An Investigation of Physical Participation Dissonance and Virtual Activity Participation

Dale Robbennolt

The University of Texas at Austin Department of Civil, Architectural and Environmental Engineering 301 E. Dean Keeton St. Stop C1761, Austin TX 78712, USA Email: dar4836@utexas.edu

Anna Beliveau

The University of Texas at Austin Department of Civil, Architectural and Environmental Engineering 301 E. Dean Keeton St. Stop C1761, Austin TX 78712, USA Email: annabeliveau@utexas.edu

Chandra R. Bhat (corresponding author)

The University of Texas at Austin Department of Civil, Architectural and Environmental Engineering 301 E. Dean Keeton St. Stop C1761, Austin TX 78712, USA Tel: +1-512-471-4535; Email: bhat@mail.utexas.edu

ABSTRACT

Physical out-of-home (OH) activity accessibility has been studied extensively in the transportation sector, but the recent growth in virtual online activities highlights the need to consider the rich interplay between physical and virtual activity participation. In particular, telework and delivery services present opportunities for new modalities of activity access, potentially expanding activity opportunities for those with limited physical accessibility. In this paper, using data from the 2022 National Household Travel Survey, we investigate (a) the intensity (and heterogeneity across individuals in this intensity) of discord between how much individuals would like to partake in physical OH participation and how much they actually are able to (we refer to this discord as physical participation dissonance or PPD), (b) the subjective reasons for PPD (c) the intensity of, and heterogeneity across individuals in virtual participation (measured by the intensity of teleworking and home deliveries), and (d) whether or not virtual participation reduces or increases PPD, and by how much. Our results reveal that individuals from zero-worker households, households with fewer vehicles than drivers, low-income households, renting households, and households residing in rural areas all manifest a higher PPD, as do older individuals, racial minorities, non-drivers, and individuals with medical conditions. We find significant heterogeneity in the reasons for experiencing PPD and in virtual participation. Finally, virtual participation does seem to help reduce PPD for those in households with fewer vehicles than drivers, women, older adults, and individuals with medical conditions, but is not effective in reducing PPD for those in low-income, renting, and rural-residing households, as well as for racial minorities and nondrivers. These findings suggest a growing need to consider the relationship between physical and virtual participation, and provide insights for policymakers and transportation planners to improve overall activity accessibility (including expanding access to virtual opportunities) for disadvantaged populations.

Keywords: Perceived Accessibility, Physical and Virtual Activities, Dissonance, Transportation Equity, Social Exclusion

1. INTRODUCTION

Transportation accessibility plays an important role in an individual's ability to consume goods and services, as well as partake in out-of-home (OH) activities, which then has implications for economic and health-related well-being. For instance, from an <u>economic</u> standpoint, access to employment centers is critical for stable employment and many studies have demonstrated that individuals with higher employment accessibility have improved labor market potential (see Åslund et al., 2010; Hu, 2017). Access to a greater number of jobs can also serve as a proxy for the broader set of activity location attractions that those jobs provide, such as retail sites, restaurants, services, and social/leisure activities (Kapatsila et al., 2023), further contributing to economic well-being through the elevated potential to be involved in productive incomegenerating pursuits. From a <u>health well-being</u> standpoint, the increased ability to consume goods/services, and participate relatively easily (from both a time and cost standpoint) in desired OH activities of interest, can promote a sense of life fulfilment, reduce stress, and engender social inclusion (Sen, 2000; Preston and Rajé, 2007; Currie et al., 2010; Bantis and Haworth, 2020; Luz and Portugal, 2022).

Since the 1950s, transportation accessibility to OH activities has been captured through objective measures, primarily in the form of highway travel time costs of reaching activity locations and the relative attractiveness of those locations (Hansen, 1959). More recently, this has grown into the concept of multi-modal perceived accessibility (MPA), a broader multidimensional concept based not simply on objective measures of reach to OH activities, but expanding to the consideration of the availability/quality of alternative transportation modes and individual perceptions of the transportation system (Miller, 2018; Levine et al., 2019; Handy, 2020; Siddiq and Taylor, 2021). In particular, this broader notion of MPA includes subjective factors that account for an individual's abilities, personal experiences, travel attitudes, and perceptions of travel options (Lättman et al., 2016; van der Vlugt et al., 2019; Tiznado-Aitken et al., 2020; De Vos et al., 2023). Examples include how an individual perceives safety from crashes, safety from crime, and cleanliness of different modal alternatives, based on the individual's own health/disability conditions and personal prior experiences (Martens, 2016; Allen and Farber, 2020). From an equity perspective, it is important that these subjective factors be considered alongside objective measures of accessibility, since they can play a significant role in traveler behavior, travel constraints, and potential social exclusion (Lotfi and Koohsari, 2009; Lättman et al., 2018; Lavieri et al., 2018; Pot et al., 2021).

In recent years, another important activity accessibility factor relates to virtual activity participation. The interplay between physical in-person OH activity participation (for ease, referred to simply as "physical participation" in the rest of this paper) and online virtual participation (for ease, referred to simply as "virtual participation" in the rest of this paper) did receive attention even before the onset of the pandemic (see, for example, Lyons et al., 2008; Lavieri et al., 2018). But this interplay has taken on new significance in the aftermath of the pandemic, because, during the pandemic, virtual participation became the norm for most individuals (see Morris et al., 2023). For many, it also was the first experience of ordering goods, food, and services online. In the after-COVID landscape, with opportunities for physical participation reopening, individuals and households appear to more seamlessly integrate physical and virtual participation. In this context, individuals with low levels of physical accessibility may have increasing opportunities to substitute/supplement physical participation with virtual activities to achieve better overall accessibility (Dias et al., 2020; Asmussen et al., 2023; Shah et al., 2024). However, there are also wide variations in the level of virtual accessibility available to different

people and in different areas.¹ Access to internet-enabled devices, spatial availability of delivery services, and differential availability of telework opportunities, all impact the extent to which virtual activities can be pursued (Lavieri et al., 2018; Etminani-Ghasrodashti and Hamidi, 2020).

Motivated by the discussion above, our focus is on the extent to which virtual activities influence overall accessibility of individuals, and how physical and virtual participation modalities interact with each other. More specifically, we examine four separate dimensions of this interaction: (a) Is there a discord between how much individuals would like to partake in physical activities and how much they are actually able to, and does this discord vary across individuals? (b) What is the reason for the physical participation discord? (c) What is the intensity of virtual participation (measured in this paper by the intensity of teleworking and home deliveries) in the after-COVID era, and how does this virtual participation vary across individuals? (d) Does virtual participation reduce or increase the intensity of discord in physical participation? Based on Festinger's theory of cognitive dissonance (1975), we also characterize the discord in physical participation as "physical participation dissonance" (PPD), which refers to instances where beliefs, desires, and attitudes (in our case about the need/desire to undertake OH activities) do not translate completely to travel behavior (actual participation in OH activities). A key component of Festinger's cognitive dissonance theory is that individuals attempt to relieve dissonance by adapting to their situation. In the transportation arena, there is ample evidence demonstrating that individuals attempt to reduce dissonance through adapting to their travel constraints by, among other things, choosing locations that are readily available (even if not the most desirable) and reducing their travel desires to be more compatible with their mobility constraints (see, for example, Martens, 2016; Dillahunt and Veinot, 2018; Landby, 2019). Virtual participation presents a potential new avenue to reduce PPD. This situation of PPD is depicted in Figure 1. In this case, an individual experiences dissonance because of a lack of access to OH activityopportunity locations but may attempt to reduce the dissonance by substituting/supplementing their physical participation with virtual participation.

In this paper, we use data from the 2022 NextGen National Household Travel Survey (Federal Highway Administration, 2023) to investigate the four dimensions of the interaction between physical and virtual participation modalities, as just discussed. The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 provides an overview of the relevant literature. Section 3 describes the sample used and the modeling methodology. Section 4 presents model estimation results and goodness of fit measures. Section 5 discusses the implications of this research for transportation policy and equity. Finally, Section 6 summarizes important findings and identifies future research directions.

2. LITERATURE OVERVIEW

There is a body of literature on physical accessibility that is relevant to the current study, as this literature reveals a wide range of barriers to physical participation. Section 2.1 provides a broad overview of such studies. In Section 2.2, we focus on the relationship between physical and virtual participation.

¹"Physical accessibility," as referred to in this paper, includes the holistic set of objective and subjective features of the transportation system that facilitate physical participation, while "virtual accessibility" refers to the objective and subjective factors that facilitate virtual participation.

2.1 Physical Participation Accessibility

Although there is a broad range of objective physical accessibility measures, the most commonly used ones are cumulative measures and gravity-based measures (Geurs and van Wee, 2004; Kapatsila et al., 2023). Cumulative accessibility (CA) measures emphasize the number of OH activity location points of interest that can be accessed within a specified threshold of distance or time from a given point in space (Wachs and Kumagai, 1973; Kapatsila et al., 2023). Gravity (GR) measures, in contrast, develop a measure of OH activity reach by normalizing the intensity (attractiveness) of activity opportunities by distance or time, giving higher weights to locations closer to a given point and less to those that are farther away (Siddig and Taylor, 2021; Palacios and El-Geneidy, 2022). While the earliest CA and GR measures were aggregate in nature and did not differentiate based on travel mode alternatives or individual characteristics/experiences, these measures may be easily extended to consider such variations. In particular, the way to represent the number of OH activity locations for CA measures, and the attractiveness of OH activity locations for GR measures, can be varied across individuals based on such attributes as occupation (for instance, only counting jobs of a specific occupation as keyed to an individual's occupation). Alternatively, the thresholds for determining the number of OH points of interest for CA measures, and the separation representation for GR measures, can be varied across individuals based on such factors as modal availability. Some recent examples of these kinds of disaggregate physical participation accessibility measures include Deboosere and El-Geneidy (2018), Grisé et al. (2019), Bezyak et al. (2020), Dixit and Sivakumar (2020), Yousefzadeh Barri et al. (2021), Bills et al. (2022), Guzman et al. (2023), and Klein et al. (2023).

Of course, the ease of reach to OH activities is not only based on objective factors, but also on how these objective factors are perceived (Lättman et al., 2016; De Vos et al., 2023). A wide range of studies have reported the effects of subjective perceptions on transportation outcomes, including trip-making and the use of specific modes. For instance, perceptions of travel time reliability have been shown to have a significant impact on transportation satisfaction and travel intentions (Carrion and Levinson, 2012; Taylor, 2013; Chen et al., 2017). The desire for flexibility also plays an important role in how accessibility is perceived. Some individuals may need the flexibility to go to work or to pick up children at short notice, and so may be unable to use specific modes or travel to certain destinations that limit this flexibility (Haustein and Hunecke, 2007). Similarly, active modes may not be perceived as available at all times because of factors such as weather conditions that can provide less mobility control at any given time (El-Assi et al., 2017). Beyond the perceptions of travel time reliability, flexibility, and mobility control, as discussed above, perceptions of safety are of critical importance, which may vary across individuals based on social norms and expectations. For instance, cyclists and pedestrians are likely to be concerned about crash-related safety (Ng et al., 2017), while public transit users may be more concerned about crime-related safety (Kim et al., 2007). These safety perceptions are also inherently individual specific, both because of differences in objective safety and because of perceived differences related to the personal backgrounds and experiences of individual users (Yavuz and Welch, 2010). For instance, women are more likely to experience harassment on public transit, and may tend to avoid transit, particularly when traveling alone (Currie et al., 2013; Stark and Meschik, 2018). Relatedly, while perceptions of crime may deter some users, excess security and policing may deter others. Thus, as Spieler (2020) puts it, "White riders are likely to see a police officer on a train as a comforting presence, while many Black riders justifiably will perceive them as a potential threat." Finally, perceptions of health and cleanliness can also play a role. The COVID-19 pandemic provides a clear example. Fears of infection in public spaces and perceptions

of cleanliness contributed to significant declines in public transportation, ridesharing, and other shared modes, while the use of individual active modes grew (Dong et al., 2021; Seabra et al., 2021; Javadinasr et al., 2022). While the effects of cleanliness and health may have a much smaller impact outside a global health crisis, studies have shown that they do still impact mode choices and accessibility by public transit and active modes (Suminski et al., 2005; van Lierop and El-Geneidy, 2016).

2.2 Physical and Virtual Activity Participation

The discussion in Section 2.1 focuses on physical accessibility. However, with the rapid growth of communications technologies, there are growing opportunities to pursue activities virtually. This is evident in the large body of recent literature that has explored the ways that virtual activities (particularly telework and delivery services) can (1) substitute or replace existing physical participation, (2) increase physical participation that earlier was not easily pursued, (3) stimulate additional travel due to changes in activity patterns, and (4) redistribute trips for the same purpose to new physical locations (see Kenyon, 2006; Cochran, 2020; Elldér, 2020; Shukla and Raval, 2021; Le et al., 2022; Shao et al., 2022; Khaddar and Rahman Fatmi, 2024; Xu and Saphores, 2024). These virtual participation opportunities offer individuals with low physical accessibility the chance to increase their overall accessibility (Ozbilen et al., 2021; Vinella-Brusher et al., 2022). Those experiencing physical participation dissonance (PPD) may be particularly well suited to benefit from the growth of virtual activities, as they are individuals who desire a greater amount of activity participation than what they perceive as being possible through physical participation (Muhammad et al., 2008; Chen et al., 2024; Pot et al., 2024).

However, while virtual participation may seem to offer significant potential to enhance overall accessibility, it is conceivable that virtual participation actually increases PPD. In particular, given evidence that virtual activities can result in other changes to activity patterns (including stimulating additional trips) and lifestyles, those who adopt online activities may desire greater physical accessibility and experience more PPD (Ding and Lu, 2017; Lee et al., 2017). For instance, individuals who begin teleworking may experience greater PPD associated with OH leisure participation if they feel socially isolated working at home and are unable to compensate with an increase in physical participation to the extent they desire (Budnitz et al., 2020; Thulin et al., 2023). Another issue relates to equity considerations. There is evidence that those with limited physical accessibility may be the same ones who face virtual accessibility challenges. After all, virtual accessibility requires access to technology, knowledge and availability of virtual opportunities to effectively replace specific physical activities, and the self-efficacy (or at least the perception of self-efficacy) to use technology to partake in remote activities (Lavieri et al., 2018; Morrison-Smith and Ruiz, 2020; Chen et al., 2021; Cavallaro and Dianin, 2022). Individuals may also be constrained by the suitability of their physical environment to pursue virtual activities (such as loud home environments, making telework challenging) and the availability of social and technological support (Laumer and Maier, 2021; Leroy et al., 2021; Squire, 2022). Thus, just as with physical accessibility, virtual opportunities and resources are not distributed evenly (Lavieri et al., 2018; Dirks et al., 2022; van Wee, 2022; Pedreira Junior and Pitombo, 2024). Therefore, there is a need for a better understanding of the interplay between physical and virtual activity participation.

2.3 Study in Context

The current study examines the relationship between PPD and virtual participation, contributing to the literature in several ways. First, to our knowledge, the current study is the first to investigate dissonance in the context of trip making and accessibility. The theory of cognitive dissonance has been previously applied in other areas of transportation, such as to mode choice (De Vos, 2018; An et al., 2022), residential location choices (van de Coevering et al., 2018; De Vos and Singleton, 2020), sustainable travel decision making (Higham et al., 2013), and telework decisions (Anderson et al., 2024). However, to our knowledge, this social psychology theory has not been invoked in the context of activity participation. The application of this theory can help identify individuals who are experiencing travel-related challenges in the pursuit of physical participation. Second, we examine the subjective reasons for experiencing PPD, including perceived constraints of the transportation system, individual travel needs, and perceptions of health and safety (we will use the label "PPD reasons" to refer to these subjective reasons for PPD). Doing so provides a window into how different population groups may experience PPD for different reasons. Such insights can suggest appropriate interventions to reduce PPD and facilitate physical participation. As importantly, by modeling reported PPD experience jointly with PPD reasons, we are able to identify potential PPD reasons for any individual in the general population, regardless of whether an individual currently reports PPD or not. Third, we examine the propensity of individuals to participate in virtual activities (telework and online-based home deliveries) and whether (or not) virtual participation has the potential to reduce PPD. In investigating this issue, we control for unobserved factors that may impact both physical and virtual participation. For example, a socially and technologically savvy extrovert (unobserved individual characteristics in the current research) may enjoy partaking in both physical and virtual activities, leading to a higher PPD as well as a higher virtual participation propensity. If such positive correlations are ignored, they could inappropriately depress any "true" PPD-alleviating effect of virtual participation. Finally, we consider a detailed set of exogenous variables (including income, race, age, household composition, location, and vehicle access) to accommodate the heterogeneity (across individuals) in PPD experience, PPD reasons, and virtual participation. These results have implications for equity and transportation policy, informing ways to better integrate physical and virtual systems to address disparities in access.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1. Data Description

The data used for this study are drawn from the 2022 NextGen National Household Travel Survey (NHTS), administered by the US Department of Transportation between January 2022 and January 2023 (Federal Highway Administration, 2023). The 2022 NHTS is the first large-scale U.S. nationwide activity-travel survey to be collected since the onset of the pandemic, providing a unique opportunity to examine new transportation behaviors at a national level. A random sample was collected based on an address-based sampling frame from the US Postal Service. Participants were invited to participate in the survey online, with the option to request a paper survey. Respondents provided household socioeconomic and demographic information, mode use and commute data, and a one-day travel diary. The survey also included special topic questions covering the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic, online work and shopping behaviors, the use of emerging modes, and concerns about transportation equity. Of particular interest here is a question in the transportation equity section asking whether individuals had taken fewer trips in the last 30 days than they had planned, and what the reasons were for suppressing these planned trips.

For the current analysis, we included only adults 18 years of age or over (individuals below the age of 18 years were not asked the equity questions). We further focused on individuals who reported either not suppressing any planned trip in the past 30 days, or reported suppressing a planned trip for one of eight transportation-related reasons that could reasonably be construed as a sign of physical participation dissonance (PPD). This issue is discussed further in the next section. After cleaning and screening, the final sample included 12,469 individuals.

3.1.1 Endogenous Outcome Variables

Descriptive statistics of the endogenous outcome variables are shown in Table 1. The first outcome is a binary response indicating whether the individual took fewer trips than planned in the 30 days prior to taking the survey. Thus, because an individual needed to have some expectation of completing a trip to plan it in the first place, it is reasonable to view this suppression of planned trips as PPD. Of the 12,469 individuals in the sample, 2,553 individuals (20.5%) indicated that they had suppressed at least one planned trip in the 30 days prior to the survey (that is, experienced PPD; see the first row panel of Table 1).

The second set of outcomes consists of a set of eight PPD reasons. These include (with the shorter labels we will use in the rest of the paper in parenthesis):

- 1. Transportation did not feel safe (Not Safe)
- 2. Transportation did not feel clean or healthy (Not Clean)
- 3. Transportation was not reliable (Not Reliable)
- 4. Available transportation did not go where I need to go (Poor Destination Access)
- 5. Unable to afford available forms of transportation (Not Affordable)
- 6. Had health problems and unable to travel (Health Problems)
- 7. Did not have time to travel (No Time)
- 8. Concerns related to COVID-19 (COVID Concerns)

The results for the number of times each of the above PPD reasons was selected are shown in the second row panel of Table 1.² Note that the entries in Table 1 are the percentages selecting one or more of the above eight PPD reasons out of the individuals who experienced PPD. Additionally, these entries do not add up to 100% (across the PPD reasons) because respondents could indicate multiple PPD reasons. The majority of respondents (73.0%) selected only a single PPD reason, while 17.3% selected two reasons and 9.7% selected three or more reasons. As can be observed from Table 1, the most common PPD reasons were "COVID concerns," "health

² The intent of the equity section of the survey was to determine how extensive trip suppression of planned trips was because of transportation accessibility challenges, and whether this varied by population groups, which dovetails nicely with our study of PPD. But, in the survey, in addition to the eight reasons identified above, individuals had the option of providing their response in an additional "other" reason category (for suppressing trips). We attempted to obtain the textual characterizations corresponding to this "other" reason but were informed that it would not be available. Given that this non-descriptive "other" category could be for a variety of reasons not related to PPD, such as "felt tired" or "was ill" or "inclement weather during the past 30 days" or any of many other reasons for suppressing trips, we only included individuals who either did not suppress trips, or, if they suppressed trips, marked at least one of the eight reasons listed above. One more issue here. An additional tenth PPD reason category in the survey was "I had more home deliveries instead of going to trips to stores." While we could have used this as a metric for virtual activity, this PPD reason is available only for those who reported having PPD (and not for the vast number of other individuals who chose this tenth reason exclusively without choosing any of the eight PPD reason (there were anyway very few individuals who chose this tenth reason exclusively without choosing any of the eight PPD reasons considered here). Instead, we used the actual reported number of deliveries as a separate virtual participation outcome, since this information is available for all individuals.

problems," and "no time." The least common reasons were "not safe" and "not clean." The most likely pairing (after controlling for total occurrence of each PPD reason) was "not safe" and "not clean."

The final set of endogenous outcomes are those relating to virtual participation (shown in the bottom row panel of Table 1). Participants indicated the frequency with which they telework and use delivery services (based on online activity), which were elicited in the survey on a four-point ordered-response scale. As far as telework, the telework outcome is only available for employed individuals, so is unavailable for 45.7% of the sample who were unemployed or retired. Most of the employed respondents (56.4% of those employed, and 30.6% of the overall sample) did not telework at all, while sizeable numbers of individuals teleworked at other frequency levels (especially "five or more days of the week"). A little more than a quarter of respondents did not have any deliveries in the 30 days prior to the survey, while the majority had between one and five deliveries (42.1%), and the remainder had six or more.

3.1.2 Exogenous Variables

The Census division of household residence, household demographics, and individual characteristics of respondents in the sample are provided in Table 2, along with data from the 2020 United States Census (U.S. Census Bureau, 2020).³ The sample, in the overall, reflects quite well the geographic distribution of households in the U.S. But it also exhibits an underrepresentation of single adult households (both with and without children) and low-income households, particularly those with incomes less than \$25,000 (as a point of note, a child is defined in this study as an individual 17 years or younger). Conversely, there is a slight overrepresentation of owner households from rural locations. As far as individual characteristics, there is an overrepresentation of older, retired, and highly educated (in terms of formal degree attainment) respondents, and an underrepresentation of non-white and Hispanic respondents.

The skews in the exogenous variables observed in this sample compared with the national statistics imply that the descriptive statistics derived from this sample cannot be generalized to the entire U.S. population. However, since this study undertakes an individual-level analysis, there is no reason to believe that the causal relationships estimated would not apply to the population at large. The NHTS survey comprises a large sample that encompasses the entire nation, and presents substantial variation in the exogenous variables, allowing estimation of the effects of the exogenous variables on the endogenous outcomes of interest. Additionally, since the NHTS is based on a random address-based sample rather than on an endogenous sampling design, an unweighted approach is preferred to a weighted approach because it yields consistent and more efficient estimates (see Wooldridge, 1995; Solon et al., 2015).

3.2 Analytic Framework

The modeling framework consists of a multivariate ordered-response probit (MORP) model with eleven outcomes. The first is the binary PPD decision. The next eight outcomes correspond to

³ The nine U.S. divisions were defined according to the Census groupings. These divisions include the New England (Connecticut, Main, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont), Middle Atlantic (New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania), East North Central (Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Ohio, and Wisconsin), West North Central (Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, and South Dakota), South Atlantic (Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, and West Virginia), East South Central (Alabama, Kentucky, Mississippi, and Tennessee), West South Central (Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Texas), Mountain (Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, New Mexico, Montana, Utah, Nevada, and Wyoming) and Pacific (Alaska, California, Hawaii, Oregon, and Washington).

binary responses for each of the eight possible PPD reasons. Each individual who reported experiencing PPD was able to select any combination of the PPD reasons, so these outcomes are not mutually exclusive and are jointly observed as eight binary responses. Finally, the last two outcomes correspond to the frequency of telework and frequency of deliveries, representing virtual participation outcomes, which are observed as ordered outcomes. The rest of this section describes the mathematical formulation of the MORP model (this is because binary responses can be viewed as ordered responses with two categories). Note that the MORP is presented assuming an individual with PPD. For an individual without PPD, the procedure requires a simple modification in estimation to marginalize over the PPD reasons such that only three outcomes are relevant (corresponding to the PPD outcome and the two virtual participation outcomes).

Let *i* be the index for each of the ordered outcomes (i = 1, 2, ..., I). In the current empirical context I = 11. Let the number of ordered levels for each outcome be K_i such that each outcome is indexed by $(k_i = 1, 2, ..., K_i)$. $K_i = 2$ for the binary outcomes, and $K_i = 4$ for the two virtual participation outcomes. In the following presentation, we suppress the index for individuals. Following the usual framework for ordered response variables, a latent propensity (y_i^*) can be defined for each outcome as a function of covariates that relates to the actual outcomes (y_i) through threshold bounds:

$$y_i^* = \mathbf{\beta}_i' \mathbf{x} + \varepsilon_i, y_i = k_i \text{ if } \theta_i^{k_i - 1} < y_i^* < \theta_i^{k_i}$$

$$\tag{1}$$

where **x** is an $(L \times 1)$ vector of exogenous variables (excluding a constant), $\boldsymbol{\beta}_i$ is a corresponding $(L \times 1)$ vector of coefficients to be estimated (some of whose coefficients can, and in general, will be zero), and ε_i is a standard normal error term assumed to be independent and identically distributed across all individuals. The threshold bounds satisfy the following conditions: $\theta_i^0 = -\infty$, $\theta_i^{K_i} = +\infty$, and $\theta_i^0 < \theta_i^1 < \theta_i^2 ... < \theta_i^{K_i-1} < \theta_i^{K_i}$. Now stack the thresholds to be estimated for each outcome into a vector $\boldsymbol{\theta}_i = (\theta_i^1, \theta_i^2, ..., \theta_i^{K_i-1})'$. Let $\mathbf{y}^* = (y_1^*, y_2^*, ..., y_I^*)'$, $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\theta_1', \theta_2', ..., \theta_I')'$, $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (\boldsymbol{\beta}_1, \boldsymbol{\beta}_2, ..., \boldsymbol{\beta}_L)'$, and $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} = (\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, \varepsilon_3, ..., \varepsilon_I)'$. $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$ is multivariate normal distributed with a mean vector of zeros and a correlation matrix given by:

$$\boldsymbol{\Sigma} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \rho_{12} & \rho_{13} & \cdots & \rho_{1I} \\ \rho_{12} & 1 & \rho_{23} & \cdots & \rho_{2I} \\ \rho_{13} & \rho_{23} & 1 & \cdots & \rho_{3I} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \rho_{1I} & \rho_{2I} & \rho_{3I} & \cdots & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$
(2)

The off-diagonal terms of Σ capture error correlations among the underlying latent propensities of the endogenous outcomes, accommodating the presence of unobserved variables that jointly influence multiple outcomes. If all the correlation terms ρ_{ij} are zero, then this modeling system collapses to a series of independent ordered response models. Now, define a vector $\boldsymbol{\delta}$ that collects

the parameters to be estimated:
$$\delta = \left(\left[\operatorname{Vech}(\beta) \right]', \theta', \left[\operatorname{Vechup}(\Sigma) \right]' \right)$$
, where the operator "Vech(.)"

row-vectorizes all the non-zero elements of the matrix/vector on which it operates, and the operator Vechup(.) row-vectorizes the upper diagonal elements of a matrix.

Let the individual under consideration select level m_i (i = 1, 2, ..., I). Stack the lower thresholds θ_{i,m_i-1} and the upper thresholds θ_{i,m_i} for the individual into $(I \times 1)$ vectors θ_{low} and θ_{high} , respectively. Then, in matrix form, the latent propensities underlying the observed multivariate outcome for the individual should satisfy :

$$\mathbf{y}^* = \boldsymbol{\beta}' \mathbf{x} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} , \ \boldsymbol{\theta}_{low} < \mathbf{y}^* < \boldsymbol{\theta}_{high} , \text{ where } \mathbf{y}^* \sim MVN_I(\boldsymbol{\beta}' \mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}),$$
(3)

where $MVN_I(\beta' \mathbf{x}, \Sigma)$ stands for the multivariate normal distribution with mean $\beta' \mathbf{x}$ and correlation matrix Σ . The individual's likelihood function may be written as:

$$L(\mathbf{\delta}) = \Pr\left[\mathbf{\theta}_{low} < \mathbf{y}^* < \mathbf{\theta}_{high}\right],$$

= $\int_{D_r} f_I(\mathbf{r} \mid \mathbf{\beta}' \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{\Sigma}) d\mathbf{r},$ (4)

where the integration domain $D_r = \{ \mathbf{r} : \mathbf{\theta}_{low} < \mathbf{r} < \mathbf{\theta}_{high} \}$ is simply the multivariate region of the \mathbf{y}^* vector truncated by the upper and lower thresholds. $f_I(\mathbf{r} | \mathbf{\beta}' \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{\Sigma})$ is the MVN density function of dimension *I* with a mean of $\mathbf{\beta}' \mathbf{x}$ and a correlation matrix $\mathbf{\Sigma}$. The log-likelihood function for a sample of *Q* decision-makers is the sum of the individual-level log-likelihood functions. The integral in Equation (4) involves up to a 11-dimensional integral, which is evaluated using recent matrix-based analytic approximation approaches (see Bhat, 2018).

As part of our joint system, and after controlling for unobserved correlation in the Σ matrix, we can also incorporate the direct effects of PPD/PPD reasons on virtual participation and virtual participation on PPD/PPD reasons. However, in joint limited dependent outcome models of the type estimated in the current paper, it is possible only to identify one-way recursive effects (see Bhat, 2015). In our empirical analysis, we tested both directionalities of effects; from PPD/PPD reasons to virtual participation and from virtual participation to PPD/PPD reasons; and selected the one that outperforms the other based on data fit considerations. In our final recursive configuration, both types of virtual participation (telework and deliveries) influenced PPD and PPD reasons (however, note that the PPD/PPD reasons and virtual participation outcomes are jointly modeled as a package because of the correlation in unobserved factors).

4. RESULTS

The final model specification was developed through an iterative process of including exogenous variables in various functional forms/combinations and testing the statistical fit. Categorical variables were initially included in their most disaggregate form and progressively combined based on statistical tests to yield a parsimonious specification. Additionally, in the model estimation process variables were retained or removed based on a t-statistic threshold of 1.65 (corresponding to a 90% confidence level) for the PPD outcome and the two virtual participation outcomes. Due to the smaller number of participants with responses for the PPD reasons, a lower t-statistic threshold of 1.28 (corresponding to an 80% confidence level) was used. We must also note here that very few coefficients turned up to be significant at the 80% level, but not at the 90% level; removing such coefficients had literally no effect on the other model parameter estimates or model

fit; so, we retained them in case they may be useful in future studies with larger sample sizes to explain the PPD reasons).

The model results are shown in Table 3 (a "--" entry in these tables indicates that the row exogenous variable does not have any statistically significant impact on the column outcome variable). The first row panel of threshold values in Table 3 do not have any substantive interpretations and serve the sole (but important) purpose of translating the underlying latent propensities into actual observed ordinal values. The effects of the exogenous variables correspond to their impact on the underlying propensities of each endogenous outcome (these are the β matrix elements). For the binary PPD and PPD reasons, these effects also immediately carry over to the binary outcome probability effects. The parameters corresponding to "Census Division of Household Residence" (second row panel of Table 3) accommodate for overall geographic variations in the endogenous outcomes. As such, they are difficult to interpret, though they suggest an overall higher PPD (lower satisfaction with accessing OH activities) among households residing in the New England and Pacific Census divisions. The effects of other exogenous variables are discussed below. Also to be noted is that the effects of exogenous variables on PPD in Table 3 refers to the direct effects after accommodating the indirect effects through the endogenous telework/deliveries effects on PPD (we discuss this issue more in Section 5).

4.1 PPD Outcome

The results for the PPD outcome are shown in the first numeric column of Table 3, followed in the next immediate eight columns by the PPD reasons. The discussion below should be interpreted as general (average) tendencies; deviations from these general tendencies will always be present. Single adults have a higher PPD relative to households with 2+ adults, attributable to poorer destination access, though single adults also appear to be less COVID-concerned. The latter result presumably reflects potential contagion concerns in multi-adult households. There is no PPD disparity based on presence of children, though individuals in households with children are generally more concerned with affordability of physical travel, and much less with reliability or the ability to reach specific destinations of interest. This result is intuitive, as individuals with children face particular economic challenges, though they are generally less deterred by activityreach problems in their quest to facilitate OH activity participation of their children (see Lee et al., 2007; Mackett, 2013). Individuals from worker-households (households in which at least one individual works) do not show any differences from those in zero-worker households in terms of PPD, but those from two or three-worker households are more likely to cite poor reliability and poor destination access of the transportation system as PPD reasons, potentially due to the narrower space-time windows to pursue joint OH activities outside of the work schedules of the multiple workers (Gliebe and Koppelman, 2005; Neutens et al., 2012).

As expected, vehicle-constrained households (those with fewer vehicles than drivers) experience higher PPD relative to other households (that is households with equal or more vehicles than drivers) (see Blumenberg et al., 2020). Vehicle-constrained households tend to suppress trips due to concerns of safety, destination access, and COVID contagion, reflecting the unease commonly associated with shared modes such as public transportation. Similarly, PPD is much more common among individuals in lower income households relative to individuals in higher income households, particularly due to concerns of reliability, destination access, and affordability. These results are aligned with a large body of existing literature showing that low-income households have less access to affordable and reliable transportation (Lovejoy and Handy, 2008; Makarewicz et al., 2020; Tiznado-Aitken et al., 2022). Higher-income households, however, are

more likely to suppress trips due to health problems; however, these income effects on "health problems" are statistically significant at only the 85% significance level.

Compared with homeowners, renters exhibit a higher PPD tendency (more likely to suppress planned trips), largely due to concerns of safety, reliability, destination access, and affordability. This is consistent with findings suggesting that renters, particularly lower-income renters, have challenges finding affordable housing in areas that also have high levels of accessible and affordable transportation (see Makarewicz et al., 2020). Renters seem less concerned about time considerations relative to homeowners, though this effect is statistically significant at only the 81% level). Those living in rural locations also exhibit higher PPD relative to those residing in urban areas, primarily due to lack of affordability, which is not an unsurprising result given the longer trip distances in low-density areas (McGrail et al., 2015). In urban areas, individuals suppress trips (even though not at the same intensity as rural residents) due to concerns of safety, cleanliness, and health, most possibly because of the higher population densities, and the higher shares of travel by public transit and active modes (essentially, tight spaces and high occupancy travel compared to rural areas).

As far as individual level characteristics, women experience more PPD than do men, particularly due to health problems and COVID concerns. The COVID concern is consistent with findings suggesting that women tend to be more health-conscious (Yıldırım et al., 2021; Feraco et al., 2024; Maslakçı and Sürücü, 2024). Men, in contrast, seem to be more concerned with affordability relative to women, perhaps a reflection of the fact that women generally face more economic disadvantage and have less control over household finances; so they may adapt more to the conditions surrounding their physical participation, including greater use of shared and less expensive modes (Kunieda and Gauthier, 2007; Priya Uteng and Turner, 2019). On the other hand, men, who have more financial control, may perceive greater lack of affordability because of higher expectations of what they believe the transportation system should provide to accommodate their more expensive travel "needs," including the use of private vehicles for much of their travel. Older individuals also tend to experience more PPD, due in large part to health problems and concerns about COVID. This may be explained by their increasing physical frailty and their higher likelihood of actually contracting contagious illnesses (Roe et al., 2021). Reliability and timerelated considerations are less of an issue for older adults, particularly individuals 55+ years of age.

While those employed are no different than those retired or unemployed in terms of experiencing PPD, employed individuals are more likely to identify "no time" as a reason for PPD, presumably due to space-time constraints from work schedules. Retired individuals, not surprisingly, are less concerned about reliability, though report experiencing PPD due to "health problems," likely due to physical mobility constraints limiting their travel alternatives (Dabelko-Schoeny et al., 2021; Zhou et al., 2022). In terms of race effects, individuals identifying as non-white report more PPD than those identifying as white, attributing the PPD to transportation unreliability, poor destination access, and COVID concerns. These results align with the existing literature showing that minority racial groups, particularly Black Americans, face significantly more economic and temporal constraints, live in areas with less developed transportation infrastructure, are more likely to use public transportation, and have increased safety concerns largely related to discrimination and policing (Agyeman and Doran, 2021; Barajas, 2021; Haddad et al., 2023). As far as educational attainment, those with higher levels of formal education are predisposed more to PPD, largely due to transportation systems being "not clean," having "no time," and being COVID contagion concerned. These PPD reasons reflect broad trends of greater

health concern and more time constraints among highly educated population groups (Jacobs and Burch, 2021).

Finally, individuals without a driver's license, and those who have medical conditions that hinder their travel, experience more PPD, reflecting the burdens of the travel constraints these groups face. Respondents without a driver's license are less likely to attribute PPD to health factors, instead citing time constraints. These individuals are more reliant on rides from others, active modes, and public transportation, all of which are typically more time consuming (than driving) (Haustein and Siren, 2014). The reverse holds for respondents with medical conditions, who appear to experience PPD less due to time constraints, but more to health problems.

4.2 Virtual Accessibility

While the results in the previous section focused on PPD, the final set of results (presented in the last two columns of Table 3) center on virtual participation, including the propensity to telework and use delivery services. Individuals in households with two or more adults (relative to sole-adult individuals) and those with children in the household (relative to those without children) have a lower propensity to telework, perhaps due to the greater number of household distractions among larger families (Pabilonia and Vernon, 2022). Those with children in the home also appear to have a higher tendency to have deliveries (possibly a mechanism to reduce time spent on OH shopping; Spurlock et al., 2020), while those with a large number of workers are inclined to have fewer deliveries (possibly because these workers tend to combine OH shopping activities with the commutes of one or more workers; Dirks et al., 2022). Other effects of household characteristics are as follows: (a) Individuals in vehicle-constrained households have a higher predilection to be teleworkers, but also a lower inclination for package deliveries, (b) As household income increases or when living in urban areas (rather than non-urban areas), the propensity of teleworking and receiving deliveries both increase. These results have been found in many recent studies (see, for example, Fabusuyi et al., 2020; Kaplan et al., 2023; Asmussen et al., 2024). For example, the urban effect may be attributed to broader internet access, greater suitability of jobs for telework, and more delivery services with lower costs in urban areas.

As far as individual characteristics, women utilize delivery services more than men, perhaps representing women's higher level of time consciousness and responsibilities for home maintenance activities (Young et al., 2022). Younger individuals are less predisposed to telework (presumably reflecting greater preferences for sociability and opportunities for advancement in physical offices; Tagliaro and Migliore, 2021), while older individuals have a lower propensity to use delivery services (potentially reflecting less technology-savviness and greater concerns that delivery services will fulfill their needs; see Erjavec and Manfreda, 2022). Similarly, retired individuals, unemployed individuals, and those identifying as non-white have a lower generic tendency for deliveries. The latter result may be associated with inequities in delivery service provision, wherein delivery providers, driven by profit maximization associated with the amount of consumption of consumer goods, locate themselves to serve geographic areas with white majority populations (Saphores and Xu, 2021; Hicks et al., 2022).

Individuals with higher levels of formal education attainment show a higher predilection for telework and use of delivery services. This result is intuitive given that jobs most suitable for telework are associated with higher educational attainment (López-Igual and Rodríguez-Modroño, 2020; Nguyen, 2021). Marketing of delivery services also tends to be oriented towards concerns that resonate more with well-educated population groups, including convenience for students and young professionals, diverse food options aligning with the preferences of those with more exposure to diverse cuisines, and health and wellness efforts appealing to those who are more nutrition and wellness aware (Shah et al., 2021; Zhong et al., 2022; Keeble et al., 2022). Finally, those with a medical condition tend to have higher propensities for telework and deliveries, suggesting that virtual participation may be helping alleviate OH accessibility challenges.

4.3 Endogenous Effects and Correlations

Higher levels (relative to lower levels) of telework and deliveries lead to statistically significant reduction in PPD, as we hypothesized earlier. This overall PPD reduction is explained to a large extent by a reduction in "poor destination access" and "no time" perceptions. Thus, virtual participation opportunities do appear to have the beneficial effect of elevating overall (physical and virtual) accessibility.

The estimated correlation parameters and their t-statistics are shown at the bottom of Table 3. Sixteen correlation terms are significant at the 80% confidence level or above and are retained in the model. These significant correlation terms indicate the presence of unobserved effects that jointly impact several of the endogenous outcomes. Importantly, the PPD reasons are only observable if a person reports PPD. To generalize the perceived physical participation barriers due to the transportation system (which is what the PPD reasons represent) to all individuals, the resulting sample selection in the observed data needs to be accounted for. In our estimations, though, these correlations did not turn out to be statistically significant. However, there is substantial correlation across the PPD reasons, with positive correlations among the PPD reasons of (a) "not safe," "not clean," "not reliable," and "poor destination access" and (b) "not affordable," "not "reliable," and "poor destination access." These positive correlations suggest that intrinsic (unobserved) individual factors as well as unobserved location factors may lead to a common set of transportation barriers. Additionally, positive correlations between the PPD reasons of "COVID concerns" with "not safe" and "not clean" suggest the "not safe" and "not clean" perceptions may decline as pandemic effects subside. The correlations between "health problems" and "safety," and "COVID concerns" and "no time," are rather weak and barely significant at the 80% confidence level.

In addition to the correlations among the PPD reasons, a positive correlation between COVID concerns and telework is unsurprising, indicating that those with more intrinsic pandemic concern have a higher propensity to telework. Similarly, a positive correlation between the use of telework and delivery services indicates that unobserved factors, such as technological savviness or access to technology, impact the use of both virtual services. Finally, both virtual activities are positively correlated with PPD. Notably, these correlations between PPD and virtual participation outcomes take the opposite sign of the endogenous effects discussed in the previous section, indicating that, if these correlations were ignored, the impact of virtual participation to reduce PPD and enhance overall accessibility.

4.4 Model Fit

Although the statistically significant correlations mentioned in the previous section already motivate the use of a joint modeling approach, we compare the proposed joint model to an independent ordered probit model to assess the overall model fit. The independent model assumes that the errors among the endogenous outcomes are all independent, maintaining a correlation structure with zeros for all off-diagonal terms in Equation (2). A series of disaggregate and aggregate statistics are shown in Table 4 to compare the joint and independent models. First,

comparing the disaggregate measures, the log-likelihood at convergence and adjusted likelihood ratio index for the full model are both larger than that of the independent model, while the Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC) statistic shows a lower value for the joint model relative to the independent model. Since the independent model is a nested form of the full model, the two can be compared with a formal likelihood ratio test. The likelihood ratio test statistic is 246.14, which is much higher than the chi-squared value with 16 degrees of freedom at any reasonable level of significance, indicating a statistically significant superior fit for the proposed model. Finally, the models can be intuitively compared based on the average probability of correct predication, which is computed using the multivariate predictions for all available outcomes for each individual (note that the average probability of correct prediction is low for both models due to the large number of possible combinations for the complete outcome set, amounting to 4096 possible combinations for those reporting PPD and 16 possible combinations for those not reporting PPD.

The models can also be compared based on aggregate fit. To do so, the share of individuals selecting each combination of outcomes is compared with the predicted shares based on each model. Since the total number of outcome combinations for the full set of 11 dimensions is very large, we limit this aggregate comparison to the PPD dimension and the two virtual accessibility dimensions, resulting in 40 possible combinations (including combinations that do not include the telework dimension for non-workers). For each combination of these three outcomes, the absolute percent error (APE) between the predicted share and the observed share in the dataset is computed for each model. Then, the weighted average percent error (WAPE) is computed by weighing these APEs by the observed shares. The weighted average percent error is smaller for the proposed model (7.16) than the independent model (8.82). Overall, based on a variety of data fit metrics at both the disaggregate and aggregate data fit measures, our joint model outperforms the independent model.

5. IMPLICATIONS

5.1 ATE Computations

The model results presented in the previous section provide important insights into the underlying propensities associated with PPD, PPD reasons, and virtual participation. But, as such, they do not provide the magnitude of effect on the actual binary PPD and PPD reasons, and the ordinal virtual participation outcomes. This is especially so for the PPD outcome because the exogenous variable effects in Table 3 represent direct effects not overall effects that include indirect effects through the virtual participation outcomes. For this, we use Average Treatment Effects (ATEs), which represent the impact of a change of state of an antecedent variable on the endogenous outcomes of interest. While we can compute such effects for each of the eleven dimensions in our analysis, here we focus on exogenous variable effects on the PPD outcome and the two virtual participation outcomes. We begin by computing, for each individual, the tri-variate probability predictions for each of the 32 combination outcomes of the PPD, telework, and deliveries outcomes (total possible combinations= $2 \times 4 \times 4 = 32$, including counterfactual outcomes) for the base level of an exogenous variable. Then, by marginalizing over the combinations, we can obtain the probability of "yes" and "no" for the PPD outcome for each individual. For the telework frequency and delivery frequency outcomes, we obtain the probabilities for each ordinal level and compute an expected value by assigning the mid-point frequency value of each level (so, we assume 1-2 days per week represents 1.5 days a week and so on for telework, and assume 1-5 deliveries in the last 30 days corresponds to 2.5 deliveries in the last 30 days and so on for deliveries). The share of individuals with "yes" and "no" for the PPD dimensions can be computed as the average probability of each

of the two PPD categories across all individuals, and the average teleworking days and monthly deliveries can be computed similarly by averaging the expected value across individuals. The same procedure is adopted for the <u>treatment level</u> of the exogenous variable. For example, consider the treatment effect of presence of children. We set all individuals in the dataset to "no presence of children" and compute the share (in percentage terms) of "yes" for PPD, as just discussed. Then, all individuals are assigned to the treatment level of "presence of children," and we get the share again (in percentage terms) of "yes" for PPD. The change in the "yes" shares (in percentage terms) provides the magnitude and direction of the total ATE of the "presence of children" variable on PPD. The ATE effect for the telework and deliveries dimensions are computed as the difference in the average teleworking days and monthly deliveries between the base and treatment levels. For the sake of presentation simplicity, for exogenous variables with more than two levels (such as income), we compute the ATEs for a change between only the highest and lowest levels.

An additional issue here is that there are endogenous outcome effects of telework and deliveries on PPD. This implies that the total ATE effect of an exogenous variable is a combination of mediating effects through the telework/deliveries outcomes (indirect effects) as well as a direct effect of the variable on PPD. To distinguish between the two types of effects, we compute the direct effect of an exogenous variable on PPD by maintaining the values of all other exogenous variables (as well as the telework/deliveries endogenous outcomes affecting PPD) as they are in the data. The treatment effect corresponding to this computation is the direct ATE effect of the exogenous variable. By subtracting the direct effect from the total ATE, we obtain the indirect effect. As an example, the effect of presence of children on PPD, based on the estimation results from Table 3, is purely an indirect effect through telework and deliveries (note that "presence of children" has no direct effect on PPD). The presence of children has a negative effect on telework propensity, but a positive effect on the propensity of having deliveries. Both telework propensity and propensity of deliveries have a negative PPD effect, which implies that individuals with children in the household will have an indirect positive effect on PPD (through telework) and an indirect negative effect on PPD (through deliveries). The total ATE effect will be the net combination of the two effects.

The final ATE effects (including direct and indirect effects on PPD) are shown in Table 5. We order the endogenous outcomes differently from that in Table 3 because the causal pathway starts from telework and deliveries, and both these affect PPD. Also, for easy interpretation, we take the treatment level as the one that leads to a higher overall PPD relative to the base level (so the base level in Table 5 may be different from the base level in Table 3). The exogenous variable effects on weekly teleworking days and monthly deliveries are straightforward and represent direct effects (that also represent total effects). For example, the entry of "-1.01" under the "Telework ATE" column for "Income" indicates that individuals in households with low income (<50K annually), on average, telework about one fewer day per week than individuals from households with high income (>200K annually). The entry of "-1.53" in the "Monthly Deliveries ATE" column for "Income" indicates that individuals in low-income households, on average, have 1.53 fewer monthly deliveries than individuals in high-income households. The PPD column has four sub-columns. The entry of "13.27" in the last sub-column for income indicates that, in a pool of 100 individuals from low-income households, one may expect about 13 more individuals to experience PPD relative to in a pool of 100 individuals from high-income households. The three immediate sub-columns to the left of the "Total ATE" column provide the percentage splits of the total effect as originating from an indirect telework effect, from an indirect deliveries effect, and from a direct effect. Thus, for income, the increased PPD among individuals from low-income

households may be attributed to an 11% effect through the reduced ability to telework, a 6% effect through the reduced ability to order deliveries, and an 83% direct PPD effect. The sign associated with each contribution illustrates whether the corresponding effect increases the total PPD ATE (+) or decreases the total PPD ATE (-). For example, the total PPD ATE for "presence of children" may be attributable to an increase in PPD due to the reduced ability to telework (contributing 75% to the total PPD) and a decrease in PPD due to increase delivery services (contributing 25% to the total PPD). There is no direct effect on PPD based on the presence of children. Note also that the relative magnitudes of the indirect and direct effects are computed to total 100%. All other entries in Table 5 may be similarly interpreted.

Toward the bottom of the table, we also compute the ATE effects of telework and deliveries on PPD. These endogenous ATE effects on PPD add value to policy development and insights. For these effects, we consider a change from the base level of "5+ days per week" to the treatment level of "0 days per week" (for telework) and from the base level of "more than 10 deliveries in the past 30 days" to "0 deliveries in the past 30 days" (for deliveries). The corresponding ATEs indicate the substantial PPD-alleviating impacts of virtual participation.

In the rest of this section, we discuss the implications of our results based on the ATE results from Table 5, combined with the PPD reason results in Table 3. The focus of our discussions will be on the indirect and direct ATE effects on the PPD outcome, though we invoke other results from Table 3 and Table 5 as appropriate in our discussions.

5.2 Who is Teleworking and Who Receives Home Deliveries?

Our results provide insights based on demographic variations in telework and home delivery preferences; telework frequency is higher for single adults without children, individuals from vehicle-constrained households and high-income households in urban areas, older adults, those with more formal education, and individuals with medical conditions. These findings have important implications for cities, developers, and urban planners as they design developments appropriate for telework and consider the impacts of changing commuting patterns. Strategies such as providing local community workspaces in residential areas could be beneficial to promote telework among those who do not have suitable spaces at home and provide mechanisms to help teleworkers maintain social connections while working remotely (Ciccarelli and Mariotti, 2024). At the same time, the low telework among individuals with children, along with the higher overall PPD among individuals with children, reveals a need to promote telework opportunities for this population group, which already faces a high level of mobility-related social exclusion due to time poverty and work-family conflict issues (see Bernardo et al., 2015). Work-friendly telework and flexible work policies directed toward parents, as well as establishing third workplace facilities in communities with a sizeable share of households with children, may be beneficial in addressing PPD among parents.

The results in Table 3 also have implications for employers as they rethink telework policies to align with their own needs and the preferences of their employees. For instance, telework seems to have been particularly helpful at reducing PPD (and particularly the adverse effects of COVID-19, as per the results of PPD reason in Table 3) for older adults, allowing them to retain spatial separation while working. Telework opportunities allow older adults to continue to participate in the workforce for longer, enabling them to be engaged in productive income-generating activities. Doing so has been tied to feelings of less social exclusion, especially in the post-COVID era, while also providing a sense of self-empowerment and continued self-efficacy among older adults (Sheng et al., 2022; Nagarajan and Sixsmith, 2023; Yuan and Wang, 2023).

Thus, it is important for employers to consider retaining telework opportunities for aging employees, provide training in the use of online services, and communicate these options to their workforce.

The frequency of home deliveries is higher among individuals in households with children, without workers, with more vehicles and high incomes, and living in urban areas, as also among women, younger employed individuals, white individuals, those with more formal education, and individuals with medical conditions. These variations in delivery frequency have implications for businesses and service providers, who can tailor their services and marketing to specific population segments. For instance, younger individuals who value the flexibility afforded by delivery services may prefer more rapid service times (such as same day or 2-hour deliveries) and may make smaller but more frequent purchases. Beyond providing customized services to specific population groups, from a broader societal standpoint, the results highlight inequities in delivery services, underscoring a need to better serve low-income and minority population groups (virtual participation inequities are further discussed in Section 5.4). The results also highlight the importance of accommodating the impacts of delivery services in travel demand models; the growth in delivery services may lead to reductions in personal travel for maintenance activities that then increase other OH activity participation over potentially a more expansive spatial area, as well as an increased number of delivery trips serving these orders (see Dias et al., 2020; Titiloye et al., 2024; Xu and Saphores, 2024). In this context, a better integration between individual-level travel demand models and commercial vehicle movement is needed. Relatedly, there is an increasing need to collect detailed information in activity-travel surveys on home-based deliveries.

5.3 How has Virtual Participation Reduced PPD?

The endogenous ATE effects (of both telework and deliveries) on PPD, shown at the bottom of Table 5, indicate that virtual activities can serve to alleviate PPD. In particular, virtual participation has the effect of reducing PPD for individuals from households with fewer vehicles than drivers, women, older adults, those with more formal educational attainment, and individuals with medical conditions. For women (particularly those with children), the PPD reduction through virtual participation is through increased home deliveries, which is not surprising given the continued disproportionate household maintenance activity responsibility of women (Wang and Cheng, 2024). Online shopping can save time, allowing women to allocate more time to other activities, such as education, career advancement, or leisure, potentially leading to a more balanced lifestyle (of course, we do not mean this at the necessary exclusion of more general society-wide efforts to reduce the gender identity-based asymmetry in household responsibilities). In addition to releasing time pressures, online shopping can enable women, especially those with limited mobility and in male-dominated societies, to make purchases independently, fostering financial autonomy (Roper and Alkhalifah, 2020; Liu et al., 2023). Therefore, continuing to promote delivery services for basic household products and expanding the reach of food and grocery delivery services (including through strategies mentioned in the previous section) should help promote gender equity.

Individuals with medical conditions that make travel difficult also appear to be able to leverage virtual participation (both in the form of telework and delivery services) to alleviate dissonance (reducing overall PPD by about 8%). However, after accounting for the benefits of virtual participation, PPD is still 15.79% higher among those with a medical condition (compared to those without). Thus, there is still substantial potential to expand virtual participation access for this population group. This can include ensuring that delivery personnel leave packages in designated and easy to reach drop-off locations (Lee et al., 2020), and designing apps and websites

that embed screen readers, voice commands, and large font sizes, especially for those with visual impairments (see Kaufman-Scarborough and Childers, 2009; Leporini et al., 2023). Finally, building inclusive user-centered virtual participation systems that involve individuals with medical conditions in the design process from the get-go will help increase virtual participation and further alleviate PPD in this population group.

5.4 For Whom Has Virtual Participation Not Reduced PPD?

While virtual participation has alleviated PPD for some groups, this has not been universal. In terms of geographic variation, it is evident that individuals in rural areas have lower levels of virtual participation, contributing further to the already existing physical accessibility gap between those living in urban and rural areas. This virtual participation disparity is a result of several interrelated factors associated with urban areas, including (a) the higher concentration of teleworkconducive knowledge-based jobs, (b) higher quality of internet and telecommunications infrastructure, (c) greater demand for flexible work arrangements to alleviate peak-hour traffic congestion, and (d) higher density of delivery services and concentration of consumers (Dannenberg et al., 2020; López-Igual and Rodríguez-Modroño, 2020; Asmussen et al., 2023). Expanding high-speed internet access, including through traditional broadband services as well as cellular and satellite networks, and providing greater access to technological resources and public working spaces will help the growth of virtual participation in rural areas. In terms of home deliveries, there is a growing need to ensure that rural areas are provided with adequate coverage and service quality, and at affordable prices (note from Table 3 that "not affordable" is a common PPD reason in rural areas). This includes maintaining local and regional delivery hubs that serve as locations to collect and dispatch deliveries to rural areas. In addition, collaboration with local businesses (in a community-centered approach that is customizable to the needs of local residents) is especially important in lower-density areas; local businesses can serve as pick-up and drop-off points for deliveries, can assist in last-mile delivery, and can provide reliable and cost-effective service fulfillment by minimizing shipping distances and costs (Sousa et al., 2020; Wu et al., 2022).

In addition to geographic disparities, demographic disparities in virtual participation exist based on income and race; virtual participation is less common among individuals from lowincome households and racial minorities, population groups that already face high PPD. Telework promotion strategies among these population segments can include diverse hiring initiatives and financial assistance to cover upfront telework-related expenses such as internet bills, utility costs, and office supplies. For deliveries, hubs located near underserved communities to increase reliability and reduce costs, as well as the provision of access to a full range of products through online ordering platforms, can be beneficial. In contrast, today, many food and grocery delivery platforms customize their delivery options (in both the variety of the product line and the time/cost of delivery) based on profit-maximizing margins, essentially exacerbating existing disparities in physical accessibility. Equity considerations need to be brought to the fore, through government incentives for businesses in underserved markets and the creation of shared delivery hubs to improve the affordability of delivery services (see Haider et al., 2022; Buettner et al., 2023).

5.5 How Can Physical Infrastructure Improvement Reduce PPD?

While virtual participation can play an important role in reducing PPD, it is (as of yet) not doing much for those in low-income, renting, and rural-residing households, as well as for racial minorities and non-drivers. Many of these population groups cite "not reliable" and "poor destination access" as PPD reasons (see Table 3), which underscores the need not to lose sight of

more traditional physical infrastructure improvements to alleviate PPD. Some specific strategies include expanding access to public transportation by (a) designing routes that connect low-income residential areas to key points of interest (including employment centers, educational institutions, healthcare facilities, grocery stores, and recreational facilities), (b) improving last-mile connectivity both through the use of bike-sharing and scooter programs and good provision of sidewalks/bike lanes, and (c) provision of reliable public transportation services by establishing dedicated bus lanes, increasing frequency during peak hours, and implementing real-time tracking systems so that users can efficiently navigate schedules and delays (see, for example, Al-Hawari et al., 2020; Beale et al., 2023). Affordability is another common concern for rural-residing residents as well as renters and low-income individuals. Providing discounted or free public transportation ridership, partnering with ride-sharing companies to offer subsidized rides, and implementing income-based fare structures may all be effective ways of addressing affordability concerns. Additionally, investing in demand-responsive transit may be effective in rural areas as it can offer a cost-effective and flexible transportation alternative in areas without enough demand to support fixed-route public transportation (Vansteenwegen et al., 2022). Prioritizing these types of physical transportation infrastructure improvements is particularly important given the substantial direct PPD effect for these population groups, as evidenced in Table 5.

6. CONCLUSIONS

The growth of virtual activities presents many opportunities to increase overall activity accessibility, especially for those with limited transportation options. In the current study, using data from the 2022 National Household Travel Survey, we investigate the dissonance that exists between how much individuals would like to participate in in-person OH activities and how much they are actually able to (PPD), as well as the extent to which virtual participation can alleviate this dissonance. Our results reveal that low-income individuals, racial minorities, older individuals, those without driver's licenses, and individuals with medical conditions (that limit their ability to travel) are more likely to experience PPD than their peers. We also find significant heterogeneity in the PPD reasons across different population groups; low-income individuals and racial minorities tend to attribute PPD to infrastructure-related factors (such as "poor destination access," "not reliable," and "not affordable"), while older individuals and those with medical conditions tend to attribute dissonance to health problems and COVID concerns. Finally, virtual participation appears to help reduce PPD for those with medical conditions, women, older adults, and vehicleconstrained households, but not for those living in rural areas, low-income individuals, and racial minorities. These results have important implications, suggesting a growing need to incorporate both physical and virtual participation modalities into measures of accessibility and activity-based travel demand modeling. In terms of employment accessibility, telework has significantly changed the need for physical access, potentially expanding the reach of many people with limited mobility. Similarly, delivery services should be carefully considered when evaluating access to healthy food, as these services may provide a greater range of options than individuals can access on their own. At the same time, however, we find that some existing disparities in physical accessibility are replicated and exacerbated by disparities in virtual accessibility, highlighting the need to carefully consider the interplay between physical and virtual participation from an overall accessibility as well as equity standpoint.

As with any research, there are several avenues to extend this research. While we provide evidence of the potential of virtual participation to reduce PPD from an activity accessibility standpoint, we have not examined the broader social aspects of the two different activity participation channels. For instance, delivery services may provide better access to healthy food, but obviously do not provide the same level of social interactions that are possible at the neighborhood grocery store. There is a need to consider activity participation at this broader level of fulfilment, satisfaction, and quality of life, beyond simply subjective perceptions of access to activity opportunities afforded by the transportation system. On the opposite end of the spectrum, future studies also can focus on PPD at the more specific levels of activity purpose, travel mode, and location quality of activity performance for individual activity episodes, and expand the consideration of virtual participation to include other online activities such as telemedicine and telesocial activities. In summary, the rich and nuanced interplay between physical and virtual participation offers a variety of research opportunities, especially because of its evolving nature at a time of rapid technological development.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research was partially supported by the U.S. Department of Transportation through the Center for Understanding Future Travel Behavior and Demand (TBD) (Grant No. 69A3552344815 and No. 69A3552348320). The authors are grateful to Lisa Macias for her help in formatting this document.

REFERENCES

- Agyeman, J., Doran, A., 2021. "You Want Protected Bike Lanes, I Want Protected Black Children. Let's Link": Equity, Justice, and the Barriers to Active Transportation in North America. Local Environment 26, 1480–1497. https://doi.org/10.1080/13549839.2021.1978412
- Al-Hawari, F., Al-Sammarraie, M., Al-Khaffaf, T., 2020. Design, Validation, and Comparative Analysis of a Private Bus Location Tracking Information System. Journal of Advanced Transportation 2020. https://doi.org/10.1155/2020/8895927
- Allen, J., Farber, S., 2020. Planning Transport for Social Inclusion: An Accessibility-Activity Participation Approach. Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment 78. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trd.2019.102212
- An, Z., Heinen, E., Watling, D., 2022. Multimodal Travel Behaviour, Attitudes, and Cognitive Dissonance. Transportation Research Part F: Traffic Psychology and Behaviour 91, 260– 273. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trf.2022.10.007
- Anderson, S.M., Asmussen, K.E., Saxena, S., Batur, I., Pendyala, R.M., Bhat, C.R., 2024. An Investigation of Dissonance in Telework Frequency. Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies.
- Åslund, O., Östh, J., Zenou, Y., 2010. How Important Is Access to Jobs? Old Question— Improved Answer. Journal of Economic Geography 10, 389–422. https://doi.org/10.1093/jeg/lbp040
- Asmussen, K., Mondal, A., Bhat, C.R., 2023. The Interplay Between Teleworking Choice and Commute Distance. Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies.
- Asmussen, K.E., Mondal, A., Batur, I., Dirks, A., Pendyala, R.M., Bhat, C.R., 2024. An Investigation of Individual-Level Telework Arrangements in the COVID-Era. Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice 179. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tra.2023.103888

- Bantis, T., Haworth, J., 2020. Assessing Transport Related Social Exclusion Using a Capabilities Approach to Accessibility Framework: A Dynamic Bayesian Network Approach. Journal of Transport Geography 84. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtrangeo.2020.102673
- Barajas, J.M., 2021. Biking Where Black: Connecting Transportation Planning and Infrastructure to Disproportionate Policing. Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment 99, 103027. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trd.2021.103027
- Beale, K., Kapatsila, B., Grisé, E., 2023. Integrating Public Transit and Shared Micromobility Payments to Improve Transportation Equity in Seattle, WA. Transportation Research Record 2677, 968–980. https://doi.org/10.1177/03611981221103233
- Bernardo, C., Paleti, R., Hoklas, M., Bhat, C., 2015. An Empirical Investigation into the Time-Use and Activity Patterns of Dual-Earner Couples with and Without Young Children. Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice, Emerging data and methodological considerations in time-use analysis 76, 71–91. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tra.2014.12.006
- Bezyak, J.L., Sabella, S., Hammel, J., McDonald, K., Jones, R.A., Barton, D., 2020. Community Participation and Public Transportation Barriers Experienced by People with Disabilities. Disability and Rehabilitation 42, 3275–3283. https://doi.org/10.1080/09638288.2019.1590469
- Bhat, C.R., 2018. New Matrix-Based Methods for the Analytic Evaluation of the Multivariate Cumulative Normal Distribution Function. Transportation Research Part B: Methodological 109, 238–256. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trb.2018.01.011
- Bhat, C.R., 2015. A New Generalized Heterogeneous Data Model (GHDM) to Jointly Model Mixed Types of Dependent Variables. Transportation Research Part B: Methodological 79, 50–77. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trb.2015.05.017
- Bills, T.S., Twumasi-Boakye, R., Broaddus, A., Fishelson, J., 2022. Towards Transit Equity in Detroit: An Assessment of Microtransit and Its Impact on Employment Accessibility. Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment 109. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trd.2022.103341
- Blumenberg, E., Brown, A., Schouten, A., 2020. Car-Deficit Households: Determinants and Implications for Household Travel in the U.S. Transportation 47, 1103–1125. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11116-018-9956-6
- Budnitz, H., Tranos, E., Chapman, L., 2020. Telecommuting and Other Trips: An English Case Study. Journal of Transport Geography 85. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtrangeo.2020.102713
- Buettner, S.A., Pasch, K.E., Poulos, N.S., 2023. Factors Associated with Food Delivery App use Among Young Adults. Journal of Community Health 48, 840–846. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10900-023-01229-1
- Carrion, C., Levinson, D., 2012. Value of Travel Time Reliability: A Review of Current Evidence. Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice 46, 720–741. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tra.2012.01.003
- Cavallaro, F., Dianin, A., 2022. Combining Transport and Digital Accessibilities in the Evaluation of Regional Work Opportunities. Journal of Transport Geography 98. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtrangeo.2021.103224
- Chen, B.Y., Yuan, H., Li, Q., Wang, D., Shaw, S.-L., Chen, H.-P., Lam, W.H.K., 2017. Measuring Place-Based Accessibility Under Travel Time Uncertainty. International Journal of Geographical Information Science 31, 783–804. https://doi.org/10.1080/13658816.2016.1238919

- Chen, J., Cui, M., Levinson, D., 2024. The Cost of Shopping: Measuring Virtual and Physical Access for Obtaining Goods. TeMA Journal of Land Use, Mobility and Environment 17, 129–145. https://doi.org/10.6093/1970-9870/10688
- Chen, Y., Hou, A.Y.C., Huang, L., 2021. Development of Distance Education in Chinese Higher Education in Perspectives of Accessibility, Quality and Equity Under COVID-19. Asian Education and Development Studies 11, 356–365. https://doi.org/10.1108/AEDS-05-2020-0118
- Ciccarelli, F.C., Mariotti, I., 2024. Chapter 15: Remote work, coworking spaces, and wellbeing during the COVID-19 pandemic and beyond: exploring peripheral and rural areas, in: Andres, L., Bryson, J.R., Ersoy, A., Reardon, L. (Eds.), Pandemic Recovery? Reframing and Rescaling Societal Challenges, Geography, Planning, and Tourism 2024. Elgar, pp. 209–220.
- Cochran, A.L., 2020. Impacts of COVID-19 on Access to Transportation for People with Disabilities. Transportation Research Interdisciplinary Perspectives 8. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trip.2020.100263
- Currie, G., Delbosc, A., Mahmoud, S., 2013. Factors Influencing Young Peoples ' Perceptions of Personal Safety on Public Transport. Journal of Public Transportation 16, 1–19. https://doi.org/10.5038/2375-0901.16.1.1
- Currie, G., Richardson, T., Smyth, P., Vella-Brodrick, D., Hine, J., Lucas, K., Stanley, Janet, Morris, J., Kinnear, R., Stanley, John, 2010. Investigating Links Between Transport Disadvantage, Social Exclusion and Well-Being in Melbourne – Updated Results. Research in Transportation Economics, Reforming Public Transport throughout the World 29, 287– 295. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.retrec.2010.07.036
- Dabelko-Schoeny, H., Maleku, A., Cao, Q., White, K., Ozbilen, B., 2021. "We Want to Go, but There Are No Options": Exploring Barriers and Facilitators of Transportation Among Diverse Older Adults. Journal of Transport & Health 20. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jth.2020.100994
- Dannenberg, P., Fuchs, M., Riedler, T., Wiedemann, C., 2020. Digital Transition by COVID-19 Pandemic? The German Food Online Retail. Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie 111, 543–560. https://doi.org/10.1111/tesg.12453
- De Vos, J., 2018. Do People Travel with Their Preferred Travel Mode? Analysing the Extent of Travel Mode Dissonance and Its Effect on Travel Satisfaction. Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice 117, 261–274. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tra.2018.08.034
- De Vos, J., Lättman, K., van der Vlugt, A.-L., Welsch, J., Otsuka, N., 2023. Determinants and Effects of Perceived Walkability: A Literature Review, Conceptual Model and Research Agenda. Transport Reviews 43, 303–324. https://doi.org/10.1080/01441647.2022.2101072
- De Vos, J., Singleton, P.A., 2020. Travel and cognitive dissonance. Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice 138, 525–536. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tra.2020.06.014
- Deboosere, R., El-Geneidy, A., 2018. Evaluating Equity and Accessibility to Jobs by Public Transport Across Canada. Journal of Transport Geography 73, 54–63. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtrangeo.2018.10.006
- Dias, F.F., Lavieri, P.S., Sharda, S., Khoeini, S., Bhat, C.R., Pendyala, R.M., Pinjari, A.R., Ramadurai, G., Srinivasan, K.K., 2020. A Comparison of Online and in-Person Activity Engagement: The Case of Shopping and Eating Meals. Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies 114, 643–656. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trc.2020.02.023

- Dillahunt, T.R., Veinot, T.C., 2018. Getting There: Barriers and Facilitators to Transportation Access in Underserved Communities. ACM Transactions on Computer-Human Interaction 25, 29:1-29:39. https://doi.org/10.1145/3233985
- Ding, Y., Lu, H., 2017. The Interactions Between Online Shopping and Personal Activity Travel Behavior: An Analysis with a GPS-Based Activity Travel Diary. Transportation 44, 311– 324. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11116-015-9639-5
- Dirks, A., Batur, I., Mondal, A., Magassy, T.B., Pendyala, R.M., Haddad, A., Bhat, C.R., Chen, C., Salon, D., Bhagat-Conway, M.W., Mohammadi, M., Chauhan, R., Mohammadian, A., Derrible, S., 2022. Access to Food in a Severe Prolonged Disruption: The Case of Grocery and Meal Shopping During the COVID-19 Pandemic. Technical paper, Department of Civil, Architectural and Environmental Engineering, The University of Texas at Austin.
- Dixit, M., Sivakumar, A., 2020. Capturing the Impact of Individual Characteristics on Transport Accessibility and Equity Analysis. Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment 87. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trd.2020.102473
- Dong, H., Ma, S., Jia, N., Tian, J., 2021. Understanding Public Transport Satisfaction in Post COVID-19 Pandemic. Transport Policy 101, 81–88. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tranpol.2020.12.004
- El-Assi, W., Salah Mahmoud, M., Nurul Habib, K., 2017. Effects of Built Environment and Weather on Bike Sharing Demand: A Station Level Analysis of Commercial Bike Sharing in Toronto. Transportation 44, 589–613. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11116-015-9669-z
- Elldér, E., 2020. Telework and Daily Travel: New Evidence from Sweden. Journal of Transport Geography 86. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtrangeo.2020.102777
- Erjavec, J., Manfreda, A., 2022. Online Shopping Adoption During Covid-19 and Social Isolation: Extending the UTAUT Model with Herd Behavior. Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services 65. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2021.102867
- Etminani-Ghasrodashti, R., Hamidi, S., 2020. Online Shopping as a Substitute or Complement to in-Store Shopping Trips in Iran? Cities 103. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2020.102768
- Fabusuyi, T., Twumasi-Boakye, R., Broaddus, A., Fishelson, J., Hampshire, R.C., 2020. Estimating Small Area Demand for Online Package Delivery. Journal of Transport Geography 88. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtrangeo.2020.102864
- Federal Highway Administration, 2023. 2022 NextGen National Household Travel Survey. https://nhts.ornl.gov
- Feraco, A., Armani, A., Amoah, I., Guseva, E., Camajani, E., Gorini, S., Strollo, R., Padua, E., Caprio, M., Lombardo, M., 2024. Assessing gender differences in food preferences and physical activity: a population-based survey. Front. Nutr. 11. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnut.2024.1348456
- Festinger, L., 1975. A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance. Row, Peterson, and Company, Evanston, IL.
- Geurs, K.T., van Wee, B., 2004. Accessibility Evaluation of Land-Use and Transport Strategies: Review and Research Directions. Journal of Transport Geography 12, 127–140. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtrangeo.2003.10.005
- Gliebe, J.P., Koppelman, F.S., 2005. Modeling Household Activity–Travel Interactions as Parallel Constrained Choices. Transportation 32, 449–471. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11116-005-5328-0

- Grisé, E., Boisjoly, G., Maguire, M., El-Geneidy, A., 2019. Elevating Access: Comparing Accessibility to Jobs by Public Transport for Individuals with and Without a Physical Disability. Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice 125, 280–293. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tra.2018.02.017
- Guzman, L.A., Cantillo-Garcia, V.A., Oviedo, D., Arellana, J., 2023. How Much Is Accessibility Worth? Utility-Based Accessibility to Evaluate Transport Policies. Journal of Transport Geography 112. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtrangeo.2023.103683
- Haddad, A.J., Mondal, A., Bhat, C.R., Zhang, A., Liao, M.C., Macias, L.J., Lee, M.K., Watkins, S.C., 2023. Pedestrian Crash Frequency: Unpacking the Effects of Contributing Factors and Racial Disparities. Accident Analysis & Prevention 182. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aap.2023.106954
- Haider, Z., Hu, Y., Charkhgard, H., Himmelgreen, D., Kwon, C., 2022. Creating grocery delivery hubs for food deserts at local convenience stores via spatial and temporal consolidation. Socio-Economic Planning Sciences 82, 101301.
- Handy, S., 2020. Is Accessibility an Idea Whose Time Has Finally Come? Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment 83. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trd.2020.102319
- Hansen, W.G., 1959. How Accessibility Shapes Land Use. Journal of the American Institute of Planners 25, 73–76. https://doi.org/10.1080/01944365908978307
- Haustein, S., Hunecke, M., 2007. Reduced Use of Environmentally Friendly Modes of Transportation Caused by Perceived Mobility Necessities: An Extension of the Theory of Planned Behavior. Journal of Applied Social Psychology 37, 1856–1883. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2007.00241.x
- Haustein, S., Siren, A., 2014. Seniors' Unmet Mobility Needs How Important Is a Driving Licence? Journal of Transport Geography 41, 45–52. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtrangeo.2014.08.001
- Hicks, M., Stickle, B., Harms, J., 2022. Assessing the Fear of Package Theft. American Journal of Criminal Justice 47, 399–420. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12103-022-09687-4
- Higham, J., Cohen, S.A., Peeters, P., Gössling, S., 2013. Psychological and Behavioural Approaches to Understanding and Governing Sustainable Mobility. Journal of Sustainable Tourism 21, 949–967. https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2013.828733
- Hu, L., 2017. Job Accessibility and Employment Outcomes: Which Income Groups Benefit the Most? Transportation 44, 1421–1443. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11116-016-9708-4
- Jacobs, M., Burch, A.E., 2021. Anxiety During the Pandemic: Racial and Ethnic Differences in the Trajectory of Fear. Journal of Affective Disorders 292, 58–66. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2021.05.027
- Javadinasr, M., Maggasy, T., Mohammadi, M., Mohammadain, K., Rahimi, E., Salon, D., Conway, M.W., Pendyala, R., Derrible, S., 2022. The Long-Term Effects of COVID-19 on Travel Behavior in the United States: A Panel Study on Work from Home, Mode Choice, Online Shopping, and Air Travel. Transportation Research Part F: Traffic Psychology and Behaviour 90, 466–484. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trf.2022.09.019
- Kapatsila, B., Palacios, M.S., Grisé, E., El-Geneidy, A., 2023. Resolving the Accessibility Dilemma: Comparing Cumulative and Gravity-Based Measures of Accessibility in Eight Canadian Cities. Journal of Transport Geography 107. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtrangeo.2023.103530

- Kaplan, M., Hotle, S., Heaslip, K., 2023. How Has COVID-19 Impacted Customer Perceptions and Demand for Delivery Services: An Exploratory Analysis. Transport Policy 134, 217– 230. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tranpol.2023.02.020
- Kaufman-Scarborough, C., Childers, T.L., 2009. Understanding Markets as Online Public Places: Insights from Consumers with Visual Impairments. Journal of Public Policy & Marketing 28, 16–28. https://doi.org/10.1509/jppm.28.1.16
- Keeble, M., Adams, J., Burgoine, T., 2022. Investigating Experiences of Frequent Online Food Delivery Service Use: A Qualitative Study in UK Adults. BMC Public Health 22. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-022-13721-9
- Kenyon, S., 2006. Reshaping Patterns of Mobility and Exclusion? The Impact of Virtual Mobility upon Accessibility, Mobility and Social Exclusion, in: Mobile Technologies of the City. Routledge.
- Khaddar, S., Rahman Fatmi, M., 2024. Modeling Telecommuting and Teleshopping Preferences in the Post-Pandemic Era. Transportation Research Record 03611981231222238. https://doi.org/10.1177/03611981231222238
- Kim, S., Ulfarsson, G.F., Todd Hennessy, J., 2007. Analysis of Light Rail Rider Travel Behavior: Impacts of Individual, Built Environment, and Crime Characteristics on Transit Access. Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice 41, 511–522. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tra.2006.11.001
- Klein, N.J., Basu, R., Smart, M.J., 2023. Transitions into and Out of Car Ownership Among Low-Income Households in the United States. Journal of Planning Education and Research 0739456X231163755. https://doi.org/10.1177/0739456X231163755
- Kunieda, M., Gauthier, A., 2007. Gender and Urban Transport: Smart and Affordable, in: Sustainable Transport: A Sourcebook for Poliymakers in Developing Cities. Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development.
- Landby, E., 2019. Everyday Travel for Families with Children Using Wheelchairs: Parents' Perceptions of Constraints and Adaptation Strategies. Children's Geographies 17, 388–400. https://doi.org/10.1080/14733285.2018.1528342
- Lättman, K., Friman, M., Olsson, L.E., 2016. Perceived Accessibility of Public Transport as a Potential Indicator of Social Inclusion. Social Inclusion 4, 36–45. https://doi.org/10.17645/si.v4i3.481
- Lättman, K., Olsson, L.E., Friman, M., 2018. A New Approach to Accessibility Examining Perceived Accessibility in Contrast to Objectively Measured Accessibility in Daily Travel. Research in Transportation Economics, Competition and Ownership in Land Passenger Transport (selected papers from the Thredbo 15 conference) 69, 501–511. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.retrec.2018.06.002
- Laumer, S., Maier, C., 2021. Why Do People (Not) Want to Work from Home? An Individual-Focused Literature Review on Telework, in: Proceedings of the 2021 on Computers and People Research Conference. ACM, pp. 41–49. https://doi.org/10.1145/3458026.3462155
- Lavieri, P.S., Dai, Q., Bhat, C.R., 2018. Using Virtual Accessibility and Physical Accessibility as Joint Predictors of Activity-Travel Behavior. Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice 118, 527–544. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tra.2018.08.042
- Le, H.T.K., Carrel, A.L., Shah, H., 2022. Impacts of Online Shopping on Travel Demand: A Systematic Review. Transport Reviews 42, 273–295. https://doi.org/10.1080/01441647.2021.1961917

- Lee, R.E., O'Neal, A., Cameron, C., Hughes, R.B., O'Connor, D.P., Ohri-Vachaspati, P., Todd, M., Nosek, M.A., 2020. Developing Content for the Food Environment Assessment Survey Tool (FEAST): A Systematic Mixed Methods Study with People with Disabilities. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health 17. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17217781
- Lee, R.J., Sener, I.N., Mokhtarian, P.L., Handy, S.L., 2017. Relationships Between the Online and in-Store Shopping Frequency of Davis, California Residents. Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice 100, 40–52. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tra.2017.03.001
- Lee, Y., Hickman, M., Washington, S., 2007. Household Type and Structure, Time-Use Pattern, and Trip-Chaining Behavior. Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice 41, 1004–1020. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tra.2007.06.007
- Leporini, B., Buzzi, M., Hersh, M., 2023. Video Conferencing Tools: Comparative Study of the Experiences of Screen Reader Users and the Development of More Inclusive Design Guidelines. ACM Transactions on Accessible Computing 16, 1–36. https://doi.org/10.1145/3573012
- Leroy, S., Schmidt, A.M., Madjar, N., 2021. Working from Home During COVID-19: A Study of the Interruption Landscape. Journal of Applied Psychology 106, 1448–1465. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000972
- Levine, J., Grengs, J., Merlin, L.A., 2019. From Mobility to Accessibility: Transforming Urban Transportation and Land-Use Planning. Cornell University Press.
- Liu, J., Pei, S., Zhang, X. (Michael), 2023. Online Food Delivery Platforms and Female Labor Force Participation. Information Systems Research. https://doi.org/10.1287/isre.2021.0182
- López-Igual, P., Rodríguez-Modroño, P., 2020. Who is Teleworking and Where from? Exploring the Main Determinants of Telework in Europe. Sustainability 12, 8797. https://doi.org/10.3390/su12218797
- Lotfi, S., Koohsari, M.J., 2009. Analyzing Accessibility Dimension of Urban Quality of Life: Where Urban Designers Face Duality Between Subjective and Objective Reading of Place. Social Indicators Research 94, 417–435. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-009-9438-5
- Lovejoy, K., Handy, S., 2008. A Case for Measuring Individuals' Access to Private-Vehicle Travel as a Matter of Degrees: Lessons from Focus Groups with Mexican Immigrants in California. Transportation 35, 601–612. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11116-008-9169-5
- Luz, G., Portugal, L., 2022. Understanding Transport-Related Social Exclusion Through the Lens of Capabilities Approach. Transport Reviews 42, 503–525. https://doi.org/10.1080/01441647.2021.2005183
- Lyons, G., Farag, S., Haddad, H., 2008. The Substitution of Communications for Travel?, in: The Implementation and Effectiveness of Transport Demand Management Measures. Routledge.
- Mackett, R.L., 2013. Children's Travel Behaviour and Its Health Implications. Transport Policy, "Understanding Behavioural Change: An International Perspective on Sustainable Travel Behaviours and Their Motivations": Selected Papers from the 12th World Conference on Transportation Research 26, 66–72. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tranpol.2012.01.002
- Makarewicz, C., Dantzler, P., Adkins, A., 2020. Another Look at Location Affordability: Understanding the Detailed Effects of Income and Urban Form on Housing and Transportation Expenditures. Housing Policy Debate 30, 1033–1055. https://doi.org/10.1080/10511482.2020.1792528
- Martens, K., 2016. Transport Justice: Designing Fair Transportation Systems. Routledge.

- Maslakçı, A., Sürücü, L., 2024. Gender Effects on Depression, Anxiety, and Stress Regarding the Fear of COVID-19. Trends in Psychol. 32, 152–164. https://doi.org/10.1007/s43076-022-00227-x
- McGrail, M.R., Humphreys, J.S., Ward, B., 2015. Accessing Doctors at Times of Need– Measuring the Distance Tolerance of Rural Residents for Health-Related Travel. BMC Health Services Research 15, 212. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-015-0880-6
- Miller, E.J., 2018. Accessibility: Measurement and Application in Transportation Planning. Transport Reviews 38, 551–555. https://doi.org/10.1080/01441647.2018.1492778
- Morris, E.A., Speroni, S., Taylor, B.D., 2023. Going Nowhere Fast: Might Changing Activity Patterns Help Explain Falling Travel? Journal of Transport Geography 110. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtrangeo.2023.103620
- Morrison-Smith, S., Ruiz, J., 2020. Challenges and Barriers in Virtual Teams: A Literature Review. SN Applied Sciences 2. https://doi.org/10.1007/s42452-020-2801-5
- Muhammad, S., de Jong, T., Ottens, H.F.L., 2008. Job Accessibility Under the Influence of Information and Communication Technologies, in the Netherlands. Journal of Transport Geography 16, 203–216. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtrangeo.2007.05.005
- Nagarajan, N.R., Sixsmith, A., 2023. Policy Initiatives to Address the Challenges of an Older Population in the Workforce. Ageing International 48, 41–77. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12126-021-09442-w
- Neutens, T., Delafontaine, M., Scott, D.M., De Maeyer, P., 2012. An Analysis of Day-to-Day Variations in Individual Space–Time Accessibility. Journal of Transport Geography, Special Issue on Time Geography 23, 81–91. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtrangeo.2012.04.001
- Ng, A., Debnath, A.K., Heesch, K.C., 2017. Cyclist' Safety Perceptions of Cycling Infrastructure at Un-Signalised Intersections: Cross-Sectional Survey of Queensland Cyclists. Journal of Transport & Health 6, 13–22. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jth.2017.03.001
- Nguyen, M.H., 2021. Factors Influencing Home-Based Telework in Hanoi (Vietnam) During and After the COVID-19 Era. Transportation 48, 3207–3238. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11116-021-10169-5
- Ozbilen, B., Wang, K., Akar, G., 2021. Revisiting the Impacts of Virtual Mobility on Travel Behavior: An Exploration of Daily Travel Time Expenditures. Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice 145, 49–62. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tra.2021.01.002
- Pabilonia, S.W., Vernon, V., 2022. Telework, Wages, and Time Use in the United States. Review of Economics of the Household 20, 687–734. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11150-022-09601-1
- Palacios, M.S., El-Geneidy, A., 2022. Cumulative Versus Gravity-Based Accessibility Measures: Which One to Use? Findings. https://doi.org/10.32866/001c.32444
- Pedreira Junior, J.U., Pitombo, C.S., 2024. Unveiling Substitution Patterns of Work Trips by Teleworking and Their Associations with Physical and Virtual Accessibility in the Brazilian COVID-19 Crisis. Travel Behaviour and Society 34. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tbs.2023.100657
- Pot, F.J., Heinen, E., Tillema, T., 2024. Sufficient Access? Activity Participation, Perceived Accessibility and Transport-Related Social Exclusion Across Spatial Contexts. Transportation. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11116-024-10470-z

- Pot, F.J., van Wee, B., Tillema, T., 2021. Perceived Accessibility: What It Is and Why It Differs from Calculated Accessibility Measures Based on Spatial Data. Journal of Transport Geography 94. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtrangeo.2021.103090
- Preston, J., Rajé, F., 2007. Accessibility, Mobility and Transport-Related Social Exclusion. Journal of Transport Geography 15, 151–160. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtrangeo.2006.05.002
- Priya Uteng, T., Turner, J., 2019. Addressing the Linkages Between Gender and Transport in Low- and Middle-Income Countries. Sustainability 11. https://doi.org/10.3390/su11174555
- Roe, C.M., Rosnick, C.B., Colletta, A., Babulal, G.M., 2021. Reaction to a Pandemic: Social Distancing and Driving Among Older Adults During COVID-19. Journal of Applied Gerontology 40, 263–267. https://doi.org/10.1177/0733464820966516
- Roper, S., Alkhalifah, E.S., 2020. Online shopping in a restrictive society: lessons from Saudi Arabia. Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal 24, 449–469. https://doi.org/10.1108/QMR-01-2020-0012
- Saphores, J.-D., Xu, L., 2021. E-Shopping Changes and the State of E-Grocery Shopping in the US - Evidence from National Travel and Time Use Surveys. Research in Transportation Economics, E-groceries, digitalization and sustainability 87. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.retrec.2020.100864
- Seabra, C., Silva, C., Paiva, O., Reis, M., Abrantes, J.L., 2021. Perceptions of Safety and Risk in the Daily Life and Travel Plans in the COVID-19 Context: One Year and Three Waves After, in: Pandemics and Travel: COVID-19 Impacts in the Tourism Industry. Emerald Group Publishing.
- Sen, A., 2000. Social exclusion: Concept, application, and scrutiny (No. Social Development Papers No. 1). Office of Environment and Social Development, Asian Development Bank, Manila, Philippines.
- Shah, A.M., Yan, X., Qayyum, A., 2021. Adoption of Mobile Food Ordering Apps for O2O Food Delivery Services During the COVID-19 Outbreak. British Food Journal 124, 3368– 3395. https://doi.org/10.1108/BFJ-09-2020-0781
- Shah, H., Carrel, A.L., Le, H.T.K., 2024. Impacts of Teleworking and Online Shopping on Travel: A Tour-Based Analysis. Transportation 51, 99–127. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11116-022-10321-9
- Shao, R., Derudder, B., Witlox, F., 2022. The Geography of E-Shopping in China: On the Role of Physical and Virtual Accessibility. Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services 64. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2021.102753
- Sheng, N., Fang, Y., Shao, Y., Alterman, V., Wang, M., 2022. The Impacts of Digital Technologies on Successful Aging in Non-Work and Work Domains: An Organizing Taxonomy. Work, Aging and Retirement 8, 198–207. https://doi.org/10.1093/workar/waac008
- Shukla, R., Raval, P.M., 2021. Impact of Virtual Accessibility on Out-of-Home Activity and Travel in Indian Urban Context: A Structural Equation Analysis. Transportation Research Interdisciplinary Perspectives 12. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trip.2021.100483
- Siddiq, F., Taylor, B.D., 2021. Tools of the Trade? Journal of the American Planning Association 87, 497–511. https://doi.org/10.1080/01944363.2021.1899036
- Solon, G., Haider, S.J., Wooldridge, J.M., 2015. What Are We Weighting For? Journal of Human Resources 50, 301–316. https://doi.org/10.3368/jhr.50.2.301

- Sousa, R., Horta, C., Ribeiro, R., Rabinovich, E., 2020. How to Serve Online Consumers in Rural Markets: Evidence-Based Recommendations. Business Horizons 63, 351–362. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2020.01.007
- Spieler, C., 2020. Racism has shaped public transit, and it's riddled with inequities | Kinder Institute for Urban Research [WWW Document]. Kinder Institute for Urban Research | Rice University. URL https://kinder.rice.edu/urbanedge/racism-has-shaped-public-transitand-its-riddled-inequities (accessed 6.7.24).
- Spurlock, C.A., Todd-Blick, A., Wong-Parodi, G., Walker, V., 2020. Children, Income, and the Impact of Home Delivery on Household Shopping Trips. Transportation Research Record 2674, 335–350. https://doi.org/10.1177/0361198120935113
- Squire, K.D., 2022. From Virtual to Participatory Learning with Technology During COVID-19. E-Learning and Digital Media 19, 55–77. https://doi.org/10.1177/20427530211022926
- Stark, J., Meschik, M., 2018. Women's Everyday Mobility: Frightening Situations and Their Impacts on Travel Behaviour. Transportation Research Part F: Traffic Psychology and Behaviour 54, 311–323. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trf.2018.02.017
- Suminski, R.R., Poston, W.S.C., Petosa, R.L., Stevens, E., Katzenmoyer, L.M., 2005. Features of the Neighborhood Environment and Walking by U.S. Adults. American Journal of Preventive Medicine 28, 149–155. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2004.09.009
- Tagliaro, C., Migliore, A., 2021. "COVID-Working": What to Keep and What to Leave? Evidence from an Italian Company. Journal of Corporate Real Estate 24, 76–92. https://doi.org/10.1108/JCRE-10-2020-0053
- Taylor, M.A.P., 2013. Travel Through Time: The Story of Research on Travel Time Reliability. Transportmetrica B: Transport Dynamics 1, 174–194. https://doi.org/10.1080/21680566.2013.859107
- Thulin, E., Vilhelmson, B., Brundin, L., 2023. Telework After Confinement: Interrogating the Spatiotemporalities of Home-Based Work Life. Journal of Transport Geography 113. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtrangeo.2023.103740
- Titiloye, I., Sarker, M.A.A., Jin, X., 2024. Unraveling Heterogeneity in Online Shopping and Travel Behavior Through Latent Class Modeling. Transportation Research Record 03611981241234918. https://doi.org/10.1177/03611981241234918
- Tiznado-Aitken, I., Lucas, K., Muñoz, J.C., Hurtubia, R., 2022. Freedom of Choice? Social and Spatial Disparities on Combined Housing and Transport Affordability. Transport Policy 122, 39–53. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tranpol.2022.04.005
- Tiznado-Aitken, I., Lucas, K., Muñoz, J.C., Hurtubia, R., 2020. Understanding Accessibility Through Public Transport Users' Experiences: A Mixed Methods Approach. Journal of Transport Geography 88. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtrangeo.2020.102857
- U.S. Census Bureau, 2020. Profile of General Population and Housing Characteristics., Decennial Census, DEC Demographic Profile, Table DP1.
- van de Coevering, P., Maat, K., van Wee, B., 2018. Residential Self-Selection, Reverse Causality and Residential Dissonance. A Latent Class Transition Model of Interactions Between the Built Environment, Travel Attitudes and Travel Behavior. Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice 118, 466–479. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tra.2018.08.035
- van der Vlugt, A.-L., Curl, A., Wittowsky, D., 2019. What About the People? Developing Measures of Perceived Accessibility from Case Studies in Germany and the UK. Applied Mobilities 4, 142–162. https://doi.org/10.1080/23800127.2019.1573450

- van Lierop, D., El-Geneidy, A., 2016. Enjoying Loyalty: The Relationship Between Service Quality, Customer Satisfaction, and Behavioral Intentions in Public Transit. Research in Transportation Economics, Competition and Ownership in Land Passenger Transport (selected papers from the Thredbo 14 conference) 59, 50–59. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.retrec.2016.04.001
- van Wee, B., 2022. Accessibility and Equity: A Conceptual Framework and Research Agenda. Journal of Transport Geography 104. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtrangeo.2022.103421
- Vansteenwegen, P., Melis, L., Aktaş, D., Montenegro, B.D.G., Sartori Vieira, F., Sörensen, K., 2022. A Survey on Demand-Responsive Public Bus Systems. Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies 137. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trc.2022.103573
- Vinella-Brusher, E., Cochran, A.L., Iacobucci, E., Wang, J., Wolfe, M., Oluyede, L., Prunkl, L., McDonald, N.C., 2022. Potential of Telehealth to Mitigate Transport Barriers: Evidence from the COVID-19 Pandemic. Findings. https://doi.org/10.32866/001c.37060
- Wachs, M., Kumagai, T.G., 1973. Physical Accessibility as a Social Indicator. Socio-Economic Planning Sciences 7, 437–456. https://doi.org/10.1016/0038-0121(73)90041-4
- Wang, S., Cheng, C., 2024. Opportunity or Exploitation? A Longitudinal Dyadic Analysis of Flexible Working Arrangements and Gender Household Labor Inequality. Social Forces 102, 1446–1466. https://doi.org/10.1093/sf/soad125
- Wooldridge, J.M., 1995. Selection Corrections for Panel Data Models Under Conditional Mean Independence Assumptions. Journal of Econometrics 68, 115–132. https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-4076(94)01645-G
- Wu, S., Yang, Q., Yang, Z., 2022. Integrating Express Package Delivery Service with Offline Mobile Sales: A New Potential Solution to Sustainable Last-Mile Logistics in Rural China. International Journal of Logistics Research and Applications 1–29. https://doi.org/10.1080/13675567.2022.2153356
- Xu, L., Saphores, J.-D., 2024. Does E-Shopping Impact Household Travel? Evidence from the 2017 U.S. NHTS. Journal of Transport Geography 115. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtrangeo.2024.103827
- Yavuz, N., Welch, E.W., 2010. Addressing Fear of Crime in Public Space: Gender Differences in Reaction to Safety Measures in Train Transit. Urban Studies 47, 2491–2515. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098009359033
- Yıldırım, M., Geçer, E., Akgül, Ö., 2021. The Impacts of Vulnerability, Perceived Risk, and Fear on Preventive Behaviours Against COVID-19. Psychology, Health & Medicine 26, 35–43. https://doi.org/10.1080/13548506.2020.1776891
- Young, M., Soza-Parra, J., Circella, G., 2022. The Increase in Online Shopping During COVID-19: Who Is Responsible, Will It Last, and What Does It Mean for Cities? Regional Science Policy & Practice 14, 162–178. https://doi.org/10.1111/rsp3.12514
- Yousefzadeh Barri, E., Farber, S., Kramer, A., Jahanshahi, H., Allen, J., Beyazit, E., 2021. Can Transit Investments in Low-Income Neighbourhoods Increase Transit Use? Exploring the Nexus of Income, Car-Ownership, and Transit Accessibility in Toronto. Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment 95, 102849. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trd.2021.102849
- Yuan, B., Wang, M., 2023. How Work Pattern Transformation May Affect the Mental Health of Older Workers Faced With Unmet Health Care Needs During the Pandemic? A Comparative Investigation of Different Work Models. Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine 65. https://doi.org/10.1097/JOM.00000000002813

- Zhong, S., Lomas, C., Worth, T., 2022. Understanding Customers' Adoption of Express Delivery Service for Last-Mile Delivery in the UK. International Journal of Logistics Research and Applications 25, 1491–1508. https://doi.org/10.1080/13675567.2021.1914563
- Zhou, Y., Yuan, Q., Ding, F., Chen, M., Yang, C., Guo, T., 2022. Demand, Mobility, and Constraints: Exploring Travel Behaviors and Mode Choices of Older Adults Using a Facility-Based Framework. Journal of Transport Geography 102. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtrangeo.2022.103368



Figure 1 Framework of Physical Participation Dissonance (PPD)

Physical Participation Dissonance (PPD)	Number	Percent
Suppressed trips in the last 30 days	2553	20.5
No suppressed trips in the last 30 days	9916	79.5
PPD Reasons	Times Selected	Percent
Transportation did not feel safe	169	6.6
Transportation did not feel clean or healthy	109	4.3
Transportation was not reliable	234	9.2
Available transportation did not go where I need to go	199	7.8
Unable to afford available forms of transportation	482	18.9
Had health problems and unable to travel	732	28.7
Did not have time to travel	643	25.2
Concerns related to COVID-19	1028	40.3
Virtual Participation	Number	Percent
Work from home		
NA (Unemployed or Retired)	5693	45 7
(Onemployed of Refiled)	5075	13.7
0 days per week	3821	30.6
0 days per week 1 – 2 days per week	3821 961	30.6 7.7
0 days per week 1 – 2 days per week 3 – 4 days per week	3821 961 536	30.6 7.7 4.3
0 days per week 1 – 2 days per week 3 – 4 days per week 5 or more days per week	3821 961 536 1458	30.6 7.7 4.3 11.7
0 days per week 1 – 2 days per week 3 – 4 days per week 5 or more days per week Number of deliveries in the last 30 days	3821 961 536 1458	30.6 7.7 4.3 11.7
0 days per week 1 – 2 days per week 3 – 4 days per week 5 or more days per week Number of deliveries in the last 30 days 0	3821 961 536 1458 3125	30.6 7.7 4.3 11.7 25.1
0 days per week 1 – 2 days per week 3 – 4 days per week 5 or more days per week Number of deliveries in the last 30 days 0 1 – 5	3821 961 536 1458 3125 5245	30.6 7.7 4.3 11.7 25.1 42.1
0 days per week 1-2 days per week 3-4 days per week 5 or more days per week Number of deliveries in the last 30 days 0 1-5 6-10	3821 961 536 1458 3125 5245 2323	30.6 7.7 4.3 11.7 25.1 42.1 18.6

Table 1 Descriptive Statistics of Outcomes

Variable	% in Sample	% in Census	Variable	% in Sample	% in Census
C	ensus Divisi	ion of Hou	sehold Residence	Bampie	Census
New England	5.9	4.6	East South Central	5.6	5.9
Middle Atlantic	11.8	12.8	West South Central	11.1	12.3
East North Central	16.0	14.3	Mountain	7.8	7.5
West North Central	7.2	6.5	Pacific	14.7	16.2
South Atlantic	19.9	19.9			l
	House	chold Dem	ographics		
Household composition			Household income		
One adult, no children	14.7	27.6	Less than \$50,000	24.4	33.8
Two or more adults, no children	52.9	42.0	\$50,000 - \$99,999	31.6	28.9
single parent	3.2	6.8	\$100,000 - \$149,999	22.0	17.1
Two or more adults with children	29.2	23.6	\$150,000 - \$199,999	9.2	8.8
Number of workers			\$200,000 or more	12.8	11.4
0	28.8		Household ownership		
1	31.1		Own	78.4	63.1
2	31.9		Rent	21.6	36.9
3 or more	8.2		Household location type		
Vehicles per driver			Rural	28.5	21.2
More vehicles than drivers	15.6		Urban	71.5	78.8
Equal vehicles and drivers	64.5				
Fewer vehicles than drivers	19.9				
	Indivic	dual Charo	acteristics		
Gender			Race		
Male	48.7	49.1	White	83.5	61.6
Female	51.3	50.9	Black	6.9	12.4
Age			Asian	5.8	6.0
18 - 25	9.9	12.0	Other	3.8	20.0
25 - 34	14.3	17.4	Ethnicity		
35 - 44	14.8	16.4	Not Hispanic	90.9	81.3
45 - 54	14.0	15.8	Hispanic	9.1	18.7
55 - 64	18.0	16.8	Education		
65 or older	29.0	21.6	Less than high school diploma	6.8	19.6
Employment			High school diploma	15.4	28.6
Unemployed (and not retired)	19.0	21.9	Some college	28.8	27.4
Retired	26.7	18.4	Bachelor's degree	27.9	15.5
Employed	54.3	59.7	Graduate degree	21.1	8.9
Medical condition that makes travel d	lifficult		Driver status		
Yes	8.5		Driver	90.7	
No	91.5		Non-driver	9.3	

Table 2 Descriptive Statistics of Exogenous Variables

Table 3 Main Estimation Results (1/3)

			PPD Reasons													Virtual Participation						
	DI	n							Po	oor												
Thresholds/Variables (base)	11	D							Desti	nation	N	ot	Hea	ılth			COV	/ID				
			Not S	afe	Not C	Clean	Not Re	eliable	Ace	cess	Affor	dable	Prob	lems	No T	ime	Conc	erns	Telev	work	Deliv	eries
	Coeff.	t-stat	Coeff. t	t-stat	Coeff.	t-stat	Coeff.	t-stat	Coeff.	t-stat	Coeff.	t-stat	Coeff.	t-stat	Coeff.	t-stat	Coeff.	t-stat	Coeff.	t-stat	Coeff.	t-stat
Thresholds																						
Threshold 0 1	0.85	8.95	1.89	6.75	2.08	8.57	1.17	4.39	1.20	3.60	0.58	2.71	1.27	2.99	0.64	1.74	0.99	5.58	1.09	11.88	0.16	2.35
Threshold 1 2																			1.52	16.55	1.41	21.10
Threshold 2 3																			1.79	19.40	2.09	30.83
Census Division of Household																						
Residence																						
Census Division (New England)																						
Middle Atlantic	-0.23	-4.86											0.27	2.42	0.23	2.35	0.38	4.04				
East North Central	-0.25	-5.85							0.16	1.44	0.41	4.47	0.20	1.97			0.27	3.12				
West North Central	-0.40	-6.79											0.24	1.75	0.42	4.54					-0.10	-2.49
South Atlantic	-0.19	-4.63							0.19	1.78	0.29	3.38			0.19	1.41	0.27	3.41			0.05	1.99
East South Central	-0.27	-4.24											0.23	1.73	0.32	2.90			-0.15	-2.27	-0.12	-2.83
West South Central	-0.36	-7.30											0.27	2.31	0.22	1.84			-0.08	-1.70	-0.07	-2.29
Mountain	-0.24	-4.48													0.29	2.82	0.18	1.71	0.18	3.15		
Pacific									0.20	1.76			0.21	2.04	0.42	4.54	0.52	6.14				
Household Demographics																						
Composition																						
Single adult (2+ adults)	0.12	3.40							0.17	1.79							-0.13	-2.04	0.10	2.52		
Presence of Children (≤ 17 yrs.)							-0.15	-1.54	-0.17	-1.66	0.13	1.79							-0.10	-3.34	0.08	3.23
Number of Workers (0 workers)																						
1 worker																					-0.10	-3.07
2 workers									0.31	2.95											-0.29	-7.05
3+ workers							0.23	1.57	0.31	2.95											-0.47	-9.19
Vehicles per Driver (Fewer)																						
Equal vehicles and drivers	-0.07	-1.72							-0.16	-1.60									-0.34	-7.72	0.09	3.24
More vehicles than drivers	-0.11	-2.30	-0.17 -	-1.40					-0.18	-1.38							-0.09	-1.30	-0.46	-8.45	0.18	5.40
Household Income (< \$50,000)																						
\$50,000 - \$99,999	-0.18	-4.82					-0.31	-3.01	-0.26	-2.29	-0.30	-3.48							0.09	1.98	0.22	7.76
\$100,000 - \$149,999	-0.29	-6.55					-0.39	-2.88	-0.29	-1.78	-0.41	-3.72	0.14	1.44					0.26	5.18	0.31	9.43
\$150,000 - \$199,999	-0.35	-5.75					-0.48	-3.12	-0.29	-1.78	-0.65	-3.64	0.17	1.42					0.43	7.12	0.43	10.39
\$200,000+	-0.40	-6.93					-0.48	-3.12	-0.29	-1.78	-0.76	-4.20	0.17	1.42					0.50	8.56	0.53	13.58
Home Ownership (Own home)																						
Rent	0.10	2.90	0.25	2.37			0.25	2.75	0.29	3.22	0.17	2.16			-0.11	-1.32						
Household Location Type (Urban)																						
Rural	0.05	1.70	-0.24 -	2.29	-0.30	-2.41					0.10	1.41	-0.16	-2.30					-0.19	-5.34	-0.09	-3.80

Table 3 Main Estimation Results (cont. 2/3)

			PPD R							Reasons								Virtual Participation			
	р	PD						Po	or												
Thresholds/Variables (base)	11	D						Destir	nation	N	ot	Hea	ılth			COV	VID				
			Not Safe	Not C	Clean	Not Re	liable	Acc	ess	Affor	dable	Prob	lems	No T	ime	Conc	erns	Telev	work	Deliv	reries
	Coeff.	t-stat	Coeff. t-sta	t Coeff.	t-stat	Coeff.	t-stat	Coeff.	t-stat	Coeff.	t-stat	Coeff.	t-stat	Coeff.	t-stat	Coeff.	t-stat	Coeff.	t-stat	Coeff.	t-stat
Individual Characteristics																					
Gender (Male)																					
Female	0.11	4.21								-0.11	-1.74	0.13	1.93			0.09	1.70			0.26	12.98
Age (18-24)																					
25-34	0.21	3.60										0.34	1.88	-0.19	-1.43			0.42	6.13		
35-44	0.24	4.60										0.41	2.41	-0.19	-1.43			0.52	8.20		
45-54	0.24	4.60										0.41	2.41	-0.34	-2.30	0.16	1.87	0.52	8.20		
55-64	0.24	4.60				-0.32	-3.01					0.41	2.41	-0.45	-3.18	0.25	3.22	0.52	8.20	-0.11	-3.74
65+	0.24	4.60				-0.32	-3.01					0.50	2.67	-0.45	-3.18	0.52	7.09	0.58	7.56	-0.23	-6.39
Employment Status (Employed)	-																				
Retired				-0.37	-3.16	-0.19	-1.61			-0.36	-4.51	0.32	3.48	-0.50	-3.53					-0.32	-7.59
Unemployed														-0.24	-1.80					-0.46	-14.30
Race (White)																					
Black	0.24	4.60				0.37	3.23	0.28	2.10			-0.23	-1.79			0.34	3.68			-0.17	-4.40
Asian	0.20	3.58				0.23	1.57	0.52	3.64	-0.29	-1.82					0.41	3.72			-0.24	-5.60
Other	0.15	2.18	0.54 3.93	0.35	2.26	0.24	1.53	0.29	1.65	-0.31	-1.93									-0.23	-4.36
Education (No diploma)								*-=>													
High school diploma	0.14	2.10										-0.20	-1.39							0.45	9.50
Some college	0.22	3.60										-0.21	-1.48	0.27	2.39			0.37	7.50	0.84	18.94
Bachelor's degree	0.22	3.60		0.19	1.97							-0.23	-1.55	0.27	2.39	0.12	2.16	0.74	15.43	0.97	21.06
Graduate degree	0.33	4 77		0.19	1 97					-0.18	-2.00	-0.24	-1 57	0.27	239	0.12	2 16	0.74	15 43	1.05	21.60
Driver Status (Driver)	0.55	,		0.17	1.97					0.10	2.00	0.21	1.07	0.27	2.37	0.12	2.10	0.71	10.10	1.05	21.00
Not a driver	0.18	3 80										-0.26	-2.29	0.30	2 33						
Medical Condition (No)	0.10	5.00										0.20	2.2)	0.20	2.00						
Yes	0.55	11 71										1 24	9 66	-0.32	-2 35			0.43	4 75	0.07	1 93
Endogenous Effects	0.00	11.,1										1.21	2.00	0.52	2.55			0.15	1.75	0.07	1.95
Telework (none)																					
1 - 2 days per week	-0.10	-1.96												-0.17	-2.09						
3 - 4 days per week	-0.10	-3.07						-0.21	-1 89					-0.17	-2.07						
5 or more days per week	-0.18	-3.07						-0.23	-1.81					-0.28	_2.01						
Deliveries (none)	-0.10	-3.07						-0.23	-1.01					-0.28	-2.00						
1 - 5								-0.18	-1.58					-0.14	_1 00						
6 - 10	-0.30	-6.40						-0.23	_1 20					-0.19	-1.79						
More than 10	-0.35	_4 90						-0.38	_1 40					-0.24	_1 32						

				PPD Reasons														Virtual Participation				
	PPD								Po	or												
Thresholds/Variables (base)	11	D							Destin	ation	Nc	ot	Heal	lth			COV	/ID				
			Not	Safe	Not C	Clean	Not Re	liable	Acc	ess	Afford	lable	Proble	ems	No T	ime	Conc	erns	Telev	vork	Delive	eries
	Coeff.	t-stat	Coeff.	t-stat	Coeff.	t-stat	Coeff.	t-stat	Coeff.	t-stat	Coeff.	t-stat	Coeff.	t-stat	Coeff.	t-stat	Coeff.	t-stat	Coeff.	t-stat	Coeff.	t-stat
Correlations																						
PPD	1.00																					
Not Safe	0.00		1.00																			
Not Clean	0.00		0.66	3.84	1.00																	
Not Reliable	0.00		0.32	2.28	0.36	1.79	1.00															
Poor Destination Access	0.00		0.22	1.42	0.36	1.85	0.42	2.64	1.00													
Not Affordable	0.00		0.00		0.00		0.26	1.88	0.31	2.07	1.00											
Health Problems	0.00		-0.25	-1.42	0.00		0.00		0.00		0.00		1.00									
No Time	0.00		0.00		0.00		0.00		0.00		0.00		0.00		1.00							
COVID Concerns	0.00		0.17	1.42	0.38	2.24	0.00		0.00		0.00		0.00		-0.24	-1.61	1.00					
Telework	0.26	3.61	0.00		0.00		0.00		0.00		0.00		0.00		0.00		0.24	1.41	1.00			
Deliveries	0.33	5.94	0.00		0.00		0.00		0.00		0.00		0.00		0.00		0.00		0.19	3.16	1.00	

Table 3 Main Estimation Results (cont. 3/3)

Table 4 Model Fit

	Disaggregate Fit Measures													
		Metric			Proposed	Model	Independent Model							
Log-Likelih	ood at Conve	rgence			-36028	.55	-36151	.62						
Log-Likelih	ood at Consta	ints			-39260	.02	-39260	-39260.02						
Number of F	Parameters				216	216 2								
Adjusted Lil	kelihood Rati	o Index			0.07	4								
Bayesian Inf	formation Cri	terion			36470.90 36561.20									
Average Pro	bability of a	Correct Prediction	n		0.16	6	0.16	4						
Likelihood I	Ratio Test					24	6.14							
			Aggrege	ate Fit Measu	vres									
Out	come Combi	nations	Ot	oserved	Proposed	Model	Independer	t Model						
Suppressed	Telework	Delivery	Count	Share (%)	Share (%)	APE	Share (%)	APE						
Trips	Frequency	Frequency	count		Share (70)		Share (70)	I II L						
No	N/A	0	1476	11.84	10.93	7.63	11.85	0.13						
No	N/A	1-5	1788	14.34	14.86	3.62	14.79	3.16						
No	N/A	6-10	648	5.20	5.15	0.99	5.59	7.61						
No	N/A	More than 10	434	3.48	3.16	9.28	3.37	3.15						
No	0 days	0	783	6.28	6.70	6.69	5.41	13.82						
No	0 days	1-5	1405	11.27	11.21	0.50	10.32	8.38						
No	0 days	6-10	602	4.83	4.88	1.16	5.23	8.28						
No	0 days	More than 10	438	3.51	3.23	8.03	4.20	19.55						
No	1-2 days	0	86	0.69	0.77	11.61	1.05	52.17						
No	1-2 days	1-5	307	2.46	2.74	11.34	2.44	0.82						
No	1-2 days	6-10	212	1.70	1.55	8.70	1.38	18.78						
No	1-2 days	More than 10	182	1.46	1.30	11.04	1.21	17.18						
No	3-4 days	0	40	0.32	0.37	14.54	0.54	68.68						
No	3-4 days	1-5	182	1.46	1.39	4.96	1.32	9.67						
No	3-4 days	6-10	88	0.71	0.75	6.57	0.76	8.23						
No	3-4 days	More than 10	103	0.83	0.65	20.74	0.68	17.49						
No	5+ days	0	139	1.11	0.97	12.57	1.39	24.79						
No	5+ days	1-5	469	3.76	3.40	9.53	3.67	2.54						
No	5+ days	6-10	273	2.19	2.10	4.19	2.21	1.03						
No	5+ days	More than 10	261	2.09	2.09	0.29	2.04	2.59						
Yes	N/A	0	426	3.42	3.38	1.07	3.38	1.16						
Yes	N/A	1-5	561	4.50	4.82	7.24	4.21	6.44						
Yes	N/A	6-10	225	1.80	2.11	16.92	1.55	13.85						
Yes	N/A	More than 10	135	1.08	1.25	15.19	0.91	16.19						
Yes	0 days	0	127	1.02	1.02	0.20	1.25	22.91						
Yes	0 days	1-5	261	2.09	1.80	13.79	2.42	15.73						
Yes	0 days	6-10	119	0.95	1.04	8.60	1.23	28.90						
Yes	0 days	More than 10	86	0.69	0.91	31.60	0.99	42.83						
Yes	1-2 days	0	16	0.13	0.13	4.11	0.26	102.16						
Yes	1-2 days	1-5	83	0.67	0.56	16.62	0.60	10.36						
Yes	1-2 days	6-10	40	0.32	0.40	23.88	0.33	4.00						
Yes	1-2 days	More than 10	35	0.28	0.36	29.99	0.30	2.77						
Yes	3-4 days	0	6	0.05	0.06	28.32	0.14	181.52						
Yes	3-4 days	1-5	54	0.43	0.33	25.35	0.32	25.05						
Yes	3-4 days	6-10	37	0.30	0.24	21.00	0.19	37.48						
Yes	3-4 days	More than 10	26	0.21	0.30	43.55	0.16	21.69						
Yes	5+ days	0	26	0.21	0.17	20.78	0.36	70.79						
Yes	5+ days	1-5	135	1.08	0.92	15.49	0.92	15.37						
Yes	5+ days	6-10	79	0.63	0.80	26.35	0.54	14.14						
Yes	5+ days	More than 10	76	0.61	1.20	97.64	0.49	18.95						
Weighted A	verage Perce	ent Error (WAP	E)		7.16	5	8.82	2						

Table 5	Average	Treatment	Effects	(ATEs)
---------	---------	-----------	---------	--------

				Monthly		PPD AT	E	
Variable	Base Level	Treatment Level	Telework	Deliveries	Percent Contri	bution Through	Percent	Total
			AIL	ATE	Telework	Deliveries	Direct Effect	ATE
Household Demograph	ics							
Number of Adults	Two or More	Single Adult	0.21	0.00	-9	0	91	2.94
Presence of Children	No Children	Children	-0.21	0.22	75	-25	0	0.21
Number of Workers	No Workers	3+ Workers	0.00	-1.29	0	100	0	0.65
Vehicle Ownership	More Vehicles than Drivers	Fewer Vehicles than Drivers	0.95	-0.53	-30	6	64	1.84
Income	\$200,000+	< \$50,000	-1.01	-1.53	11	6	83	13.27
Home Ownership	Owner	Renter	0.00	0.00	0	0	100	2.71
Household Location	Urban	Rural	-0.38	-0.25	26	6	68	2.14
Individual Characterist	tics							
Gender	Male	Female	0.00	0.74	0	-11	89	2.67
Age	18-24	65 or Older	1.07	-0.64	-20	4	76	4.68
Employment	Employed	Retired	0.00	-0.91	0	100	0	0.45
Employment	Employed	Unemployed	0.00	-1.32	0	100	0	0.66
Race	White	Black	0.00	-0.49	0	3	97	7.09
Race	White	Asian	0.00	-0.68	0	6	94	6.10
Race	White	Other	0.00	-0.65	0	8	92	4.39
Educational Attainment	No Diploma	Graduate Degree	1.35	2.75	-16	-13	71	5.04
Driver Status	Driver	Non-Driver	0.00	0.00	0	0	100	4.58
Medical Condition	No Medical Condition	Medical Condition	0.91	0.20	-7	-1	92	15.79
Endogenous Effects	-							
Telework	5+ Days per Week	None					100	4.67
Deliveries	More than 10	None					100	8.90