, in the analysis of the tourism behaviours of children in CYC and children in LPH the highest number of holidaymakers was registered in the summer in both cases: 58.7% of children in CYC and 51.4% of children in LPH travelled at least once between July and September. Children in CYC also travelled a lot between April and June (25.2% of all children in CYC), and less between January and March (21.9%) and between October and December (17%). Considering children in LPH, the shares of those who took at least one holiday were: 18.7% in the winter, 17.6% in the spring and 14.7% in the autumn. Hence, in every period, the share of children in CYC who took at least one personal trip was higher than the share of children in LPH.

The propensity of children⁷ to take at least one holiday changes according to the age classes, whatever the type of household. Generally, younger age classes (aged 0 to 24) presented higher shares, whereas older classes (aged 45 and over) showed lower ones.

Considering persons aged less than 15, the share of children in CYC who took at least one personal trip was higher in the winter and in the autumn than that of children in LPH (22% of all children in CYC vs. 19.8% of all children in LPH between January and March, 17.8% vs. 10.5% between October and December). On the contrary, in the summer children in LPH travelled more (69.2%) than children in CYC (65.8%). Finally, in the spring, both presented rather similar tendencies, with shares around 30%.

In the 15-24 age class, during the first two quarters, children living in CYC travelled more than those living in LPH (24% vs. 22.6% in the first quarter, 22.6% vs. 18.2% in the second one), whereas children in LPH travelled more than the others during the remaining quarters of the 2006 (65.8% vs. 54.8% in the third quarter, 20.5% vs. 16.5% in the fourth one).

The 25-34 age class presented less marked differences, with an opposite tendency compared to the 15-24 age class. As a matter of fact, children in LPH registered higher shares in the first six months, whereas children in CYC had higher shares in the last six months.

The 35-44 age class presented a tendency similar to that of children aged 15-24: children in CYC travelled more than the children in LPH during the first semester, whereas children in LPH more than the others second semester, though the differences are rather small, except in the third quarter, when 37.7% of children in LPH took at least one trip vs. 28% of children in CYC.

Also as for persons aged 45 and over who were generally less inclined to travel, those in LPH registered higher shares than those living in CYC from July to December, and lower shares from April to June in both types of household. Less than 8% of children travelled between January and March.

5.1 Characteristics of the children's holidays

Participation of other household members

Children in CYC were generally more inclined to go at least once on holidays with the whole family (10.7 of children in CYC in the first quarter, 12.9% in the second one, 35.3% in the third one and 8.6% in the fourth one) than to travel alone (9.3%, in the first quarter, 9.7% in the second one, 18.9% in the third one and 5.7% in the fourth one) (see table 11). In each quarter, younger children

⁷ Conventionally, in paragraphs 5 and 5.1 we used "Children" to indicate a single person who still living with parents. 14

and teenagers travelled more often with the whole family than alone, whereas adults more often alone.

In each period, children in LPH were more inclined to travel without every member of the family: 12.9% indeed went on a trip alone in the winter, 10.5% in the spring, 31% in the summer and 8% in the autumn. Shares of tourists who travelled with the whole family were, on the other hand, less consistent: 6.5% of the children in LPH in the first quarter, 4.8% in the second one, 19.8% in the third one and 5.3% in the fourth one. In comparison with children in CYC, the differences between the share of children who travelled alone and with the whole were more consistent in the case of those living in LPH. Here too, in each quarter, younger children and teenagers travelled more often with all the family and adults more often alone.

Table 10 – Children who travel for leisure by quarter, type of household, class of age and type of participation to the trip - Year 2006 (share for 100 children with the same characteristics)

Type of households and Class of age	Quarters			
	January- March	April- June	July- September	October- December
CHILDREN IN COUPLES WITH CHILDREN				
0-14	22.0	30.1	65.8	17.8
<i>of which: lone child</i>	2.4	4.6	2.7	1.1
<i>of which: all members together</i>	17.3	22.2	57.4	14.1
15-24	24.0	22.6	54.8	16.5
<i>of which: lone child</i>	16.2	14.9	29.0	7.8
<i>of which: all members together</i>	6.5	5.3	21.7	5.4
25-34	20.2	18.5	52.4	17.0
<i>of which: lone child</i>	15.7	14.9	41.7	12.7
<i>of which: all members together</i>	2.5	2.8	8.4	1.7
35-44	11.0	12.9	28.0	11.1
<i>of which: lone child</i>	6.5	8.9	24.4	9.1
<i>of which: all members together</i>	4.0	3.5	2.4	2.1
45 or more	7.8	13.6	18.2	1.4
<i>of which: lone child</i>	7.8	6.9	11.2	1.4
<i>of which: all members together</i>	-	6.8	7.0	-
Total	21.9	25.2	58.7	17.0
CHILDREN IN LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLD				
0-14	19.8	30.9	69.2	10.5
<i>of which: lone child</i>	4.6	6.3	7.5	-
<i>of which: all members together</i>	15.5	18.8	58.2	7.1
15-24	22.6	18.2	65.8	20.5
<i>of which: lone child</i>	17.8	14.0	41.8	12.9
<i>of which: all members together</i>	5.2	3.0	23.0	8.5
25-34	21.6	19.4	49.2	16.4
<i>of which: lone child</i>	16.3	9.8	37.9	10.1
<i>of which: all members together</i>	7.0	5.0	12.1	3.2
35-44	10.7	11.6	37.7	12.5
<i>of which: lone child</i>	8.0	10.0	33.0	6.1
<i>of which: all members together</i>	2.6	3.8	4.6	6.4
45 or more	7.9	10.9	24.2	6.3
<i>of which: lone child</i>	7.9	7.0	14.7	5.2
<i>of which: all members together</i>	-	2.1	8.9	1.1
Total	18.7	17.6	51.4	14.7

Source: Istat, Survey *Holidays and Trips*.

Main purpose of the trip

In every quarter, children in CYC and in LPH mostly took at least one trip to relax (leisure, recreation and holiday) rather than to visit friends and relatives or for other reasons, whatever the way other members participate in the trip. Only in the autumn, holidaymakers who travelled with the whole family to visit friends and relatives registered higher shares than who travelled for relax/leisure (4.9% of children in CYC vs. 3.9% and 3.3% of children in LPH vs. 2.3% respectively).

The shares of children in CYC who went on holidays alone for leisure/recreation were not really different from those of who travelled with the whole family for the same reason, except in the third quarter: 7.9% and 7.5% of all children in CYC respectively in the first quarter, 8.3% and 9.5% in the second quarter, 17.3% and 30.4% in the third one and 4.1% and 3.9% in the fourth one (see

table 12). In each quarter, children travelled more often to visit friends and relatives with the whole family rather than separately, though registering rather modest shares.

In each period of the year, children in LPH who travelled for leisure/recreation separately from the rest of the family registered higher shares than those who travelled for the same reason with the whole family. Here too, considering who went on holiday for visiting friend and relatives, children who moved alone registered higher shares than those who travelled with the whole family.

Table 11 - Children who travel for leisure by quarter, type of household and type of participation to the trip - Year 2006 (share for 100 children with the same characteristics)

Type of households and type of participation	Quarters			
	January- March	April- June	July- September	October- December
CHILDREN IN COUPLES WITH CHILDREN				
Lone child	9.3	9.7	18.9	5.7
All members together	10.7	12.9	35.3	8.6
Total of children who travel living in couples with children	21.9	25.2	58.7	17.0
CHILDREN IN LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLD				
Lone child	12.9	10.5	31.0	8.0
All members together	6.5	4.8	19.8	5.3
Total of children who travel living in lone parent household	18.7	17.6	51.4	14.7

Source: Istat, Survey *Holidays and Trips*.

Duration

Children both in CYC and in LPH generally took at least one trip that lasted 4 nights and more rather than 1 to 3 nights mainly in the third quarter (52% of children in CYC for long holidays vs. 14.5% for short ones, 44% of children in LPH for long holidays vs. 14.7% for short ones) (see table 12). In the other periods, they mostly tended to take short personal trips rather than long ones, especially in the fourth quarter where the gap between the two types of trips, moreover, was the largest after that observed for the third quarter (11.3% of children in CYC for short holidays vs. 7.2% for long ones, 10.2% of children in LPH for short holidays vs. 6.1% for long ones). Only for children in LPH the gap was quite consistent also in the second quarter (11% for short holidays vs. 7.2% for long ones). However, the share of children who took a short personal trips remained quite constant all year round, while for long personal trips it was high only in the summer.

The tendency to prefer long holidays more than short ones only in the third quarter occurred for children who travelled both with whole family and alone. Moreover, higher share of long holidays than short ones was registered also when children in LPH moved with the whole family in the first quarter: as a matter of fact, in the winter they preferred more long stays than short ones (4% vs. 2.5% respectively).

Principal destination

Children in CYC preferred to spend their holiday mainly in Italy all year round. In the high-tourism quarter (July- September), almost half of all children in CYC took at least one personal trip in an Italian location (48.7% of children in CYC), while only 14.6% spent their holidays abroad (see table 13). In the other quarters the shares of holidaymakers were less consistent: the shares of persons travelling in Italy were: 17.8% in the first quarter, 20.1% in the second and 14.1% in the fourth one; as regards persons who travelled abroad, their shares were: 4.9% in the first period, 5.7% in the second and 3.4% in the fourth one.

Children in LPH travelled more in Italy than abroad in all quarters too, though their reached shares less high than children in CYC. Children in LPH who took at least one trip in Italy were 14.4% of children in LPH in the winter, 12.7% in the spring, 42.9% in the summer and 9.4% in the autumn. The shares of children travelling abroad were: 5.6% in the winter, 5.4% in the spring, 12.6% in the summer, 5.9% in the autumn.

Table 12 – Children who travel for personal purpose by quarter, some characteristics of the trip, some types of household, some types of participation to the trip - Year 2006 (share for 100 children with the same characteristics)

Purpose, duration and type of participation to the trip	Quarters			
	January- March	April- June	July- September	October- December
PURPOSE				
CHILDREN IN COUPLES WITH CHILDREN				
Leisure, recreation and holidays	16.2	19.5	50.6	9.5
<i>of which: lone child</i>	7.9	8.3	17.3	4.1
<i>of which: all members together</i>	7.5	9.5	30.4	3.9
Visiting friend and relatives	5.9	5.7	10.8	8.3
<i>of which: lone child</i>	1.6	1.3	2.2	1.6
<i>of which: all members together</i>	3.1	3.5	5.6	4.9
Other ^(a)	0.7	0.8	1.4	0.5
<i>of which: lone child</i>	0.2	0.2	0.4	0.2
<i>of which: all members together</i>	0.3	0.4	1.0	0.3
CHILDREN IN LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLD				
Leisure, recreation and holidays	12.1	12.8	45.3	9.5
<i>of which: lone child</i>	8.7	9.1	27.5	6.8
<i>of which: all members together</i>	3.4	2.6	16.9	2.3
Visiting friend and relatives	6.6	4.4	9.6	6.1
<i>of which: lone child</i>	4.2	1.1	4.3	1.1
<i>of which: all members together</i>	2.3	2.2	4.1	3.3
Other ^(a)	0.8	0.7	1.0	-
<i>of which: lone child</i>	-	0.4	0.8	-
<i>of which: all members together</i>	0.8	0.3	0.2	-
DURATION (in nights)				
CHILDREN IN COUPLES WITH CHILDREN				
1-3 nights	12.6	13.5	14.5	11.3
<i>of which: lone child</i>	5.6	5.5	4.8	3.7
<i>of which: all members together</i>	5.6	6.9	7.6	5.7
4 plus nights	11.3	13.0	52.0	7.2
<i>of which: lone child</i>	4.2	4.4	16.0	2.2
<i>of which: all members together</i>	5.9	7.0	31.9	3.7
CHILDREN IN LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLD				
1-3 nights	10.6	11.0	14.7	10.2
<i>of which: lone child</i>	8.1	5.8	8.6	4.9
<i>of which: all members together</i>	2.5	3.4	4.7	3.9
4 plus nights	9.5	7.2	44.0	6.1
<i>of which: lone child</i>	6.0	5.2	26.4	3.6
<i>of which: all members together</i>	4.0	1.6	16.4	1.3

(a) "Others" stands for health treatment, religion, pilgrimage, other purposes.
Source: Istat, Survey *Holidays and Trips*.

In both types of household, however, tourists who travelled abroad mainly involved persons who went on holiday alone, especially in the third quarter: 6.6% of all children in CYC and 10.6% of all children in LPH. When all family members travelled abroad together, their shares were less marked (almost always under 2%), except in the summer for children in CYC (6.2%).

Main type of accommodation

Overall, children in CYC were more inclined to stay in collective establishments than in private accommodations in the first two quarters of the year (12% vs. 11.4% of all children in CYC in the first quarter and 15% vs. 11.2% in the second one). In the summer and in the autumn they preferred private accommodations to collective ones (34.5% vs. 31.9% and 11.8% vs. 6.2% respectively) (see table 13).

Likewise, children in LPH chose collective establishments in the first two quarters (about 10% of all children in both periods) and private accommodations in the other two periods (32.8% between July and September, 9.8% between October and December).

As regards children - in CYC and in LPH - who travelled alone, the share of who spent at least one trip in collective establishments prevailed over who stayed in private accommodations. The

difference between the two shares becomes more important in the second quarter for both types of households, whereas in the third quarter it is relevant only for children in CYC.

Table 13 - Children who travel for personal purpose by quarter, some characteristics of the trip, some types of household, some types of participation to the trip - Year 2006 (share for 100 children with the same characteristics)

Destination, type of accommodation and type of participation to the trip	Quarters			
	January- March	April- June	July- September	October- December
DESTINATION				
CHILDREN IN COUPLES WITH CHILDREN				
Italy	17.8	20.1	48.7	14.1
<i>of which: lone child</i>	6.5	7.3	13.5	4.2
<i>of which: all members together</i>	9.2	10.6	30.9	7.7
Abroad	4.9	5.7	14.6	3.4
<i>of which: lone child</i>	3.1	2.5	6.6	1.6
<i>of which: all members together</i>	1.7	2.8	6.2	1.0
CHILDREN IN LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLD				
Italy	14.4	12.7	42.9	9.4
<i>of which: lone child</i>	9.2	6.8	23.1	4.4
<i>of which: all members together</i>	5.4	3.7	18.2	3.5
Abroad	5.6	5.4	12.6	5.9
<i>of which: lone child</i>	4.4	3.7	10.6	4.1
<i>of which: all members together</i>	1.1	1.3	1.7	1.8
ACCOMMODATION				
CHILDREN IN COUPLES WITH CHILDREN				
Collective establishment	12.0	15.0	31.9	6.2
<i>of which: lone child</i>	5.9	6.6	11.9	2.9
<i>of which: all members together</i>	5.2	7.0	17.7	2.3
Private accommodation	11.4	11.2	34.5	11.8
<i>of which: lone child</i>	3.7	3.2	8.5	3.0
<i>of which: all members together</i>	6.2	6.7	20.8	6.5
CHILDREN IN LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLD				
Collective establishment	9.9	10.1	28.5	5.9
<i>of which: lone child</i>	7.7	7.0	18.4	4.5
<i>of which: all members together</i>	2.1	2.1	8.0	1.1
Private accommodation	9.5	8.2	32.8	9.8
<i>of which: lone child</i>	5.2	3.9	17.1	4.0
<i>of which: all members together</i>	4.4	3.0	14.6	4.3

Source: Istat, Survey *Holidays and Trips*.

Persons who travel with the whole family generally preferred private accommodations. This trend is more marked for children in LPH in the summer (14.6% stayed at least once in private accommodations vs. 8% of who chose collective establishments) and for children in CYC in the autumn (6.5% stayed in private accommodations vs. 2.3% of who stayed in collective establishments).

Principal means of transport

Cars remained the means of transport most used to travel on holiday. In the quarter registering the highest number of travelling persons - which is the third - 43.4% of all children in CYC and 31.7% of all children in LPH travelled at least once with the car (see table 14). In this same quarter, airplanes were preferred more frequently by children in LPH than by children in CYC (11.9% of children in LPH vs. 9.4% of children in CYC). The share of persons who travelled by ferry, a means of transport mainly used in this period, was about the same for children belonging to both types of households (about 4%). Less high shares were surveyed in the other quarters for all means of transport. However, in the fourth quarter, the share of children in LPH who travelled by plane (6.4% of children in LPH) was higher than that of who travelled by car (5.2%).

Table 14 - Children who travel for personal purpose by quarter, some characteristics of the trip, some types of household, some types of participation to the trip - Year 2006 (share for 100 children with the same characteristics)

Destination, type of accommodation and type of participation to the trip	Quarters			
	January- March	April- June	July- September	October- December
TRANSPORT				
CHILDREN IN COUPLES WITH CHILDREN				
Air	2.9	3.4	9.4	2.6
<i>of which: lone child</i>	1.7	1.7	4.8	1.4
<i>of which: all members together</i>	1.0	1.5	3.0	0.8
Sea	0.8	0.9	4.2	0.3
<i>of which: lone child</i>	0.2	0.4	1.3	0.1
<i>of which: all members together</i>	0.6	0.5	2.2	0.1
Car	13.5	15.3	43.4	10.9
<i>of which: lone child</i>	3.6	3.0	10.0	2.4
<i>of which: all members together</i>	8.1	10.3	28.8	7.0
Other mode ^(a)	6.4	6.4	8.8	4.1
<i>of which: lone child</i>	4.2	4.9	4.7	2.2
<i>of which: all members together</i>	1.7	1.0	2.6	0.9
CHILDREN IN LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLD				
Air	3.7	5.8	11.9	6.4
<i>of which: lone child</i>	2.7	3.4	8.1	3.2
<i>of which: all members together</i>	1.0	1.3	1.6	2.1
Sea	0.8	0.6	4.3	-
<i>of which: lone child</i>	0.7	0.3	2.0	-
<i>of which: all members together</i>	0.2	0.3	1.3	-
Car	11.0	8.1	31.7	5.2
<i>of which: lone child</i>	5.5	3.6	16.3	2.5
<i>of which: all members together</i>	5.4	2.6	14.0	2.1
Other mode ^(a)	4.0	4.6	13.0	3.9
<i>of which: lone child</i>	4.0	3.5	8.3	2.2
<i>of which: all members together</i>	..	0.8	4.2	1.3
ORGANISATION				
CHILDREN IN COUPLES WITH CHILDREN				
Any type of reservation	13.1	15.1	36.8	7.7
Direct reservation	9.7	10.9	26.4	5.8
<i>of which: lone child</i>	3.8	3.4	7.8	2.4
<i>of which: all members together</i>	4.8	6.2	16.2	2.3
Use of travel agent/tour operator	3.6	4.3	11.9	2.1
<i>of which: lone child</i>	2.3	1.8	4.7	0.8
<i>of which: all members together</i>	1.2	2.0	5.4	0.7
No type of organisation	10.8	11.3	29.2	10.6
<i>of which: lone child</i>	3.8	4.8	8.2	3.0
<i>of which: all members together</i>	5.7	5.6	17.0	6.2
CHILDREN IN LONE PARENT HOUSEHOLD				
Any type of reservation	11.4	10.4	34.5	9.8
Direct reservation	8.3	6.7	26.6	7.3
<i>of which: lone child</i>	6.0	4.2	14.9	3.7
<i>of which: all members together</i>	2.2	1.6	10.6	3.2
Use of travel agent/tour operator	4.0	4.1	9.2	2.6
<i>of which: lone child</i>	4.0	2.6	6.3	1.9
<i>of which: all members together</i>	-	0.9	2.4	0.4
No type of organisation	8.4	8.6	29.8	6.3
<i>of which: lone child</i>	4.2	4.2	16.1	3.0
<i>of which: all members together</i>	4.3	2.6	9.1	2.1

(a) "Other mode" stands for other land means of transport: railway, bus, coach and others.
Source: Istat, Survey *Holidays and Trips*.

Organisation of the trip

Children in CYC and in LPH who took at least one holiday mostly preferred to book accommodation and/or transport all round year. In particular, in the summer 36.8% of those living in CYC made at least one reservation in opposition to 29.2% of those who made no reservation; 34.5% of children in LPH made a reservation *versus* 29.8% of those who made no reservation. This tendency, however, was not presented in the case of children living in CYC who travelled in the autumn: as a matter of fact, the share of those who did not book their trips exceeded the share of those who booked them (10.6% *vs.* 7.7% respectively).

In each period, whatever the form of types of household, children who took at least one personal trip with a reservation preferred to book it directly and not by a travel agency/tour operator. In the high tourism quarter (June-September), 26.4% of children CYC and 26.6% of children in LPH made a direct reservation *versus*, respectively, 11.9% and 9.2% of those who used a travel agency/tour operator.

Moreover, in the autumn the share of children in LPH who made a direct reservation slightly exceeded the share of holidaymakers who made no reservation at all (7.3% of children in LPH *vs.* 6.3%). This tendency also occurred for children who travelled with the whole family both for those living in LPH in the summer and for those living in CYC in the spring.

As regards booking by travel agency/tour operator, in any case, the shares involved less than 5% of all children in each quarter, except in the third one where 11.9% of all children in CYC and 9.2% of all children in LPH used at least once a travel agency/tour operator. Considering the type of participation in the trip, the highest shares involved children in LPH who travelled alone (6.3% of all children in LPH) and children in CYC who moved with the whole family (5.4% of all children in the CYC).

6. One-person households⁸ on holidays

Young persons aged 18-24, adults aged 25-34, employed persons and men (except in the summer when women travel more) represented the persons part of 'one-person households' that travelled the most for personal purposes in every period of the year (see table 15).

Table 15 – Lone persons who travel for personal purpose by quarter and some individual characteristics - Year 2006 (share for 100 persons with the same characteristics)

Characteristics of the lone person	Quarters			
	January-March	April-June	July-September	October-December
CLASS OF AGE				
18-24	-	100.0	-	86.7
25-34	57.9	58.8	77.7	32.9
35-44	45.1	38.6	73.5	34.7
45-64	23.4	23.5	45.1	18.5
65 or more	6.5	9.6	20.4	6.1
Total	19.7	19.6	37.6	15.7
SEX				
Male	29.5	19.9	42.1	18.9
Female	14.8	19.4	35.7	14.0
Total	19.7	19.6	37.6	15.7
ECONOMIC ACTIVITY STATUS				
Employed	43.7	37.4	66.3	26.2
Seeking an employment	38.5	-	48.6	43.3
Housewife	8.6	18.6	12.8	15.1
Student	-	-	51.6	100.0
In other condition	5.7	6.6	21.2	6.5
Person in pension	9.4	13.8	25.5	8.7
Total	19.7	19.6	37.6	15.7

Source: Istat, Survey *Holidays and Trips*.

The reason why they travel is rather to relax than to visit parents and friends, the latter involving at the most 10.7% of who travelled at least once in the spring (see table 16).

Long holidays were preferred in the summer (33.8% of tourists for long holidays *vs.* 9.3% of tourists for short ones) whereas in all other periods lone tourist didn't show a marked preference for a specific duration.

Italy was the preferred holiday destination, registering a higher share of holidaymakers in the summer (31.5%), period in which foreign countries registered their highest percentage of tourists too (9.7%).

⁸ One-persons households involve persons aged 18 years old or more.

As for the accommodation, in the summer collective establishments prevailed on private accommodation (22.4% vs. 20.6%) whereas private accommodation registered in all other periods of the year higher shares than those of collective one, with percentages included between 10.3% and 13.8%.

Cars were the means of transport most used to travel in every period of the year (from 6.8% in the fourth quarter to 21.2% in the third one), though airplanes were rather successful too (8.3% of lone persons chose it at least once in the third quarter, 5.4% in the fourth one and 3.6% in the first and second ones). Personal trips were organised mainly with a reservations rather than without (13.8% vs. 10.9% in the first quarter, 11.2% vs. 9.4% in the second one, 24% vs. 18.3% in the third one and 9.9% vs. 6.4% in the fourth one); in case of reservation, they were made directly rather than by using a travel agency/tour operator (10% vs. 4.2% in the first quarter, 7.8% vs. 3.7% in the second one, 15% vs. 10.5% in the third one and 7% vs. 4.2% in the fourth one).

Table 16 – Lone persons who travel for personal purpose by quarter and some characteristics of the trip - Year 2006 (share for 100 persons with the same characteristics)

Characteristics of the trip	Quarters			
	January-March	April-June	July-September	October-December
PURPOSE				
Leisure, recreation and holidays	12.4	9.1	30.0	9.0
Visiting friend and relatives	9.6	10.7	8.6	6.2
Other ^(a)	1.5	1.9	2.4	1.7
Total	19.7	19.6	37.6	15.7
DURATION (in nights)				
1-3 nights	12.8	9.9	9.3	8.4
4 plus nights	10.3	10.8	33.8	9.3
Total	19.7	19.6	37.6	15.7
DESTINATION				
Italy	16.7	15.7	31.5	11.6
Abroad	5.2	4.8	9.7	4.7
Total	19.7	19.6	37.6	15.7
ACCOMMODATION				
Collective establishment	8.6	8.5	22.4	6.6
Private accommodation	13.8	12.8	20.6	10.3
Total	19.7	19.6	37.6	15.7
TRANSPORT				
Air	3.6	3.6	8.3	5.4
Sea	0.4	0.4	5.3	0.4
Car	11.2	9.9	21.2	6.8
Other mode ^(b)	8.6	6.7	11.8	4.1
Total	19.7	19.6	37.6	15.7
ORGANISATION				
Any type of reservation	13.8	11.2	24.0	9.9
<i>Direct reservation</i>	10.0	7.8	15.0	7.0
<i>Use of travel agent/tour operator</i>	4.2	3.7	10.5	4.2
No type of organisation	10.9	9.4	18.3	6.4
Total	19.7	19.6	37.6	15.7

(a) "Others" stands for health treatment, religion, pilgrimage, other purposes.

(b) "Other mode" stands for other land means of transport: railway, bus, coach and others.

Source: Istat, Survey *Holidays and Trips*.

7. Closing comments

The outcomes of this study gave evidence of importance of an analysis of the tourism flows - particularly for the leisure segment- from the household perspective.

It has been defined both the generic travelling household profile and the identification of those household's members who have travelled. Italian households in 2006 preferred to travel in the summer. The participation in the trip of one member of the household or more allowed us to distinguish travel behaviour of who lives in CYC, in CNC and LPH. In particular, this study assessed that who lives in CYC or in CNC go on holiday with the whole family more than those

who lives in LPH. On the contrary, parents and children living in LPH show a higher tendency to travel alone.

Whatever the type of household considered, the tendency to travel with the whole family decrease with the increasing of the age of the members of households. Otherwise both children and parents more often travelled alone or in lone-couple (only for CYC) when their age increases .

Parents/partners and children living in whatever types of households presented in 2006 similar travel behaviours. Generally, they tended to take less holidays with the decreasing of their age. They moved principally for taking a period of relax/leisure, they preferred long stays more than short ones, they choose national country as main destination, all year round. Those members who travelled with all family stayed overnight in private accommodations in almost all quarters of 2006, whereas collective establishments were chosen when members travelled alone or with someone else, such as in the case of children moved by themselves. The majority of the persons took holidays moving by car; accommodation and transport were organised mostly with reservation (directly rather than by using a travel agency/tour operator).

In conclusion, to know how different household typologies travel could be a helpful instrument for policy maker and could give an additional information to improve analyses of tourism flows, becoming a source for evaluating households tourism needs, for identifying changes and emerging markets and for studying economical impact on the tourist areas.

References

- AA. VV., *Metodologia e organizzazione dell'indagine multiscopo sulla domanda turistica 'Viaggi e vacanze' (Methodology and organization of the Italian telephone survey on tourism demand 'Holidays and trips')*, Istat, Rome, Metodi e norme n.17/2003.
- AA. VV., *Il sistema di indagini sociali multiscopo: contenuti e metodologia delle indagini, (Multipurpose social surveys system: contents and methodology)* Istat, Metodi e norme n.31/2006.
- Bagatta G., Giusti M.V., Perez M. (1998), *The process of transition to realize the information system on Italian tourism demand*, 4th International Forum on Tourism Statistics, Copenhagen, 17-19 June.
- "Community Methodology on Tourism Statistics", Eurostat, European Communities, 1998.
- "Community Methodology on Tourism Statistics - Proposals for up-dates/extensions", 2003 Eurostat , Luxembourg.
- *Commission decision of 9 December 1998 on the procedures for implementing Council Directive 95/57/EC on the collection of statistical information in the field of tourism*, 1999 Official Journal of the European Communities.
- Perez M. (2001), *Implementing a quarterly household survey on tourism demand*, Workshop on Tourism Statistics, Budapest, 18-21 June.
- Sabbadini L.L., Bagatta G., Perez M. (1996), *Measuring the italian tourism demand through the telephone survey designed by Istat*, 4th International Forum on Tourism Statistics, Copenhagen, 17-19 June 1998.
- UN, *Recommendations on Tourism Statistics*.
- UNWTO, *International Recommendations on Tourism statistics (IRTS)*, Provisional draft, Rev.5.