Kowald, M., T. Arentze, and K. W. Axhausen (2012) A population's leisure network: Descriptive statistics and a model-based analysis of leisure-contact selection, *13th International Conference on Travel Behaviour Reserach*, Toronto. A population's leisure network: Descriptive statistics and a model-based analysis of leisure-contact selection

M. Kowald (ETH Zürich) T. Arentze (Eindhoven University of Technology) K.W. Axhausen (ETH Zürich)

IVT ETH Zurich

July 2012





Eidgenössische Technische Hochschule Zürich Swiss Federal Institute of Technology Zurich

- Leisure is an important travel segment
- It is different from other forms of travel and more strongly influenced by external factors
- A consideration of a person's social contacts adds explanatory power when approaching and explaining leisure travel patterns
  - → Include social contacts' influence in agent based simulations

Utility
$$U_{ij} = V_{ij} + \varepsilon_{ij}$$
f(Distance, attribute similarity)Thresholds $v_i, v_j$ f(Costs, odds of meeting)Probability $p_{ij} = \Pr(U_{ij} > v_i \land U_{ij} > v_j)$  $p_{ij} = \Pr(U_{ij} > v_i \land U_{ij} > v_j)$ Model $p_{ij} = \frac{\exp(V_{ij})}{\exp[\max(v_i, v_j)] + \exp(V_{ij})}$ 

#### Approach to generate a population-wide network

- 1. Estimate the friendship selection model
  - Observed personal networks of a sample of individuals provide positive observations
  - A sample from the national population provide negative observations
  - Use maximum likelihood estimation
- 2. Simulate encounters between persons on a national scale and use the friendship selection model
  - The common friend factor is taken into account by using a two-step process
  - The network generation procedure can be used in largescale agent-based travel simulation

Data collection: Ego-centric networks

| 20 7 | <u>م</u> |   | _  | 4    | 4    | 4    | _     | 1         | _   | 4    | 4   | 4   | 4  | _ | _    | 4  | 4    | -p | 0 | 0 |
|------|----------|---|----|------|------|------|-------|-----------|-----|------|-----|-----|----|---|------|----|------|----|---|---|
| 19 - |          |   | Un | obse | erve | d ov | verla | <b>ip</b> | • F | lesp | ond | ent | •  | S | ocia | CO | ntac | tþ | 0 | 0 |
| 18 - | 6        | 0 | 0  | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0     | 0         | 0   | 0    | 0   | ٩   | •  | • | 0    | 0  | •    | _  | 0 | 0 |
| 17 - | 0        | 0 | 0  | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0     | 0         | 0   | 0    | 0   | 0   | ¥  | 0 | 0    | 0  | 嶣    | 0  | 0 | 0 |
| 16 - | 0        | 0 | ٩  | 0    | ٠    | 0    | 0     | 0         | 0   | 0    | 0   | 0   | •  | > | 0    | •  | 0    | >  | 0 | 0 |
| 15 - | 0        | 0 | 0  | ¥    | •    | 0    | 0     | 0         | 0   | 0    | 0   | 0   | 0  | 0 | 0    | 0  | 0    | 0  | 0 | 0 |
| 14 - | 0        | 0 | 0  | •    | 0    | 0    | 0     | 0         | 0   | 0    | 0   | 0   | 0  | 0 | 0    | 0  | 0    | 0  | 0 | 0 |
| 13 - | 0        | 0 | 0  | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0     | 0         | 0   | 0    | 0   | 0   | 0  | 0 | 0    | 0  | 0    | 0  | 0 | 0 |
| 12 - | 0        | 0 | 0  | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0     | 0         | 0   | 0    | ۸   | 0   | 0  | 0 | 0    | 0  | ٩    | •  | ٠ | 0 |
| 11 - | 0        | 0 | 0  | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0     | 0         | 0   | •    | Ġ.  | >   | 0  | 0 | 0    | 0  | •    | Ж  | • | 0 |
| 10 - | 0        | 0 | 0  | 0    | ٩    | 0    | 0     | 0         | 0   | 0    | o:  | 0   | 0  | 0 | 0    | 0  | •    | •  | > | 0 |
| 9 -  | 0        | 0 | 0  | 0    | 0    | ┢    | •     | 0         | 0   | 0    | 0   | 0   | 0  | 0 | 0    | 0  | 0    | 0  | 0 | 0 |
| 8 -  | 0        | 0 | 0  | 0    | 0    | ♦    | 0     | 0         | 0   | 0    | 0   | :0  | 0  | 0 | 0    | 0  | 0    | 0  | 0 | 0 |
| 7 -  | 0        | 0 | 0  | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0     | 0         | 0   | 0    | 0   | •   | 0  | 0 | 0    | 0  | 0    | 0  | 0 | 0 |
| 6 -  | 0        | 0 | 0  | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0     | 0         | 0   | 0    | •   | +   | -• | 0 | 0    | 0  | 0    | 0  | 0 | 0 |
| 5 -  | 0        | 0 | 0  | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0     | 0         | 0   | 0    | 0   | •   | 0  | 0 | 0    | 0  | 0    | 0  | 0 | 0 |
| 4 -  | 0        | 0 | 0  | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0     | 0         | 0   | 0    | 0   | 0   | 0  | 0 | 0    | 0  | 0    | 0  | 0 | 0 |
| 3 -  | 0        | 0 | 0  | ٩    | •    | ٠    | 0     | 0         | 0   | 0    | 0   | 0   | 0  | 0 | 0    | 0  | 0    | •  | • | 0 |
| 2 -  | 0        | 0 | 0  | •    | Ж    | •    | 0     | 0         | 0   | 0    | 0   | 0   | 0  | 0 | 0    | 0  | 0    | 0  | 0 | 0 |
| 1 –  | 0        | 0 | 0  | •    | •    | >    | 0     | 0         | 0   | 0    | 0   | 0   | 0  | 0 | 0    | 0  | 0    | 0  | 0 | 0 |
|      | Γ        | Ι |    | 1    |      |      | Ι     | Ι         | Ι   | Ι    |     |     |    |   | Ι    | Τ  |      | Т  | Τ |   |
|      | Α        | В | С  | D    | Е    | F    | G     | Н         | I   | J    | к   | L   | М  | Ν | 0    | Ρ  | Q    | R  | S | т |

6

Data collection: A population-wide network



7

|             |      | Ratio of s | same  | Distance |          |
|-------------|------|------------|-------|----------|----------|
|             | n    | age        | sex   | mean     | std.dev. |
| Ego-Alter   | 6546 | 0.526      | 0.659 | 20.240   | 4.327    |
| Alter-Alter | 2887 | 0.426      | 0.565 | 22.991   | 9.912    |
| All         | 9433 | 0.495      | 0.631 | 21.082   | 13.437   |

- Data: Swiss Micro-census on Mobility and Transport (MZMV), 2005
- Large survey population (33'390 respondents from 31'950 households), weighted to represent the Swiss population

→ Draw random sample of 100 persons for each ego to add negative observations

# Estimation sample

| Similarity of actors' characteristics [%] | Tie present | Tie absent |
|---|-------------|------------|
| Same sex                                  | 65.9        | 49.8       |
| Same civil status                         | 66.5        | 46.7       |
| Same language                             | 98.2        | 74.4       |
| Same age                                  | 52.5        | 18.0       |
| Age difference of one category            | 30.4        | 32.5       |
| Age difference of two categories          | 14.3        | 27.2       |
| Age difference of three categories        | 2.12        | 15.4       |
| Age difference of four categories         | 0.8         | 6.8        |
| Same educational level                    | 56.8        | 41.3       |
| Educational difference of one category    | 40.3        | 50.1       |
| Educational difference of two categories  | 2.89        | 8.7        |
| Same status of home municipality          | 57.6        | 34.9       |

### Tie selection: A utility based decision model (MMNL)

| Parameter                           | Estimate | t-value |
|-------------------------------------|----------|---------|
| Alternative: No relation            |          |         |
| Threshold                           | 2.02     | 8.36    |
| Alternative: Relation               |          |         |
| Effects from Homo- or Heterophily   |          |         |
| Same sex                            | 1.150    | 23.05   |
| Same age                            | 2.270    | 30.29   |
| Age difference of two levels        | -0.342   | -5.63   |
| Age difference of three levels      | -0.953   | -8.66   |
| Age difference of four levels       | -0.539   | -3.02   |
| Same educational level              | 0.861    | 6.77    |
| Educational difference of one level | 1.300    | 10.07   |
| Same level of civil status          | 0.341    | 8.40    |
| Same size of home municipality      | 0.696    | 12.75   |

# Tie selection: A utility based decision model (MMNL)

| Parameter                                 | Estimate | t-value |
|---|----------|---------|
| Alternative: Relation                     |          |         |
| At least one actor is                     |          |         |
| of age level 1 (< 23 years)               | 0.820    | 4.58    |
| of age level 3 (37 - 49 years)            | 1.320    | 8.15    |
| of age level 4 (50 - 64 years)            | 1.570    | 19.87   |
| of age level 5 (> 65 years)               | 1.190    | 6.64    |
| of educational level 1 (mandatory school) | -2.000   | -18.20  |
| of educational level 2 (apprenticeship)   | -0.770   | -4.68   |
| a female                                  | 1.530    | 17.52   |
| of urban level 2 (town)                   | 0.906    | 13.97   |
| of urban level 3 (rural municipality)     | 1.300    | 12.04   |

# Tie selection: A utility based decision model (MMNL)

| Parameter                                | Estimate | t-value |
|--|----------|---------|
| Alternative: Relation                    |          |         |
| Interaction effects with distance        |          |         |
| Age level 3 * distance [log(KM)]         | -0.516   | -5.81   |
| Age level 5 * distance [log(KM)]         | 1.090    | 11.92   |
| Educational level 2 * distance [log(KM)] | -0.783   | -7.94   |
| Interaction effects between dummies      |          |         |
| Age level 1 * educational level 2        | -0.961   | -5.30   |
| Age level 3 * educational level 1        | 0.831    | 6.42    |
| Age level 3 * educational level 2        | 0.783    | 7.50    |
| Age level 5 * educational level 2        | -0.626   | -5.67   |
| Age level 5 * female                     | -1.040   | -9.47   |
| Urban level 3 * education level 2        | -0.322   | -2.91   |

| Parameter                   | Estimate | t-value |
|-----------------------------|----------|---------|
| Alternative: Relation       |          |         |
| Random effects              |          |         |
| Distance [log(KM)]          | -3.720   | -32.45  |
| Distance std. dev [log(KM)] | -0.917   | -26.50  |
| Adjusted Rho <sup>2</sup>   | 0.724    |         |
| Ν                           | 50'167   |         |

- 1. Employing a sample on overlapping personal leisure networks and a nationally representative sample to add non-chosen ties between actors resulted in a choice set of leisure relationships
- 2. Utility based decision models on the presence or absence of leisure relations showed major influences for spatial distance and combinations of personal characteristics
- 3. Model results can be used for an implementation in agent based (travel demand) simulations which allows a consideration of effects from a population-wide (leisure) network
- 4. Both, encounter simulation and data analysis can be extended with further personal characteristics and variables for the time dynamics of relationships