

# Exploring Network Effects of Point-to-Point Networks: An Investigation of the Spatial Patterns of Southwest Airlines' Network

**Xiaowen Fua,b,\*, Huan Jinc, Shaoxuan Liuc, Tae H. Oumc,d, Jia Yane,f**

*a Department of Industrial and Systems Engineering, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hong Kong, China*

*b Institute of Transport and Logistics Studies, University of Sydney, Australia*

*c Ningbo Supply Chain Innovation Institute of China (NSCIIC), China*

*d Sauder School of Business, University of British Columbia, Canada*

*e Washington State University, USA*

*f School of Economics and Management, Tianjin Chengjian University, China*

## Abstract

This paper explores network effects in Point-to-Point airline networks by examining the spatial patterns of Southwest airlines' route network during Southwest's major network expansionary period for completing continental US geographic coverage between 1990 and 2006. Estimation results from a spatial probit model reveal clear spatial dependence in profitability across different routes served by the carrier. Detailed investigation suggests two main sources of network effects, namely: (1) airport and regional presence, and (2) substitutability between airport-pair markets. Findings of the paper suggest also that the network effects embedded in Southwest's Point-to-Point network have many distinguishing features as compared to those identified in a typical Hub-and-Spoke network. The results of this study on Southwest's network expansionary period help us to predict how emerging LCC networks in other large aviation market, such as China, are likely to be developed over time if regulators give carriers reasonable freedom to develop their service network efficiently.

## 1. Introduction

It is well known that the Hub-and-Spoke (HS) network, with which travelers can make connecting stops at hub airports before flying to their final destinations, allows airlines to achieve cost savings through “economies of traffic density”<sup>1</sup>, to increase flight frequency and thus service quality<sup>2</sup>, and to price and compete more strategically<sup>3</sup>. Such effects are generally termed as “network effects” in the literature.

Although HS network was adopted as the predominant network model after the US aviation market deregulation (Morrison and Winston 1986, 1995), some of the most successful low cost carriers (LCCs)<sup>4</sup> including Southwest Airlines and JetBlue choose to operate PoP (Point-to-Point) which are comprised of many linear segments without extensive connection operations. As the US aviation market has led the rest of the world in terms of deregulation and low cost carrier development, a better understanding of the PoP network development in this market will help airlines and regulators in other countries, especially emerging markets such as China and India, to better plan for their future aviation network expansions. In this paper we identify possible network effects of PoP networks by examining the spatial network patterns of Southwest Airlines, which is the largest LCC in the US domestic market

---

<sup>1</sup> Caves et al. (1984) , Brueckner and Spiller (1994). Traffic density is calculated by dividing the total traffic volume by the carrier’s network size. Network size is usually defined as the number of origin-destination pairs served by the carrier, or the number of nodes connected in its network.

<sup>2</sup> Morrison and Winston (1987), Berechman and de Wit (1996), Berechman and Shy (1998), Brueckner and Zhang (2001), and Brueckner (2004)

<sup>3</sup> Toh and Higgins (1985), Borenstein (1989, 1990, and 1992), Spiller (1989), Berry (1990), Bittlingmayer (1990), Brueckner and Spiller (1991), Brueckner et al. (1992), Zhang and Wei (1993), Oum et al. (1995), Zhang (1996), and Hendricks et al. (1997).

<sup>4</sup> LCCs offer generally low fares in exchange for eliminating many traditional passenger services (such as first/business class and lounges) offered by full service airlines (FSA). The U.S. department of Transport (DOT) regularly reports financial and operational statistics for seven largest LCCs including Airtran Airways, ATA Airlines, America West Airlines, Frontier, JetBlue, Southwest, and Spirit.

and in the world. We will focus on the airline's operations during 1990-2006, during which the carrier developed pan-US geographic network coverage.

Theoretical models in Hendricks *et al.* (1995 and 1999) suggest that the PoP network allows airlines to compete on price less aggressively. Their models along with the one in Lederer and Nambimadom (1998) predict that airlines may prefer PoP networks if: (1) the sizes of the cities are large; (2) the distance between cities is very short; and (3) the number of cities is small. These predictions, of course, hardly explain the rapid expansion of Southwest and JetBlue, which developed extensive networks with nationwide coverage. Running a PoP network does not necessarily mean that an airline has to manage each route independently. Two "adjacent" routes, such as routes linking the same two cities / regions out of alternative airports (for example, Los Angeles International (LAX) – Las Vegas (LAS) vs. Orange County (SNA) – Las Vegas (LAS), or Oakland International Airport (OAK) – Baltimore (BWI) vs. San Francisco (SFO) – Ronald Reagan National Airport (DCA), are imperfect substitutes to each other. Potential gains may be achieved by strategically managing these two routes together rather than treating them as unrelated markets. Also, by consolidating all route operations in one airport, an airline may achieve, at least partially, the cost reduction and market power effects identified for HS networks. These possible network effects can be important to explain the expansion of LCCs, and to understand the strategies adopted by legacy carriers (e.g., United and American airlines) to compete with LCCs. However, network effects in PoP networks have received little attention in the literature.

An airline's profitability of operating different routes should be interdependent if there are significant network effects. Therefore, network effects can be empirically explored by examining the patterns of spatial dependence of air services across different routes. Similar to the approach used in

models of firm entry, we treat the observed network pattern, or route served by an airline as the indicator of the underlying profitability. We further classify the relationships among all routes into different categories of spatial dependence based on the distance between end-point airports. The dependence of the underlying profitability across routes can then be uncovered from the spatial network patterns of the airline. We choose to study the network configuration of Southwest, the largest and most successful LCC in the U.S and in the world. Since 1990-2006 is the time period in which Southwest developed the pan-US geographic network coverage<sup>5</sup>, we decide to focus on this time period so that rich insights can be generated not only for the US market, but also for LCC airlines in other major emerging economies. For example, the findings on Southwest network development patterns are likely to give some good lessons for predicting network development patterns of major LCCs in China (e.g., Spring Air) since China has geographic space almost as large as continental USA. Although national aviation policy is still heavily influenced by major state-owned airlines in China, both full service airlines and LCCs have been aggressively expanding their networks with increased frequency (Wang et al. 2014b, 2014c, Fu et al. 2015a). As countries in Northeast Asia liberalize their domestic and international markets, LCC penetration rates in the region have been growing fast too (Chung and Whang 2011, Adler et al. 2014).

Significant spatial dependence has been identified in Southwest's network configuration, which suggests two major sources of network effects in PoP networks: airport/regional presence and market substitutability. Airport/regional presence in our study is measured by Southwest's operation at multiple airports in a region. That is, whether Southwest provides aviation services at airports that are geographically close to each other. Because we are analyzing the services of one airline, market

---

<sup>5</sup> From 1993 to 2004, the revenue and passenger volume of Southwest were almost tripled and the airline added service to 22 new airports (Goolsbee and Syverson, 2008)

substitutability is mainly captured by airport substitutability. That is, whether routes (airport-pairs) under consideration involve the same origin/destination airport or airports that serve the same catchment area or multi-airport-region.<sup>6</sup> Our empirical results also suggest that network effects embedded in Southwest's Point-to-Point network have many distinguishing features as compared to those identified in a typical Hub-and-Spoke network. Moreover, the spatial patterns of Southwest's network changed significantly during our study period, calling for the need to control for airline size and network coverage when one attempts to identify alternative network effects.

While most previous studies (Dresner et al. 1996, Windle and Dresner 1999, Mason 2001, Morrison 2001, Morrison et al. 2006 and Hofer et al. 2008, Fu et al. 2010, Fageda et al. 2015) have shown that the growth of LCCs has brought large welfare gains, this paper brings a valuable additional insight by identifying spatial dependence of airline route service decisions. While most of the literature on airline entry, including Berry 1992, Sinclair 1995, Boguslaski et al. 2004, Aguirregabiria and Ho 2007, Dixit and Chintagunta 2007, Homsombat et al. 2014, Patrick Zeigler et al. 2017, Zhang et al. 2017, do not consider the spatial dependence in airline network configuration explicitly, this paper incorporates the effect of spatial network patterns of Southwest airlines when analyzing route decisions

---

<sup>6</sup> Substitutability between services offered on different routes may be best quantified by cross price elasticity (Fu et al. 2011). The use of alternative airports in a region, or airport substitutability, has been identified as a key determinant of substitutability for aviation services provided in multi-airport regions. The effects of airport substitutability on passenger choices and airline/airport competition have been quantified by cost and time elasticities related to airport access in multi-airport-regions (Pels et al. 2003), or the effects of service attributes (e.g. airport access time, airport delay, flight frequency, the availability of particular airport-airline combinations) on passengers' choices (Ishii et al. 2009). In anti-trust and competition investigations by regulatory agencies such as the UK Competition Commission (2013) and European Commission (2017), airport substitutability served as the one of the most important factors in defining the relevant markets. For example, the UK Competition Commission (2013) noted that "*In order to identify relevant geographic markets, we use a version of the origin and destination approach, similar to that employed by the European Commission in a number of previous investigations into airline mergers. More specifically, we identify a set of overlap corridors encompassing routes between groups of nearby origin and destination airports, close enough to one another that a significant number of passengers would be likely to consider them substitutable. Following the European Commission, we use as our starting point a 100km/1-hour distance threshold to identify potentially substitutable airports.*"

during their early stage of its network development from 1990 to 2006. Finally, understanding spatial pattern of Southwest's network is helpful to understand market outcomes in airline industry (Goolsbee and Syverson 2008).

Although a number of studies investigated the development of Asian LCCs (see, for example, Zhang et al. 2008, Chung and Whang 2011, Yeung et al. 2012, Hanaoka et al. 2014), there is limited literature on their network development patterns. Fu et al. (2015a) study the entry pattern of Spring Air, China's largest LCC. Wang et al. (2017) investigate the entry patterns of LCCs in Hong Kong. As suggested in Wang et al. 2017, LCCs in Asia have grown substantially in recent years but the LCCs market still has a huge space for growth. Although LCCs in East Asia currently operate in different business environments in terms of regulatory policy, market structure, passenger preference, there are certain characteristics and patterns similar to those in North America. For instance, both East Asia and North America have large cities with big populations and high traffic volumes; some cities in East Asia, such as Seoul, Tokyo, Osaka, Shanghai, the Pearl River Delta Region<sup>7</sup>, (Beijing and Chengdu) have developed (are developing) multi-airport systems similar to those in the metropolitan areas in North American, notably New York, San Francisco, Washington DC, Los Angeles etc. Since successful major LCCs in the region are likely to have a large number of focus cities in their future network, a study of Southwest airline's spatial network patterns during its major network expansion period is likely to help predict what could happen if regulators give Asian LCCs more freedom to develop their networks.

---

<sup>7</sup> The PRD region in South China is currently served by five international airports located in Hong Kong, Guangzhou, Shenzhen, Zhuhai and Macau, respectively.

This paper is organized as follows: Section 2 reviews some of the emerging patterns observed in Southwest's network development. Section 3 specifies the econometric model. Section 4 describes the data and variables used in empirical analysis. Section 5 reports and evaluates the estimation results on Southwest, and also discuss potential implications of these findings on future development of major LCC carriers' network in Asia, especially China. The last section concludes the paper.

## **2. Some Observations on Southwest's Network Expansionary Period**

There are two significant patterns in Southwest's network expansion especially starting from late 1990's: 1) once the airline started service at an airport, it entered multiple markets connecting the airport; 2) the airline expanded its network mainly by adding routes to connect existing airports rather than adding new airports. As shown in Table 1, Southwest increased the number of routes (airport-pairs) by more than 300%, from 81 routes in 1990 to 375 routes in 2006 while increasing the number of airports by only 100% during the same period. As a result, the average number of destinations out of an airport has increased from 5 in 1990 to 12 in 2006.

<Table 1 about here>

During its expansion, Southwest increased operations at several focus airports substantially. Table 2 lists the top five airports for Southwest over the years. In 2006, non-stop flights from these top five airports account for more than half of the Southwest system. Unlike hub airports serving large proportions (usually about 50%) of connecting passengers, Southwest's focus airports serve mainly local passengers. Figure 1 reports the ratio of enplaned passenger (passengers getting on a flight at the focus airport) to onboard passenger (including both enplaned passenger and through passengers who stop by the focus airport before flying to final destination) at Southwest's top five airports; in 2006,

more than 80% of passengers at these airports are enplaned (local) ones. Connecting passengers at hub airports normally change airplane to fly to their destinations; through passengers of Southwest usually did not change airplane at focus airports in those days.

<Table 2 and Figure 1 about here>

Focus airports of Southwest can be quite close to each other. Examples include San Diego (SAN) and Los Angeles (LAX), Orlando (MCO) and Tampa (TPA), and Baltimore-Washington (BWI) and Philadelphia (PHL); distances between these airport pairs are all close to 100 miles. This is very different from HS system in which the minimum distance between two major hub airports in a successful dual-hub system is about 560 miles<sup>8</sup> -- Northwest's Minneapolis-St. Paul and Detroit. British Airways once attempted to share hub functions of London-Heathrow airport with Gatwick airport but soon realized that it is not beneficial (O'Connell, 2008).

Another noticeable feature in Southwest's network configuration is that the airline tends to serve multiple airports in a metropolitan area/region simultaneously. For example, Southwest has operations at four airports in Los Angeles area, three airports in San Francisco bay area, and two airports in Washington, DC area; Southwest has also operations at close-by airports in Texas, Florida, and New England.

Above observations lead us to hypothesize that the PoP route system of Southwest is designed strategically to explore certain network effects. This hypothesis contradicts with the common view that

---

<sup>8</sup> AirNeth (2005).



a PoP system assembles a loosely connected collection of dense and short-haul markets, whose profitability are based on their own<sup>9</sup>.

### 3. The Econometric Model

We use a *spatial probit model* to study the network development of Southwest Airlines on airport-pair markets; interdependence in profitability indicated by spatial patterns of the airline suggests existence of possible network effects. Airport-pair markets in our study are non-directional (i.e., MDW – SFO and SFO – MDW<sup>10</sup> are considered as one market) because Southwest normally offers round-trip service between two airports. Spatial probit model was first introduced by McMillen (1992), and has been applied by several others on various problems (Case 1992, Marsh *et al.* 2000, Beron *et al.* 2003, Murdoch *et al.* 2003, and Coughlin *et al.* 2004, Wang *et al.* 2014a, Bhat 2015, McMillen and Soppelsa 2015).

In a spatial probit model, observations on the discrete dependent variable (route entries of Southwest in our case) are allowed to be interdependent in neighboring regions. Neighboring regions of an airport-pair market are defined by the distance from the end-point airports. In his study on airline competition, Morrison (2001) uses a zone with a radius of 75 miles to define “nearby” airports. He finds that the presence of Southwest at an airport affects airfares of markets out of nearby airports, particularly those “adjacent” routes – routes connecting nearby airports to nearby airports. He also finds that a zone with a radius of 75 miles provides the best fit compared to zones of 25, 50, 100, and 150-mile radius. We define the spatial relationship of airport-pair markets with similar terms used by

---

<sup>9</sup> This is the theoretical prediction from Hendricks *et al.* (1995 and 1999) and Lederer and Nambimadom (1998), as well as empirical finding from Boguslaski *et al.* (2004) on Southwest’s entry.

<sup>10</sup> MDW is the code for Chicago Midway Airport, while SFO stands for the San Francisco International Airport.

Morrison. We consider interdependence among airports up to 150 miles apart, and allow such interdependence to be different for airports within 75 miles vis-a-vis airports more than 75 miles apart.

In particular, two airports are defined as *local* to each other if they are less than or equal to 75 miles apart. For example, Chicago O’Hare airport and Chicago Midway airport are local airports to each other, and the three airports in New York/New Jersey area are also local airports to each other. Two airports are defined as *nearby* to each other if the distance between them is larger than 75 miles but less than or equal to 150 miles. For example, Los Angeles International Airport is a nearby airport to San Diego International Airport. Finally, two airports are *unrelated* if the distance between them is greater than 150 miles. The spatial relationship of any two airport-pair markets can therefore be classified into one of the 8 types as summarized in Table 3. For ease of notation, we use  $m' \sim^j m$  to denote that market  $m'$  is of type  $j$  related to market  $m$  hereafter.

<Table 3 about here>

Let  $y_m$  indicate the observed network decision of Southwest on market  $m$ , and  $M$  be the total number of airport-pair markets;  $y_m$  equals one if Southwest *served* the market in all four quarters of the year, and equals zero otherwise. That is, seasonal services are excluded from our analysis. This network configuration definition is different from the ones used in previous studies on airline entry, where an airline is said to enter a market if the firm *started* to serve the route in the year. While past studies attempt to identify the factors affecting an airline’s decision to start new services, we are concerned about airlines’ network configuration strategy, which should be better understood as a long-run decision. With our definition, whether a route is served by the airline reflects the carrier’s network configuration decision, which is formed together with all previous network decisions. If Southwest served a market from 1990 – 1994 but exited in 1995, we do not consider that the airline configured

this route in its overall network when we study its network pattern in 1995. A temporary entry/exit decision may reveal important factors affecting the airline’s decision to start/stop services in a market, but it is not suitable for our purpose to identify the network effects embedded in the long-run network configuration.

An airline’s decision to serve an airport-pair or not depends on the profit generated from this route market, which is denoted by  $\pi_m$ . An airline only serves markets where profits are non-negative.<sup>11</sup> Formally we have

$$y_m = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \pi_m \geq 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } \pi_m < 0 \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

Profits are assumed to be dependent on exogenous market factors and some factors are unobservable to econometrician; profit in one market depends also on profits in related markets because of possible network effects. We thus specify the profit function as the following

$$\pi = XB + W\pi + \varepsilon \quad (2)$$

where  $\pi = [\pi_1, \pi_2, \dots, \pi_M]'$  and  $X = [X_1, X_2, \dots, X_M]'$ ;  $X_m$  is a row vector of market factors related to market  $m$ .  $W$  is a  $M$  by  $M$  spatial dependence matrix. The  $m$ th row and the  $n$ th column of the spatial dependence matrix is 0 if  $m = n$  or market  $m$  is unrelated with market  $n$ ; is  $\rho_j$  if  $n \sim^j m$ ,

---

<sup>11</sup> Although in the long term airlines should have flexibility adjusting their fleet capacities, it is possible that they choose to serve routes with “sufficiently high” profits only due to capacity constraint at a particular time in the short run. The specification in Eq. (1) can be extended to consider such a possibility, which will lead to similar model specification and estimation procedures. For an example of such specifications, see Wang et al. (2017). Alternatively, some kind of ordered model can be used. We are thankful to Eric Pels for this recommendation.

where  $\rho_j$  is the spatial lag coefficient. In total we have 8 such coefficients to estimate from data. The noise term  $\varepsilon \equiv [\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, \dots, \varepsilon_M]'$  represents the market factors which can be observed by the airline but not econometrician; the elements in  $\varepsilon$  are parameterized as mutually independent standard normal distributions.

Consider an example in which Southwest configures its network involving following four airport-pair markets: Los Angeles Airport – San Francisco Airport (market 1), Los Angeles Airport – Oakland Airport (market 2), San Diego Airport – Oakland Airport (market 3), and San Francisco Airport – Seattle Airport (market 4). The spatial dependence matrix of this network is

$$W = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \rho_1 & \rho_5 & \rho_3 \\ \rho_1 & 0 & \rho_2 & \rho_7 \\ \rho_5 & \rho_2 & 0 & \rho_7 \\ \rho_3 & \rho_7 & \rho_7 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad (3)$$

and thus the profit of serving market 1 is

$$\pi_1 = X_1 B + \rho_1 \pi_2 + \rho_5 \pi_3 + \rho_3 \pi_4 + \varepsilon_1 \quad (4)$$

The profit of serving market 1 depends on the profits of serving other three markets, and this spatial dependence can be caused by possible network effects. Estimation results on the spatial lag coefficients reveal whether such network effects are material.

Equation (2) leads to the following reduced form

$$\pi = \tilde{X} B + \tilde{\varepsilon} \quad (5)$$

where  $\tilde{X} = (\mathbf{I} - W)^{-1} X$ ,  $\tilde{\varepsilon} = (\mathbf{I} - W)^{-1} \varepsilon$  and  $\mathbf{I}$  denotes a  $M$  by  $M$  identity matrix. The data likelihood of the airline's network configuration decisions on the  $M$  markets is thus

$$L(B, \rho) = \prod_{m=1}^M \Phi\left(\frac{\tilde{x}_m B}{\sigma}\right)^{y_m=1} \left(1 - \Phi\left(\frac{\tilde{x}_m B}{\sigma}\right)\right)^{y_m=0} \quad (6)$$

where  $\rho = [\rho_1, \rho_2, \dots, \rho_8]'$ ;  $\tilde{x}_m$  is the  $m$ th row of  $\tilde{X}$ ;  $\sigma^2 = \varpi_m \varpi_m'$  with  $\varpi_m$  denoting the  $m$ th row of  $(\mathbf{I} - W)^{-1}$ , and it is the function of spatial lag coefficients  $\rho$ ;  $\Phi(\cdot)$  is the c.d.f. of the standard normal distribution.

The model presented here explicitly accounts for the interdependence of profitability among different markets. This is the key feature of our model compared with previous airline entry studies. Earlier studies explore airline network effects by studying how a carrier's post-entry profit in a market is affected by its pre-entry presence at end-point airports. Such studies assume that airlines have no overall strategy for network configuration and they *sequentially* optimize their route entries *conditional on* their previous decisions. Network of an airline at a time point is the result of all previous route entry decisions driven by market factors and the purpose of exploring network effects. Note although entries are sequential, decisions of these entries are likely to be affected by common factors, or implemented under a strategic network configuration plan. Furthermore, network effects may exist among not only markets connecting the same airports but also markets connecting nearby/local airports. Profitability interdependence and network effects, if any, can be identified with our model specification by examining the estimation results of the spatial dependence matrix.

The parameters in the spatial probit model can be estimated by the Maximum Likelihood Estimator (MLE) which maximizes the log of the likelihood function in (6). The computation burden,

however, is heavy because operating a large size spatial dependence matrix without convenient structure cannot be avoided in evaluating the likelihood function. The network considered in our analysis includes the top 3000 airport-pair routes in the US domestic market. The spatial dependence matrix is then 3000 by 3000, and it has no convenient structure such as block diagonal as in many other spatial studies. With MLE, we have to evaluate  $(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{W})^{-1}$  in each iteration of the optimization process<sup>12</sup>, which makes the computation burden very heavy. In order to avoid such difficulty in computation, we adopt a Bayesian approach which is described in details in the appendix.

#### **4. The data**

We study the network patterns of Southwest Airlines in year 1995, 2000, and 2006 respectively. Since the early 1990s, the airline expanded its network substantially. Taking snap-shots of the airline's network configuration during this period allows us to track the evolvement of the airline's network configuration, when the airline expanded its network substantially. In addition, focusing on this period also allows us to remove any unexpected results caused by the 2008 financial crisis, which caused significant and asymmetric impacts to full service airlines and low cost carriers. The study is conducted over the largest 3000 non-stop airport-pair markets, which accounted for more than 90% of all domestic traffic as of the first quarter in year 2000, the mid-point in the time frame we would like to study. We divide the 17 years into three time windows, namely 1990-1995, 1996-2000, and 2001-2006. Entries in the last year of each period are used for analysis. The multiple time windows allow us to track the evolvement of the airline's network configuration; the 5-6 year interval of each period is to incorporate the adjustment process of the airline's network development. The dependent variable of the

---

<sup>12</sup> Because the elements in  $\mathbf{W}$  is the spatial lag coefficients.

model for each of the three periods is the route service dummy defined in (1), which takes the value of one in a market if Southwest operates at least one non-stop flight per week in the last year of the period. The market service information is compiled with the Department of Transport (DOT) T100 data for airline scheduled departure. In our specification, Southwest's network configuration, or the decision whether to serve a route market or not, depends on the following factors which affect the profitability in an airport-pair market:

- **Distance:** Distance in miles between the origin and destination airports in each potential market considered. It is well known that route distance affect potential demands for air travel in a market as well as airlines' overall network configuration.
- **Population:** Mean population for the catchment areas of the two airports. If an airport is located in a Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA)<sup>13</sup>, then the MSA region is used as the airport's catchment area. Otherwise the catchment area is defined as the county in which the airport is located. Population data are from the Regional Economic Information System (REIS) maintained by the Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA).<sup>14</sup>
- **Income:** Mean income per capita for the two airports' catchment areas. Income per capita data are from the REIS system maintained by the BEA.
- **Maximal airport HHI:** Based on the number of fared passengers carried by each airline, HHI index is calculated for each airport. A higher HHI indicates a more concentrated market structure at an airport. If the airport HHI index is high for one of the two airports in a market, LCCs may face higher costs to serve the route. Of course, the argument would be reversed in a few airports where Southwest achieved higher market share, such as the Houston Hobby

---

<sup>13</sup> As defined by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget, released in June 2003 with revisions released in February 2004 and December 2005.

<sup>14</sup> Regional Economic Information System, 1969-2005 version.

airport. We therefore incorporate the maximum of airport HHI on a market in our empirical specification. Also, in order to avoid endogeneity problems, we use the airport HHI in 1990, at a time before our study periods. Fared passenger data are compiled from the DB1A database maintained by the DOT. The database contains 10% sample of all US domestic origin and destination tickets.<sup>15</sup>

- **Maximum airport volume:** From the fared passenger volume data, we compile the passenger volume out of each airport. Low cost carriers such as Southwest Airlines traditionally avoided large airports with congestion. The maximum airport volume of the two airports is thus used in order to control for such effects. Again, in order to avoid endogeneity problems, we use airport volumes in 1990.
- **Hub Market and Double Hub Market:** Those are dummy variables for a city-pair market if at least one airport is the hub of a major Full Service Airline (FSA). If both airports in a route are hubs of some major FSAs, it is defined as a Double Hub Market. Our hub definition follows Brueckner (2002).<sup>16</sup>
- **Vacation:** This is a dummy variable for tourism routes. An airport-pair market is defined as a vocational route if at least one of the airports is located in Florida or Nevada. Such a definition has been used in Dresner et al. (1996) and Windle and Dresner (1999).<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> We purchased the data from Database Product Inc., a reseller of the DOT airline data.

<sup>16</sup> Brueckner (2002) defined following hubs in the U.S. markets: Chicago-O'Hare (American, United), Cleveland (Continental), Newark (Continental), Atlanta (Delta), San Francisco (United), Dallas-Ft. Worth (American), Philadelphia (US Airways), Phoenix (America West), Detroit (Northwest), St. Louis (American), Houston (Continental), Washington-Dulles (United), Minneapolis-St. Paul (Northwest), Cincinnati (Delta), and Miami (American).

<sup>17</sup> Morrison (2001) proposed a similar definition ("Sunbelt airports") for tourism routes. Previous studies have found that the two definitions have essentially the same prediction power.



- **Medium Market and Large Market:** These are dummy variables used to capture possible non-linear effects of market potential on Southwest’s route service decisions. An airport-pair market is classified as “medium” if the yearly fared passenger volume is between 35,000 to 80,000 in year 1990. If there are more than 80,000 yearly fared passengers in 1990, the market is defined as “large”.

Table 4 summarizes these variables and their summary statistics.

<Table 4 about here>

## 5. Results

Estimation results are presented in Table 5. We present the posterior mean and posterior probability of being positive (numbers in parentheses) for each of the coefficients. For example, the posterior mean of medium market size coefficient in the model in 2006 is 0.7533, and the posterior probability of this coefficient being positive is 100%. This suggests that the chance of this coefficient being negative is zero. In another example, the posterior mean of income coefficient in the model in 2006 is -0.0750 and the posterior probability of this coefficient being positive is zero. This suggests that the chance of this coefficient being negative is 100%; Southwest’s profitability decreases when the mean income of the two cities linking the route gets increased.

<Table 5 about here>

The first panel of Table 5 shows the impacts of market factors on Southwest’s network configuration. Some market factors affect the airline’s network choice consistently. First, as expected

from theories, Southwest tends to enter dense markets throughout all the three periods.<sup>18</sup> Second, Southwest tends to enter markets with low average per capita income. This is probably due to the fact that the airline prefers to use secondary airports to serve price sensitive consumers. In general, demand for a normal good increases in income. However, this study only analyzes the case of Southwest which is a low cost carrier providing no-frill services. Different patterns are likely to be observed if our analysis is applied to the case of full service airlines such as American, Delta and United. Finally, Southwest tries to avoid hub airports or airports which are highly concentrated, as indicated by the results of coefficients for airport HHI index and hub dummy.

The effects of some market factors on Southwest's network development evolved over time. For example, the magnitude of the negative impact of airport HHI index on Southwest route service decision kept decreasing and the negative impact of distance on Southwest's route service decision diminished over the years.<sup>19</sup> Consistent observations have been obtained by Zou and Yu (2017), which suggested that Southwest focused on short to medium routes in the early 1990s, but began favoring longer distance routes in the late 1990s and the 2000s. While there may be more than one driving factors for such changes, estimation results on spatial dependence coefficients in our model reveal that network effects embedded in Southwest's network development cause the changes. We examine such effects in details below.

#### *Estimation results on spatial dependence coefficients*

---

<sup>18</sup> Zou and Yu (2017) noted that Southwest was attracted to markets with lower traffic density than industry average prior to 2003, but to markets with higher traffic density than industry average after 2004. Southwest's entry pattern may have been affected by factors no explicitly controlled in our study, such as inter-airline competition. Fu et al. (2006), Oum and Fu (2007) argued that because airlines' service differentiation and significant cost differences, changes in airport charges may also influence the competition between low cost carriers vs. full service airlines.

<sup>19</sup> In the 2006 model (the posterior mean of the distance coefficient is -0.0058 and the posterior probability of the coefficient being positive is 0.19

The second panel of Table 5 presents the results on the spatial dependence coefficients. Among the eight spatial dependence coefficients, type 1 – 3 coefficients are positive in general (except type 1 coefficient in 1995); type 6 and type 8 coefficients are positive in 1995 but became negative along with type 5 and type 7 coefficients in 2006. These results indicate network externalities existed in Southwest's PoP route system and suggest network effects from two sources – airport/regional presence at a focus airport and degree of market substitutability across routes being serviced from a focus city.

Let's first look at estimation results for type 1-3 coefficients, all of which capture spatial dependence in profitability of markets connecting the same airport. The results can be summarized as follows. First, in Southwest's route system, profitability of markets out of the same airport is in general positively dependent. Second, such positive dependence has become stronger and stronger over the years. Third, positive dependence among type 1 and type 2 markets is greater than the one among type 3 markets. These results imply that Southwest enjoys positive network externalities through large scale of operations at focus airports; network externalities are further enhanced when markets out of the same focus airport are imperfect substitutes (type 1 and type 2). These combined effects explain the observed patterns in Southwest's network developments over the years, especially expansions starting from late 1990's: to launch multiple routes out of a new added airport; to increase scale of operations at focus airports substantially; to connect multiple airports in a metropolitan area/region with a focus airport.

The network effects in Southwest's PoP route system captured by type 1-3 coefficients are similar to those achieved through hubbing in HS route systems. Nevertheless, the sources and mechanisms of these network effects are different. As mentioned briefly in the introduction, in a HS

route system an airline's profitability in spoke markets out of the same hub airport is positively related to the airline's scale of operations at the hub because: a) traffic density in spoke markets can be increased through hubbing such that production costs at each of the spoke markets are reduced with economies of traffic density; b) flight frequency on spoke markets can be increased through hubbing such that service quality is improved; c) different spoke markets connecting the same hub airport are complements to each other such that the hub operator can compete more strategically.<sup>20</sup> Aguirrebabiria and Ho (2008) suggests two additional explanations. First, the hub operator's cost serving a spoke market connecting the hub is lower if operator has larger scale of operations at the hub airport. Second, larger scale of operations at the hub can deter competitors' entries into spoke markets more effectively.

The percentages of connecting passengers at Southwest's focus airports are quite low compared to HS network carriers. Therefore, among the explanations on network effects through hubbing, only the two proposed in Aguirrebabiria and Ho (2008) are relevant in explaining the positive dependence in profitability of markets out of the same airport in Southwest's route system. There is another important distinction between Southwest's PoP system and HS systems. In Southwest's PoP system, the positive dependence in profitability of markets out of the same airport is strengthened by *substitutability* of markets, whereas such dependence in HS systems comes partly from the *complementarity* of spoke markets. Serving substitute markets together can be beneficial for Southwest. First of all, like a hub operator, Southwest can affect competition outcomes in one market by strategically adjusting decisions in other markets<sup>21</sup>. Moreover, by serving substitute markets together,

---

<sup>20</sup> Hendricks *et al.* (1997) show that the hub operator partially offset financial loss in one spoke market by adjusting decisions on other spoke markets

<sup>21</sup> Discussions on a firm's incentives and mechanisms to provide substitute products can be found in the literatures of product selection, analysis of multiproduct firms and product line rivalry. A review of these models and their assumptions would be useful, it is nevertheless beyond the goals this study attempts to achieve.

Southwest can deter potential entries into the origin-destination region, or compete with incumbents in the region more effectively. These network effects should be particularly evident for a group of routes which are highly substitutable to each other, such as the type 1 or 2 markets in our analysis which have substantially overlapping catchment areas around endpoint airports. This is the case for routes out of Los Angeles region, where four airports (LAX, SNA, ONT, and BUR) are “local” to each other. As of 1990, American West, another major LCC in the U.S., had significant presence in all four airports and was dominant/major carrier in markets connecting these four airports to Las Vegas and Phoenix. The same strategy of network development has been used by Southwest; the airline started to enter all these markets from 1990’s, gaining market shares from American West in all routes.<sup>22</sup>

Southwest has focus airports which are not in the same metropolitan area yet close to each other. Because of this network strategy we observe a large number of type 2 markets in the carrier’s route system. Such a network design allows the carrier to exploit combined network effects from airport/regional presence and market substitutability. This is not the case for a typical HS system, where much of the network effects come from increased traffic density, market power at hub airports and complementarity among spoke routes. If two hub airports were close to each other, traffic volume would have to be shared among competing markets, leading to reduced traffic density, reduced market

---

<sup>22</sup> Brander and Eaton (1984) studied product line rivalry where firms offer substitute products in the market. They found that “sequential decisions on product type and output can naturally give rise to equilibria in which a single firm monopolizes close substitutes. Such outcomes hold only for a certain levels of demand and might, therefore, be observed only over some portion of the life cycle of the industry”. Studying a sequential game in which two duopoly firms choose to produce substitutable products, they show that it is possible that the two firms segment the market. However, “as growth occurred in the market and the game was repeated, market segmentation would be replaced by market overlapping”. The pattern of (American West) Monopoly – (American West and Southwest) Segmentation during the process of Southwest’s entry – Market overlapping (after Southwest’s entry in all routes) appeared to be consistent with such theoretical results on substitute products.

power at hub airports and higher operation costs. This explains why British Airways failed to run both London-Heathrow airport and Gatwick airport as its hub airports.

Unlike type 1-2 markets, type 3 markets are not substitutes to each other. Southwest's network strategy to launch multiple routes from the same airport creates lots of type 3 markets in its route system. Relationships among these type 3 markets can be similar to those among spoke markets in a HS system if Southwest provides connecting services at focus airports. Southwest does provide connecting services to combine traffic volume, as found by Fu *et al.* (2011). However, the mechanism and extent are very different from HS carriers. To provide extensive connection services at hub airports, HS carriers need to coordinate/schedule flights to arrive and depart at almost the same time. This is complex and demands expensive peak time capacities. Since Southwest mainly uses secondary airports with limited capacity, such a strategy may not even be feasible. Instead, Southwest lets connecting ("through") passengers to stay in the aircraft while local passengers get onboard, in order to maintain a short turn-around time at focus airports. Such an operation allows the carrier to combine traffic in its PoP route system to some extent, without incurring the congestion and operations costs of a HS system. Although connecting services at focus airports explain part of the positive dependence in profitability of type 3 markets, it is unlikely to be the major cause of network effects given the low shares of connecting passengers.

Estimation results on other spatial dependence coefficients confirm the existence of network externalities from regional presence and market substitutability. Table 5 shows that the profitabilities of markets connecting nearby airports to nearby airports (type 6) and of markets connecting nearby airports to unrelated airports (type 8) are both positively dependent in early 1990's. However, in the 2000's, type 5 – 8 spatial dependence coefficients are all negative. Such a change over time suggests

that Southwest has consolidated its route system to combine the two sources of network effects, namely airport/regional presence and substitutability of markets. This is consistent with the pattern illustrated in Table 2, which suggested that Southwest significantly increased the number of routes out of their focus airports. Although one may expect the same signs of Type 3 and Type 5-8 dependence if our analysis is conducted on a network carrier, the mechanisms behind are different. A network carrier prefers to consolidate operations to the same hub airport to exploit the demand complementarity between spoke routes. The increased traffic volume and density also bring cost savings to the network carrier and hub airport, which further encourage the airline to strengthen its HS network, sometimes by working with the hub airports (Brueckner and Spiller 1992, 1994, Zhang 1996, Fu et al. 2010, Yang et al. 2015). On the other hand, increased traffic density and market share at an airport may bring an airline market power and cost saving, regardless it utilizes a HS or PoP network. These benefits could be important factors that explain the signs and changes for Type 5-8 dependence in our estimation. Because cost and competition effects have not been explicitly controlled in our analysis, further studies are needed to clearly identify such possible strategic effects.

## **6. Conclusion**

Clear spatial dependence patterns have been identified for Southwest's network configuration in the U.S. domestic market throughout the sample period. The carrier's network spatial pattern reveals existence of network effects in its PoP route system. Such network effects come from two main sources: (1) airport and regional presence, and (2) substitutability of markets. Over the years, Southwest has re-configured much of its route network in order to fully exploit the combined network effects. With these network effects strengthened, the importance of other factors affecting Southwest's

network configuration decisions such as market size, distance, and market concentration as measured by HHI index, had been diminishing over time.

Airport presence as a source of network effects has been well documented in previous studies on HS networks. Our study suggests that the mechanisms of generating network effects through airport presence are different in PoP and HS networks. In a HS system, airport presence is strengthened by coordinating extensive connection services among a large number of flights at hub airports. This leads to increased traffic volume and flight frequency in spoke markets, and makes spoke markets complement to each other. In a PoP system as operated by Southwest, airport presence is strengthened by (1) combining “through” traffic with local passengers at focus airports. This allows the carrier to achieve limited traffic aggregation without incurring the costs related to running a hub; (2) serving substitute markets out of the same airports. This enhances the carrier’s market power in an origin-destination region, and allows Southwest to configure multiple focus airports close to each other. This hasn’t been possible for HS carriers, since locating two hub airports close to each other would reduce traffic volumes at hubs and spokes markets. To fully exploit the two sources of network effects jointly, i.e., airport / regional presence and market substitutability, Southwest had optimized its network over our sample period.

The US aviation market has led many other countries in terms of deregulation and LCC growth. Findings from our study bring new insights into LCCs’ network development strategy in this market, and suggest possible roadmaps for aviation industry and policy-makers in other countries. For example, despite Spring Air’s fast network expansion and traffic volume growth, the Chinese LCC has been constrained both by route entry regulation and airport capacity shortage in its Shanghai base. Our findings suggest that (a) similar to full service airlines that have strong incentives to strengthen their



hubs, LCCs also benefit from increased presence at their focus airports. Airports and regulators should balance different airlines' needs when designing airport slot allocation policies and route entry control/deregulation. (b) Unlike FSAs that prefer to consolidate their regional operations to their main hub, LCCs have incentive to initiate services in multiple airports in a region. Therefore, although it is difficult for small and medium airports to attract the services from FSAs that already have significant operations in a nearby hub, it is possible to encourage an LCC to initiate new services in a region. For example, it may not be easy for airports near Shanghai (e.g. Ningbo, Hangzhou, Yangzhou) to attract major services from China Eastern. However, these airports may attract significant operations by Spring Air or Juneyao Airlines.<sup>23</sup> (c) If LCCs in emerging markets follow a similar path as Southwest, they are expected to develop national network coverage in the long term, with PoP networks clustered in multiple airports in selected regions. It is possible for nearby cities to work jointly in attracting LCC services, which would otherwise be difficult for the case of FSAs.

Our exploratory study reveals possible network effects in PoP route systems. The findings are helpful in understanding the rapid expansions of low-cost carriers such as Southwest, and outcomes of competition in the U.S. domestic airline market. However, to complement the exploratory findings in this paper, detailed investigation on the specific sources and mechanisms of the network effects would be very valuable. Since airport capacity limit and congestion pricing have been found to influence airline scheduling and competition, controlling these effects may improve our empirical estimation. In addition, it should be useful to explicitly consider spatial structure in the specification of the error term. These are left as possible future extensions to the current study.

---

<sup>23</sup> China Eastern is a leading FSA in China, whereas Spring Air and Juneyao Airlines are leading LCCs. All three airlines are headquartered in Shanghai and have major operations at the Shanghai Hongqiao Airport and Shanghai Pudong Airport.

**Acknowledgement**

Grant supports from the Social Science and Humanities Research Council of Canada, the National Natural Science Foundation of China (71728002), and in the earlier stage to this research the grant support by the Natural Science and Engineering Council of Canada, are gratefully acknowledged.

**Table 1. Summary Statistics for Southwest's Network in Selected Years**

Year	1990	1995	2000	2006
Number of markets served (airport-pair routes)	81	152	295	375
Number of airports served	31	46	56	62
Average number of markets connecting one airport	5	7	11	12
Number of airports with less than or equal to 3 routes	12	14	6	3

**Table 2. Five Most Concentrated Airports for Southwest Airlines in Selected Years**

Year	1990		1995		2000		2006	
Airport Rank	Airport	Route #	Airport	Route #	Airport	Route #	Airport	Route #
1	PHX	16	PHX	23	LAS	35	LAS	50
2	HOU	14	LAS	16	PHX	34	MDW	43
3	DAL	13	STL	15	BNA	27	PHX	41
4	ELP	12	HOU	15	MDW	25	BWI	35
5	ABQ	10	DAL	13	BWI	23	MCO	28

Notes: The airports included in the above table include Las Vegas (LAS), Chicago Midway (MDW), Phoenix (PHX), Baltimore-Washington International (BWI), Orlando (MCO), Nashville (BNA), Houston Hobby (HOU), Dallas Love Field (DAL), St. Louis (STL), El Paso International (ELP), Albuquerque International (ABQ).

**Table 3. Spatial relationship of airport-pair markets**

	<i>Same</i>	<i>Local</i>	<i>Nearby</i>	<i>Unrelated</i>
<i>Same</i>	N.A.	Type 1 (Example: LAX – SFO and LAX – OAK)	Type 2 (Example: LAX – SFO and LAX – SAN)	Type 3 (Example: LAX – SFO and LAX – SEA)
<i>Local</i>	Type 1	Type 4 (Example: LAX – SFO and SNA – OAK)	Type 5 (Example: LAX – SFO and SAN – OAK)	Type 7 (Example: LAX – SFO and SNA – SEA)
<i>Nearby</i>	Type 2	Type 5 (Example: LAX – SFO and SAN – SMF)	Type 6 (Example: LAX – SFO and SAN – SMF)	Type 8 (Example: LAX – SFO and SAN – SEA)
<i>Unrelated</i>	Type 3	Type 7	Type 8	No relationship (Example: LAX – SEA and SFO – BOS )

**Note:** LAX: Los Angeles Airport; SFO: San Francisco Airport; OAK: Oakland Airport; SAN: San Diego Airport; SMF: Sacramento Airport; SEA: Seattle Airport; SNA: Santa Ana Airport (Orange County, California); BOS: Boston Airport

**Table 4. Market factors affecting route service decision**

Variables	Description	Summary Statistics
Medium market size dummy	1 if the number of fared OD passengers in 1990 is greater than 35000 per year but less than or equal to 80000 per year	24%
Large market size dummy	1 if the number of fared OD passengers in 1990 is greater than 80000 per year	26%
Distance in miles	Distance between the two airports of a market	1027 (642)
Population in million	Mean population of the two MSAs or counties in which the two airports are located	3.00 (2.53)
Income in thousand US \$	Mean income per capita of the two MSAs or counties in which the two airports are located	20.64 (21.31)
Maximal airport HHI	The maximum of Herfindahl-Hirschman Index of the two airports in 1990	0.26 (0.01)
Maximal airport volume in million	The maximum of passenger volume of the two airports in 1990	3.2 (1.6)
Hub market dummy	1 if at least one of the two airports is the hub of some major full service airlines	44%
Double hub market dummy	1 if both the two airports are hubs of some major full service airlines	4%
Vacation dummy	1 if at least one of the two airports is located in Florida or Nevada	26%


Note: We report sample means and sample standard deviations (numbers in parentheses) for continuous variables, and fractions of the sample for dummy variables.

**Table 5. Estimation results for Southwest airline (Dependent Variable: Route Service Dummy)**

Variables	1995	2000	2006
Constant	3.6695 (0.99)	3.3202 (1.00)	1.8357 (0.99)
Medium market size dummy	1.0533 (1.00)	0.8613 (1.00)	0.7533 (1.00)
Large market size dummy	2.2311 (1.00)	1.7812 (1.00)	1.6597 (1.00)
Distance (000's miles)	-0.0935 (0.00)	-0.0239 (0.00)	-0.0058 (0.19)
Population (million)	0.0137 (0.66)	-0.0295 (0.11)	-0.0364 (0.41)
Income (000's US \$)	-0.0248 (0.20)	-0.0763 (0.00)	-0.0750 (0.00)
Maximal airport HHI	-11.835 (0.00)	-8.2741 (0.00)	-3.1936 (0.09)
Maximal airport volume (million)	-0.0362 (0.20)	-0.0118 (0.35)	-0.0056 (0.42)
Hub market dummy	-0.1596 (0.07)	-0.2069 (0.01)	-0.1203 (0.06)
Double hub market dummy	0.1988 (0.77)	0.1848 (0.77)	0.1763 (0.78)
Vacation dummy	-0.0237 (0.43)	0.2348 (1.00)	0.2544 (1.00)
<i>Spatial Dependence Coefficients</i>			
Type 1 (same - local)	-0.0071 (0.38)	0.0338 (0.95)	0.0523 (0.98)
Type 2 (same - nearby)	0.0268 (0.98)	0.0493 (1.00)	0.0606 (1.00)
Type 3 (same - unrelated)	0.0053 (1.00)	0.0057 (1.00)	0.0061 (1.00)
Type 4 (local - local)	0.0094 (0.66)	-0.0226 (0.23)	0.0036 (0.56)
Type 5 (local - nearby)	-0.2262 (0.62)	-0.0159 (0.10)	-0.0195 (0.02)
Type 6 (nearby - nearby)	0.0018 (0.99)	-0.0004 (0.28)	-0.0008 (0.04)
Type 7 (local - unrelated)	-0.0059 (0.32)	-0.0116 (0.14)	-0.0113 (0.10)
Type 8 (nearby - unrelated)	0.0013 (1.00)	0.0002 (0.73)	-0.0004 (0.09)

Note: We present posterior means of coefficients, and the numbers in parentheses are  $p(\beta > 0 | Data)$ , that is, the posterior probabilities that the coefficients are positive.

**Figure 1. Enplaned Passenger to Onboard Passenger Ratio for the top 5 focus airports in 2006**



Note: Enplaned passengers refer to passengers who get on (enplane) a flight at an airport. Onboard passengers refer to all passengers in a flight at the airport, which include both enplaned passenger, and “through” passengers who fly to the focus airport, remain in the aircraft and fly to the next destination.

## Appendix. A Bayesian Approach for Estimating the Spatial Probit Model

As in Albert and Chib (1993), we treat latent profits  $\pi_i$  as parameters and then work with an augmented posterior of the form

$$p(B_i, \rho_i, \pi_i | Data) \propto p(B_i, \rho_i) \times \prod_{m=1}^M \left[ \phi(\pi_{im}; x_{im} B_i + z_{im} \rho_i, 1 | \pi_{im} \geq 0) \times \mathbf{I}(y_{im} = 1) + \phi(\pi_{im}; x_{im} B_i + z_{im} \rho_i, 1 | \pi_{im} < 0) \times \mathbf{I}(y_{im} = 0) \right] \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where  $p(B_i, \rho_i)$  is the prior of the parameters.  $\phi(x; a, b | x \geq 0)$  denotes a univariate truncated normal density in which the normal distribution of  $x$  (with the mean of  $a$  and the variance of  $b$ ) is truncated below zero (truncated above zero for  $\phi(x; a, b | x < 0)$ );  $z_{im}$  is a 1 by 8 vector in which the  $j$ th element is  $\sum_{m'} \pi_{im'} \times \mathbf{I}(m' \sim^j m)$ ;  $\mathbf{I}(\cdot)$  represents the indicator function. In estimation, the prior of parameters is chosen as

$$p(B_i, \rho_i) = N(B_i; B_0, V_B) \times N(\rho_i; \rho_0, V_\rho) \quad (\text{A.2})$$

where  $N(B_i; B_0, V_B)$  is the multivariate normal density with the mean vector of  $B_0$  and the variance-covariance matrix of  $V_B$  (similar for  $N(\rho_i; \rho_0, V_\rho)$ ).  $B_0, V_B, \rho_0$ , and  $V_\rho$  are the hyperparameters which are chosen to have a very diffuse prior in estimation.

The posterior density in (A.1) is complicated such that it is not possible for us to derive analytical properties of it. Alternatively, we use the Monte-Carlo simulation to simulate random draws from the posterior and the empirical moments of the random draws will be used to summarize estimation results. Although the joint posterior in (A.1) is not known explicitly, the conditional distributions  $p(\pi_{im} | \{\pi_{im'}\}_{m' \neq m}, B_i, \rho_i, Data)$  for each  $m = 1, \dots, M$ ,  $p(B_i | \rho_i, \pi_i, Data)$ , and  $p(\rho_i | B_i, \pi_i, Data)$  are all standard distributions presented as follows:

1. For each  $m$ ,  $p(\pi_{im} | \{\pi_{im'}\}_{m' \neq m}, B_i, \rho_i, Data) \propto \begin{cases} \phi(\pi_{im}; x_{im} B_i + z_{im} \rho_i, 1 | \pi_{im} \geq 0) & \text{if } y_{im} = 1 \\ \phi(\pi_{im}; x_{im} B_i + z_{im} \rho_i, 1 | \pi_{im} < 0) & \text{if } y_{im} = 0 \end{cases}$

2.  $p(B_i | \rho_i, \pi_i, Data) \propto N(B_i; Dd, D)$ , where  $D = \left( X_i' X_i + V_B^{-1} \right)^{-1}$ ,  $d = \left( X_i' \tilde{\pi}_i + V_B^{-1} B_0 \right)$ , and

$$\tilde{\pi}_i = \pi_i - Z_i \rho_i \text{ with } Z_i = [z_{i1}, z_{i2}, \dots, z_{iM}]'$$



$$3. p(\rho_i | B_i, \pi_i, Data) \propto N(\rho_i; Dd, D), \text{ where } D = \left( Z_i' Z_i + V_\rho^{-1} \right)^{-1}, \text{ } d = \left( Z_i' \tilde{\pi}_i + V_\rho^{-1} \rho_0 \right), \text{ and}$$

$$\tilde{\pi}_i = \pi_i - X_i B_i$$

A Gibbs sampling, which is to generate an instance from these conditional distributions (conditional on the current values of other variables) in turn, is therefore applicable for our purpose. As shown by Gelman et al. (2004), the sequence from the Gibbs sampling comprises a Markov Chain and the stationary distribution of the Markov Chain is just the joint posterior in (A.1).

## References

- Adler, N., Fu X., Oum, T.H., Yu, C., 2014. Air transport liberalization and airport slot allocation: The case of the Northeast Asian transport market, *Transportation Research - Part A*, 62, 3-19.
- AirNeth 2005. Strategies of multi-hub airlines and the implications for national aviation policies, AirNeth Workshop Report, 2005.
- Albert, J. H., Chib, S., 1993. Bayesian analysis of binary and polychotomous response data, *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 88, 669-679.
- Aguirregabiria, V., Ho, C.Y., 2007. "A dynamic oligopoly game of the US airline industry: Estimation and policy experiments. working paper.
- Bhat, C., 2015. A new spatial (social) interaction discrete choice model accommodating for unobserved effects due to endogenous network formation, *Transportation*. 42(5), 879-914.
- Bittlingmayer, G., 1990 Efficiency and entry in a simple airline network. *International Journal of Industrial Organization* 8, 245-57.
- Beron, K. J., Murdoch, J. C., Vijverberg, W. P. M. 2003. Why cooperate? Public goods, economic power, and the Montreal protocol, *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 85(2), 286-297.
- Berry, S., 1992. Estimation of a model of entry in the airline industry. *Econometrica*, 60(4), 889-917.
- Berry, S., Carnall, M., Spiller, P., 1997. Airline hubs: costs, markups and the implications of customer heterogeneity. Working Paper.
- Berechman, J., de Wit, J., 1996. An analysis of the effects of European aviation deregulation on an airline's network structure and choice of a primary West European hub airport. *Journal of Transport Economics and Policy*, 30(3), 251-274.
- Berechman, J. Shy, O., 1998. The structure of airline equilibrium networks . in J.C.J.M. van der Bergh, P. Nijkamp, and P. Rietveld (eds.): *Recent Advances in Spatial Equilibrium Modelling*, Springer, Berlin.
- Borenstein, S., 1989. Hubs and high fares: dominance and market power in the U.S. Airline Industry. *RAND Journal of Economics* 20, 344-365.
- Boguslaski, C., Ito, H., Lee, D., 2004. Entry patterns in the Southwest Airlines route system, *Review of Industrial Organization*, 25, 317-350.
- Brander, J., Eaton, J., 1984. Product line rivalry, *American Economic Review*, 74(3), 323-334.
- Brueckner, J. K., Spiller, P. T., 1991. Competition and mergers in airline networks. *International Journal of Industrial Organization*, 9, 323-342.
- Brueckner, J. K., Dyer, N. J., Spiller, P. T., 1992. Fare determination in airline hub-and- spoke networks. *Rand Journal of Economics*, 23, 309 - 333.
- Brueckner, J. K., Spiller, P. T., 1994 Economies of traffic density in the deregulated airline industry. *Journal of Law and Economics*, 37, 379 - 415.
- Brueckner, J. K., Zhang, Y., 2001. A model of scheduling in airline networks: How a hub-and-spoke system affects flight frequency, fares and welfare. *Journal of Transport Economics and Policy*, 35, 195- 222.
- Brueckner, J.K., 2002. Airport congestion when carriers have market power. *American Economic Review*, 92(5), 1357-1375.
- Brueckner, J.K., 2004. Network structure and airline scheduling *Journal of Industrial Economics*, LII, 291-312.
- Case, A., 1992 Neighborhood influence and technological change. *Regional Science and Urban Economics*, 22(3), 491-508.

- Caves, D. W., Christensen, L. R., Tretheway, M. W., 1984. 'Economies of density versus economies of scale: Why trunk and local service costs differ. *Rand Journal of Economics*, 15, 471 - 489.
- Chung, J. Y., Whang, T., 2011. The impact of low cost carriers on Korean Island tourism. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 19(6), 1335-1340.
- Competition Commission (of the United Kingdom), 2013. Ryanair / Aer Lingus merger inquiry provisional findings report. 30 May 2013.
- Coughlin, C. C., Garrett, T. A., Hernandez-Murillo, R., 2004 Spatial probit and the geographic patterns of state lotteries. Working paper, Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis.
- Dixit, A., Chintagunta, P. K., 2007. Learning and exit behavior of new entrant discount airlines from city-pair markets. *Journal of Marketing*, 71(2), 150-68.
- Dresner, M., Lin, J.S.C., Windle, R., 1996. The impact of low-cost carriers on airport and route competition. *Journal of Transport Economics and Policy*, 30 309–328.
- European Commission, 2017. Case M.8361 – Qatar Airways/Alisarda/Meridiana, Commission decision pursuant to Article 6(1)(b) of Council Regulation No 139/2004 and Article 57 of the Agreement on the European Economic Area, 22 March 2017.
- FAA, (the U.S. Federal Aviation Administration) 1999. Airport business practices and their impact on airline competition. FAA / OST Taskforce study.
- Fageda, X, Suau-Sanchez, P., Mason, K.J., 2015. The evolving low-cost business model: Network implications of fare bundling and connecting flights in Europe. *Journal of Air Transport Management*, 42, 289-296.
- Fu, X., Dresner, M., Oum, T.H., 2011. Effects of transport service differentiation in the U.S. domestic airline market. *Transportation Research – Part E* 47(3), 297-305.
- Fu, X., Homsombat W., Oum, T.H., 2011. Airport-airline vertical relationships, their effects and regulatory policy implications. *Journal of Air Transport Management* 17, 347-353.
- Fu, X., Lei Z., Wang K., Yan, J. 2015a. Low cost carrier competition and route entry in an emerging but regulated aviation market - the Case of China. *Transportation Research - Part A*, 79, 3-16.
- Fu, X., Lijesen M., Oum, T.H., 2006. An analysis of airport pricing and regulation in the presence of competition between full service airlines and low cost carriers. *Journal of Transport Economics and Policy* 40(3), 425–447.
- Fu, X., Oum, T.H., Chen R., Lei, Z., 2015b. Dominant carrier performance and international liberalization – the case of North East Asia. *Transport Policy*, 43, 61–75.
- Fu, X., Oum, T.H. Yan, J., 2014. An analysis of travel demand in Japan’s inter-city market: empirical estimation and policy simulation. *Journal of Transport Economics and Policy*, 48(1), 97–113.
- Fu, X., Oum, T. H., Zhang, A., 2010. Air transport liberalization and its impacts on airline competition and air passenger traffic. *Transportation Journal*, 49(4), 24-41.
- Gelman, A., Carlin, J. B., Stern, H. S., Rubin, D. B., 2004. *Bayesian Data Analysis*, 2nd ed., Chapman & Hall / CRC.
- Goolsbee, A., Syverson, C., 2008. How do incumbents respond to the threat of entry: evidence from the major airlines. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 123(4), 1611-1633.
- Hanaoka, S., Takebayashi, M., Ishikura, T., Saraswati, B., 2014. Low-cost carriers versus full service carriers in ASEAN: The impact of liberalization policy on competition. *Journal of Air Transport Management*, 40, 96-105.
- Hendricks, K., Piccione, M., Tan, G., 1995. The economics of hubs: the case of monopoly. *Review of Economic Studies* 62, 83–99.
- Hendricks, K., Piccione, M., Tan, G., 1997. Entry and exit in hub-spoke networks. *RAND Journal of Economics* 28, 291–303.

- Hendricks, K., Piccione M., Tan, G., 1999. Equilibria in Networks. *Econometrica* 67, 1407-1434.
- Hofer, C., Windle, R., Dresner, M., 2008. Price premiums and low cost carrier competition. *Transportation Research E*, 44(5), 864-882.
- Homsombat, W., Lei, Z., Fu, X., 2014. Competitive effects of the airlines-within-airlines strategy - Pricing and route entry patterns. *Transportation Research - Part E*, 63, 1-16.
- Ishii, J., Jun, S., Van Dender, K. 2009. Air travel choices in multi-airport markets, *Journal of Urban Economics* 65, 216–227.
- Lederer, P. H., Nambimadom, R.S., 1998. Airline network design. *Operations Research*, 46(6), 785 – 804.
- McMillen, D., Soppelsa, M. E., 2015. A conditionally parametric Probit model of microdata land use in Chicago. *Journal of Regional Science*, 55. 391–415.
- Marsh, T. L., Mittelhammer, R. C., Huffaker, R. G., 2000. Probit with spatial correlation by field plot: potato leafroll virus net necrosis in potatoes. *Journal of Agricultural, Biological, and Environmental Statistics*, 5(1), 22-38.
- Mason, K.J., 2001. Marketing low-cost airline services to business travellers. *Journal of Air Transport Management*, 7(2), 103-109.
- McMillan, D. P., 1992. Probit with spatial autocorrelation. *Journal of Regional Science*, 35(3), 335-348.
- Morrison, S., 2001. Actual, adjacent, and potential competition: estimating the full effect of southwest airlines. *Journal of Transport Economics and Policy* 35, 239–256.
- Morrison, S.A., Winston, C., 1986. *The economic effects of airline deregulation*. The Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C.
- Morrison, S., Winston, C., 1987. Empirical implications and tests of the contestability hypotheses. *Journal of Law and Economics* 30, 53-66.
- Morrison, S.A., Winston, C., 1995. *The evolution of the airline industry*. The Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C.
- Morrison, S.A., Winston, C., Maheshri, V., 2006. *Competition and welfare in the U.S. airline industry*. Brookings Institution Working Paper.
- Murdoch, J. C., Sandler, T., Vijverberg, W. P. M., 2003. The participation decision versus the level of participation in an environmental treaty: a spatial probit analysis. *Journal of Public Economics*, 87(2), 337-362.
- O’Connell, J. F., 2008. Guest speaking .to TRS 2008 Conference, “The impact of the new Open Skies’ agreement for traffic between the EU and the US market”.
- Oum, T.H., Fu, X., 2007. Air transport security user charge pricing: An investigation of flat per-passenger charge vs. ad valorem user charge schemes, *Transportation Research - Part E*, 43(3), 283-293.
- Patrick, Z., Romano, P., Pere, S., Paolo, M., Renato, R., 2017. Low-cost carrier entry at small European airports: Low-cost carrier effects on network connectivity and self-transfer potential. *Journal of Transport Geography* 60. 68–79.
- Pels, E., Nijkamp, P., Rietveld, P., 2003. Access to and competition between airports: a case study for the San Francisco Bay area. *Transportation Research Part A* 37, 71–83.
- Sinclair, R., 1995. An empirical model of entry and exit in airline markets. *Review of Industrial Organization*, 10, 541-557.
- Spiller, P. T., 1989. Pricing of hub-and-spoke networks. *Economics Letters*, 30, 165-169.
- Toh, R.S., Higgins, R.G., 1985. The impact of hub and spoke network centralization and route monopoly on domestic airline profitability. *Transportation Journal*, 24(4), 16-27.

- Wang, C.H., Akar, G., Guldmann, J.M., 2014a. Do your neighbors affect your bicycling choice? a spatial probit model for bicycling to the Ohio State University. *Journal of Transport Geography* 42, pp. 122-130.
- Wang, K., Fan, X., Fu, X., Zhou, Y. 2014b. Benchmarking the performance of Chinese airlines: An investigation of productivity, yield, and cost competitiveness. *Journal of Air Transport Management*, 38, 3-14.
- Wang, K., Fu, X., Czerny, A., Hua, G., Lei, Z. 2017. Exploring connectivity in landlocked developing countries: Modeling the Potential for Aviation Liberalization in Central Asia - Market analysis and implications for the One-Belt-One-Road initiative; International Think Tank for Land Locked Developing Countries, Ulaanbaatar, 1-49. Available at <http://land-locked.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/09/2017.0926-XFu-Modelling-the-Potential-for-Aviation-Liberalization.pdf>
- Wang, K., Gong, Q., Fu, X., Fan, X., 2014c. Frequency and aircraft size dynamics in a concentrated growth market: The case of the Chinese domestic market. *Journal of Air Transport Management*, 36, 50–58.
- Wang, K., Tsui, K.W.H., Liang L., Fu, X., 2017. Entry patterns of low-cost carriers in Hong Kong and implications to the regional market. *Journal of Air Transport Management*, 64(B), 101-112.
- Windle, R., Dresner, M., 1999. Competitive responses to low cost carrier entry. *Transportation Research - E* 35, 59 - 75.
- Yang H., Zhang A. and Fu X., 2015. Determinants of airport-airline vertical arrangements: analytical results and empirical evidence, *Journal of Transport Economics and Policy* 49(3), 438–453.
- Yeung, S., Tsang, N. and Lee, Z., 2012. An importance-performance analysis of low cost carriers in Asia. *International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Administration*, 13(3), 173-194.
- Zhang, A., 1996. An analysis of fortress hubs in network-based markets. *Journal of Transport Economics and Policy*, 30, 293-308.
- Zhang, A., Hanaoka, S., Inamura, H., Ishikura, T., 2008. Low-cost carriers in Asia: deregulation, regional liberalisation and secondary airports. *Research in Transport Economics*, 24(1), 36-50.
- Zhang, A., Wei, X., 1993. Competition in airline networks: the case of constant elasticity demands. *Economics Letters*, 42, 253-259.
- Zhang, Y., Wang K., Fu X., 2017. Air transport services in regional Australia – demand pattern, frequency choice and airport entry. *Transportation Research – Part A*, 103, 472-89.
- Zou, L., Yu, C., 2017. The evolving market entry strategy: a comparative study of Southwest and JetBlue, presented at the Air Transport Research Society World Conference, Antwerp, Belgium, July, 2017.