

Location Prediction: Communities Speak Louder than Friends

Jun Pang
University of Luxembourg
jun.pang@uni.lu

Yang Zhang
University of Luxembourg
yang.zhang@uni.lu

ABSTRACT

Humans are social animals and they interact with different communities of friends to conduct different activities. The literature shows that human mobility is constrained by their social relations as well as geographic constraints. In this paper, we investigate the social impact of a person's communities on his mobility, instead of all friends from his online social networks. This can be particularly useful, as not all online friends are really true friends and certain behaviors are influenced by specific communities but not all friends. To achieve our goal, we first develop a measure to characterize a person's social diversity, which we term 'community entropy'. Through analysis of a real-life dataset, we demonstrate that a person's mobility is influenced only by a small fraction of his communities and the influence depends on the social contexts of the communities. We then exploit machine learning techniques to develop two models capturing features of communities and friends separately to predict the location of persons' future movement. Experimental results show that the model based on communities leads to more effective predictions.

Categories and Subject Descriptors

H.2.8 [Database Management]: Database Applications—
Data mining

General Terms

Algorithms, theory, experiments

Keywords

Human mobility, social networks, network communities

1. INTRODUCTION

Humans are social animals, everyone is a part of the society and gets influences from it. For example, our daily behaviors, such as what types of music we listen to, where

we have lunch on weekdays and what activities we conduct on weekends are largely dependent on our social relations. Normally, we categorize our social relations into different groups, i.e., social communities, using different criteria and considerations. By definition, *a community is a social unit of any size that shares common values*.¹ Typical communities include family, close friends, colleagues and etc. In daily life, humans are engaged in various social environments, and they interact with different communities depending on the environments. For our specific behaviors, social influences, in most of cases, are not from *all our friends* but from *certain communities*. For example, we listen to similar types of music as our close friends, but not our parents; we have lunch together with our colleagues on weekdays, but not our college friends living in another city; on weekends we spend more time with family, but not our colleagues.

Location-based social network services (LBSNs) have been booming during the past five years. Representative services include Foursquare, Gowalla and Facebook Places. Nowadays, it is common for a user to attach his location when he publishes a status or photo using his online social network account. Moreover, users may just share their locations, called *check-in*, to tell their friends where they are or to engage in social games as in Foursquare. Since these large amount of location and social relation data become available, studying human mobility, one of the most common behaviors of human being, and its connection with social relationships become quantitatively possible (e.g., [13, 7, 6, 26, 11, 5]). Understanding human mobility can lead to compelling applications including location recommendation [34, 31, 33, 10, 16], urban planning [32], immigration patterns [3], etc.

Previous works, including [1, 4, 7, 25], show that human mobility is indeed influenced by social factors. However, there is one common shortcoming: they all treat friends of users equally. First, in online social networks some of a user's friends are not his real friends, and the links may be created randomly or due to other malicious purposes [17]. These friends have little influence on users' behaviors. Second, even only considering real friends, similar to other social behaviors, in most cases mobility is only influenced by communities but not all friends. For example, the aforementioned colleagues can influence the place a user goes for lunch but probably have nothing to do with his weekend plans. Meanwhile, where a user visits on weekends largely depend on his friends or family, but not his colleagues. Therefore, the impact on a user's mobility should be considered from the perspectives of communities instead of all friends.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. To copy otherwise, to republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee.

Copyright 20XX ACM X-XXXXX-XX-X/XX/XX ...\$15.00.

¹<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Community>

Contributions. In this paper, we aim to study the impact from communities on a user’s mobility and predict his locations based on his community information.

First, we analyze the community influences on users’ mobility and our main conclusions include: (1) In general, fake or random friends don’t have impact on users’ mobility; (2) Community’s influence on users’ mobility is stronger than their friends’; (3) Users with higher social diversity are more influenced by their communities. Moreover, when investigating the impact of communities closely, we find that each user is only influenced by a small number of his communities; and such influence is typically constrained by temporal and spatial contexts. Second, we predict users’ locations using their community information. The results on a real-life dataset show that the community-based predictor outperforms the one based on friends.

Organization. After the introduction, we present a few preliminaries and our dataset in Sect. 2. Then we describe the community detection process in Sect. 3. Community and friends impact on users’ mobility are analyzed and compared in Sect. 4. Sect. 5 analyzes the properties of communities that impose influences on user’s mobility in more detail. Based on our analysis, we propose a location predictor with features linked to community information in Sect. 6 and present experimental results on a real-life dataset. We discuss related work in Sect. 7 and conclude our paper with some future work in Sect. 8.

2. PRELIMINARIES

We summarize the notations in Sect. 2.1 and briefly discuss the dataset we use throughout the paper in Sect. 2.2.

2.1 Notations

All users are contained in the set \mathcal{U} while a single user is denoted by u_i . We use the set $u_i.f$ to represent all u_i ’s friends. Therefore, when two users u_i and u_j are friends, we have both $u_i \in u_j.f$ and $u_j \in u_i.f$. We define a community of a user as a subset of his friends, and use $u_i.c_x$ to represent u_i ’s community x (i.e., $u_i.c_x \subseteq u_i.f$). Meanwhile, $u_i.c$ represents all the communities of u_i , i.e., $u_i.c$ is a set of sets and we have $u_i.c_x \in u_i.c$. Every friend of a user is assigned with a community, the union of all the communities is the set of all friends. Moreover, we only consider non-overlap communities in this paper,² namely, $u_i.c_x \cap u_i.c_y = \emptyset$.

The set \mathcal{L} contains all the locations. We use ℓ_a to denote a location and it corresponds to a pair of latitude and longitude. We use $\ell_a.ci$ to denote all the check-ins of a location ℓ_a and $\ell_a.u$ to denote all the users who have ever checked in at ℓ_a . The event u_i checks in at ℓ_a can be represented as a tuple $\langle u_i, t, \ell_a \rangle$ where t is the time of the check-in. Set $u_i.loc$ contains all the locations u_i has visited. Without ambiguity, we use a user’s check-in and location interchangeably in the following discussion. We also perform clustering operations on locations, $ct(u_i)$ denotes the set of cluster centers. Function $d(\ell_a, \ell_b)$ represents the distance between ℓ_a and ℓ_b . When $L \subseteq \mathcal{L}$ is a set of places, $d(\ell_a, L)$ returns a set of distance between ℓ_a and each location contained in L .

2.2 The dataset

²This assumption is not crucial to our approach and our results can be extended for overlap communities.

We use the dataset [7] collected from Gowalla to conduct our analysis. The dataset was collected from February 4th, 2009 to October 23rd, 2010. There are in total 6,442,892 check-ins. Besides location information, the dataset also includes the corresponding social data which contains around 1.9 million users and 9.5 million edges.

In this work, we mainly focus on the check-in data in four metropolises in US, including New York, Los Angeles (L.A.), Bay Area and Dallas-Fort Worth (Dallas). They are among the areas with most check-ins in the dataset. We also notice that the data are not uniformly distributed in time. Therefore, we only consider the data after March 1st, 2010 from when large quantity of check-ins appear. Table 1 summarizes the data in the four metropolises.

Table 1: Dataset summary.

	New York	L.A.	Bay Area	Dallas
# of users	6,987	6,429	7,734	6,713
Avg.# of friends	22.1	21.2	31.4	18.1
# of check-ins	148,381	176,737	243,149	219,876
Avg.# of check-ins	21.2	27.5	31.4	32.8

3. COMMUNITY


We first show how to detect communities on online social graphs in Sect. 3.1 and then we propose a new notion to characterize users’ social diversity in Sect. 3.2.

3.1 Community detection in social networks

Community detection in networks (or graphs) has been extensively studied for the past decade (e.g., see [21, 2, 14, 24, 19, 29, 28, 18, 30]). It has important applications in many fields, including physics, biology, sociology as well as computer science. The principle behind community detection is to partition nodes of a large graph into groups following certain metrics on the graph structure [14]. In the context of social networks, besides social graph, each user is also affiliated with attributes. These information can also be used to detect communities (e.g., see [19, 29]). For example, people who graduate from the same university can be considered as a community. Since the dataset we use only contains a social graph and no personal information are provided, we apply the algorithms that are based on information encoded in graph structure to detect communities.


According to [14], among all the community detection algorithms, InfoMap [24] has the best performance under certain metrics on undirected and unweighted graphs which is exactly the same as our social graph. Moreover, it provides parameters to adjust the number of resulting communities. This outperforms other algorithms, such as the Louvain method [2] which suffers from capturing small communities in large networks. To detect communities of u_i , first we find all his friends as well as all the links among them. Then, we delete u_i and all edges linked to him from the graph. This may generate some single nodes, i.e., nodes only linked with u_i but not with any others. We put each of such nodes into an independent community, named *singleton community*. Then, we apply InfoMap algorithm with suitable parameters to the remaining part of the graph.

Fig. 1 presents the detected communities of users 521 and 727. Each community is marked with a different color. The algorithm finds 6 communities for u_{521} who has 15 friends.



(a) u_{521} (15 friends) (b) u_{727} (50 friends)

Figure 1: Communities of users 521 and 727.



(a) Community number (b) Community size

Figure 2: Distribution of users w.r.t the number of communities and distribution of communities w.r.t their size.

Among all these 6 communities, three of them are singletons, i.e., only containing either u_{34740} , u_{34726} or u_{34737} (the three communities on top of Fig. 1a). Similarly, we detect 9 communities for u_{727} , there are four major communities (marked as red, purple, blue and green), the other five contain one user each (the five outliers in Fig. 1b).

Table 2: Community summary.

# of users	107,092
# of communities	552,772
Avg.# of communities	5.3
Avg. community size	2.4
# of singletons	302,020

Table 2 lists the summary of community information of all users who have shared their locations in the Gowalla dataset. For all the 107,092 users, totally we detect 552,772 communities. Each user has on average 5.3 communities. Note that the communities contain all users, not just users who have check-ins. Among all communities, around 60% (302,020) are singletons. This shows that users in online social networks may randomly add other users as their friends who are not true friends in their life. We will further study their check-in behaviors in Sect. 4. Due to this fact, the average size of the communities is only 2.4. When we ignore all the singleton communities, the average size of communities becomes 4.6. Fig. 2 plots the distributions of users with respect to their community number, and the distribution of communities with respect to community size (both cases include singleton communities), from which we can see that both of them follow the power law: most of the users have small number of communities and most of the detected




Figure 3: Distribution of community entropies.




Figure 4: u_{114034} with only one community.

communities are small as well.

3.2 Community entropy

After detecting communities, we are given a new domain of attributes on users. Among all these attributes, we are particularly interested in how diverse a user's communities are. We motivate this *social diversity* through an example. Suppose a user is engaged in many communities, such as colleagues at work, family members, college friends, chess club, basketball team, etc. Then, he is considered an active society member. Users of this kind are always involving in different social scenarios or environments. Therefore, his daily behaviors are largely dependent on his social relations.

Although we do not have the semantics of each of our detected communities, such as the aforementioned colleagues at work or chess club, we can still use the information encoded in the graph to define a user's social diversity. For instance, for a user with several communities whose sizes are more or less the same, his social diversity is for sure higher than the one with only one community.

To quantify the social community diversity of a user, we introduce the notion of *community entropy*.

Definition 1. For a user u_i , his *community entropy* is defined as

$$coment(u_i) = \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \log \sum_{u_i \cdot c_x} \left(\frac{|u_i \cdot c_x|}{|u_i \cdot f|} \right)^\alpha.$$

The community entropy is actually a Rényi entropy. Here, α is called the order of diversity. It can control the impact of community size on the value which gives us more flexibility to distinguish users when focusing on the sizes of their communities. In simple terms, our community entropy,

- when $\alpha > 1$, values more on larger communities;
- when $\alpha < 1$, values more on smaller communities;
- when $\alpha = 1$, is the Shannon entropy.

In general, if a user has many communities with sizes equally distributed, then his community entropy is high indicating that his social relations are highly diverse. We fix α as 10 in the following discussions.

Fig. 3 shows the histogram of community entropies of all users who have ever shared their locations in the dataset. There are totally 32,276 users whose community entropies are zero (around 30% of all users), this means that their friends are grouped into one community. In fact, the average number of friends for these 32,276 users is only 2.1, and 19,039 of them have only one friend. On the other hand, some user's friends are densely connected which also makes

his community entropy low. Fig. 4 shows an example of this, u_{114034} 's community entropy is zero, but he has 10 friends and there are 41 edges among them (marked in purple).

4. COMMUNITY AND FRIENDS

Friends shouldn't be treated equally regarding their influences on users' mobility in online social networks. There are mainly two reasons. First, not all friends in online social networks are users' real friends, such fake friends do not have (or have little) influence on users' mobility. Second, in many cases, impact from a certain community is stronger than friends on users' behaviors including mobility.

In this section, we first analyze fake friends' check-in behaviors. Then we proceed with quantifying community impact and compare it with friends impact. In the end, we focus on what types of users are influenced more by his communities than by his friends. Note that we only focus on users who have at least 10 check-ins in the metropolises, and their friends should have check-ins as well. This gives us 1,230 users for New York, 1,445 for L.A., 2,187 for Bay Area and 1,954 for Dallas.

4.1 Singleton communities

In online social networks, there are mainly two reasons for the existence of fake friends. First, some users treat online links as a capital and they try to add as many friends as possible to become powerful in the online world [12]. Second, some users intend to threaten target's privacy by adding his friends into their social networks [17]. For a normal user, the above mentioned users linked to him are called his fake friends. In this work, for each user we assume his singleton communities containing his fake friends. This is mainly because a user may have several fake friends, but the probability that these fake friends are linked to his other friends is low, i.e., fake friends do not have any common friends with the user which are exactly the singletons detected by our community detection algorithm.

Now, we focus on the behaviors of the singleton communities. First of all, most singletons don't have check-ins at all. Fig. 5 shows the number of singletons with check-ins and the total number of singletons in the four metropolises. As we can see, the differences between the numbers are huge: the ratio of singletons with check-ins over all singletons is only 6.4% for New York, 8.2% for L.A. and 9.2% for Bay Area. The number for Dallas is fairly higher, but is still only 16.2%. Second, for singletons with check-ins, their average friends number as well as average check-in number are much higher than normal users. In Table. 3, the average number of friends of singletons with check-ins is 72.02 for New York while the average number of friends for all users is only 22.1 (see Table. 1). The same cases happen with the other three metropolises. For the average number of check-ins, the gap between singletons and normal users is large as well. For instance, singletons in Dallas have three times more check-ins than normal users in the same metropolis (see Table. 1). We believe that these users are the so-called social capitalists: they have many friends and many check-ins everywhere in the metropolis. Therefore, this type of friends should have little influence on a specific user's mobility.

Note that due to the incompleteness of the social graph, there may be some real friends appearing to be singletons in our dataset. However, in general most of the detected singletons are just users without check-ins and those who have

Table 3: Singleton communities.

Singletons	New York	L.A.	Bay Area	Dallas
Avg.# of friends	72.02	52.72	57.64	34.51
Avg. # of check-ins	74.02	81.58	80.60	94.12




Figure 5: the number of singletons v.s. the number of singletons with check-ins.

check-ins are social capitalists as we have already discussed. In the rest of the paper, we ignore all the singletons when conducting analysis.

4.2 Impact quantification

It has been proved that social factors play an important role on users' mobility, e.g., see [7]. For instance, one may go to lunch with his friends or go to a bar to hangout with his friends. Meanwhile, for a user, friends of his social networks (as well as in real life) are not all equal. Instead friends normally belong to certain communities. When considering a user's mobility, intuitively different communities can have different influence within certain contexts or social environments. Continuing with the above example, the people the user has lunch with are normally his colleagues while the people he hangout with at night are his close friends. Therefore, in order to analyze the impact from a user's social relations on his mobility, it is reasonable to consider his different communities, instead of considering all his friends as a whole and treating them equally.

To verify our intuition, we need to quantify the impact of communities on users' mobility and compare it with the impact of their friends. To quantify such impacts, we choose to use 'distances'. More precisely, we represent the social impact from friends and communities by the distance between a user's frequent movement areas and the frequent movement areas of his friends or communities.

Frequent movement areas. To discover a user's (his friends or communities') frequent movement areas, we first perform clustering on all his (their) locations. Each cluster is then represented by its central point. The algorithm we use is the agglomerative hierarchical clustering algorithm. We regulate that any two clusters can be aligned only if the distance between their corresponding centroids is less than one kilometer which is a reasonable range for human activities. In order to clean outliers of location data, we ignore clusters which contain check-ins less than 0.1% of all check-ins of the user (his friends or community). Then a frequent movement area is represented by its cluster centroid.

Fig. 6 plots a user's (u_{2746}) frequent movement areas in Manhattan, as well as his friends' and his two communities'. First, the clustering algorithm we use captures a user's frequent movement areas quite well. As we can see, u_{2746} 's movement areas (marked as red) are associated with landmarks such as The Museum of Modern Art, NYU, China Town, NoMad, etc. The same applies to his friends (marked




Figure 6: u_{2746} , his friends and his two communities' frequent movement areas in Manhattan.

as blue) and his two communities (marked as cyan and magenta, respectively). Second, we can observe a difference between the two communities' frequent movement areas: community 1 has a movement area near NYU while community 2 doesn't; community 2 has an area near NoMad but community 1 doesn't. This indicates that different communities have their social activities at different areas. The third observation is that the movement areas for communities are different from the ones of friends (e.g., see Lower Manhattan in Fig. 6). This leads to the different strength between friends' impact and communities' impact on user's mobility which we will discuss in more details next.

Friends impact. Given a user and his friends' frequent movement areas, the impact on his mobility from friends are then formulated as 'distance': the average of the distances between each movement area of a user and the corresponding nearest movement area of his friends. Formally, for u_i , the impact he gets from his friends on mobility is defined as

$$im(u_i)^f = \frac{1}{|ct(u_i)|} \sum_{c \in ct(u_i)} \min\{d(c, ct(u_i.f))\},$$

where $im(u_i)^f$ is named the *friends impact* of u_i and $ct(u_i)$ contains all u_i 's movement areas. Suppose that u_i 's locations are partitioned into five movement areas, we compute the smallest distance, expressed by the function $d(\cdot, \cdot)$, between each of them to any movement area of u_i 's friends. Then, $im(u_i)^f$ is simply the mean of these five values.

Community impact. Similarly, we quantify the community impact using a 'distance' as well. As we mentioned before, a user has several communities and a user's mobility can be influenced by different communities. Therefore, this impact is defined as

$$im(u_i)^c = \frac{1}{|ct(u_i)|} \sum_{c \in ct(u_i)} \min\{d(c, \{ct(u_i.c_x) | \forall u_i.c_x \subseteq u_i.c\})\}.$$

Here, $im(u_i)^c$ is the *community impact* and it is the average of all the shortest distances between a user's frequent movement areas and any movement areas from any communities of the user. A smaller distance indicates a stronger impact on mobility. Therefore, given a user's $im(u_i)^f$ and $im(u_i)^c$, if $im(u_i)^f > im(u_i)^c$, then we say that u_i gets more




Figure 7: The numbers of users who get more, less or equal impact from their communities than their friends.

(or stronger) impact on his mobility from his communities than his friends, and vice versa.

Notice that when computing a user's community impact, we mainly focus on those communities whose frequent movement areas are closest to the user's areas. We call such communities, that are actually used in computing a user's community impact, as the user's *influential communities*. Influential communities are considered as communities that actually give impact on users' mobility, we will analyze them in more detail in Sect. 5.

4.3 Impact comparison


We extract the friends and community impacts on users' mobility in the four metropolises. Fig. 7 depicts the number of users who get more influence from communities, i.e., $im(u_i)^c < im(u_i)^f$ (marked as blue), same influence from both sides (marked as red) or more influence from friends (marked as cyan). From Fig. 7, for the four metropolises, the number of users of the first case is much bigger than the number of users of the third case. In New York, Bay Area and Dallas, almost twice users get more impact from communities than friends while the gap in L.A. is smaller (445 vs. 321). In fact, in New York and L.A. more users have the similar friends and community impacts while in Bay Area and Dallas more users are influenced by their communities. In the example in Fig. 6, u_{2746} 's frequent movement areas near NYU, civic center as well as Midtown are closer to his communities' movement areas than his friends', while the ones near The Museum of Modern Art and NoMad get a same impact from friends and communities, i.e., the nearest friends and communities' movement areas are identical.

The reason for community impact being different from friends impact in general can be explained as follows. After partitioning friends into communities, check-ins of all friends are separated as well. This can be considered as categorizing friends' check-ins at the community level or a "clustering" process driven by community detection before the hierarchical clustering algorithm. Then, after this "two-level" clustering, users' community impact become different from friends impact. Such difference is solely caused by community partition. The results in Fig. 7 showing that community impact is often stronger than friends impact confirm our intuition stated in the beginning of this section.

4.4 Community impact vs. community entropy

Intuitively, if a user's communities are more diverse (as described by community entropy), then he is more easily influenced by his social relations, in terms of communities. Given the fact that a user's community impact on mobility is stronger than friends impact in general, we look into their connection in this section.

Fig. 8a plots the percentage of users whose community impact is stronger than their friends impact among all users in



(a) Users getting more impact from communities than friends (b) Difference of friends impact and community impact

Figure 8: Community impact with community entropy.

the four metropolises, as a function of community entropies (bigger than certain values). Fig. 8a shows that with the increase of community entropy, the percentage increases as well, which indicates that higher a user’s community entropy is, more chances his community impact is stronger than his friends impact. Besides that, we also look into the actual differences between community and friends impact. We plot the average difference between friends impact and community impact, i.e., $\frac{1}{|U|} \sum_{u_i \in U} im(u_i)^f - im(u_i)^c$, as a function of community entropy. Fig. 8b shows that the difference between the two impacts also grows with the increase of community entropies, which indicates that higher a user’s community entropy is, stronger his community impact is (than his friends impact).


5. COMMUNITY AND MOBILITY

After demonstrating communities’ influences on users’ mobility are stronger than friends’, we study the characteristics of the influential communities that are used to compute community impact. There are two intuitions: (1) A user’s daily activities are constrained, and the communities that users interact are limited. (2) Communities influence a user’s social behavior under different contexts.

5.1 Number of influential communities

Research shows that a user’s mobility is constrained geographically (see [6, 7]), e.g., a user normally travels in or around the city he lives in. Meanwhile, social relations are not restricted by geographic constrains. For instance, a user’s college friends form a community and this community can spread all over the world. Now we focus on how many communities can actually influence a user’s mobility. Intuitively, this number should be small as each user’s activities are only influenced by a limited number of his communities in his daily life. To verify this, we plot the distribution of the number of user’s influential communities in the four metropolises in Fig. 9a, and the distribution follows the power law, indicating most of users are influenced only by a small number of communities.

We proceed with studying how many friends are actually contained in each user’s influential communities. For each user, we compute the ratio of the sum of his influential communities’ sizes over his friends’ size. Fig. 9b plots the average ratio of all users as a function of friends number. In general, influential communities contain about half of users’ friends (the starting point of the four lines in Fig. 9b). The ratio in Dallas is higher, around 70%, than the other three areas whose ratios are around 50%. This result is a bit biased as a



(a) Distribution of the number of influential communities (b) Ratio of friends in influential communities

Figure 9: Influential communities and friends.

lot of users only have one friend, or one community. Then, with the increase of the number of friends, the ratio goes down linearly (see Fig. 9b). For users who have more than 50 friends, their influential communities only take a small part of their friends, i.e., 30% for New York and L.A., 40% for Bay Area and 50% for Dallas.


From the above analysis, we conclude that only a small number of communities have influence on users’ mobility and also these influential communities contain a relatively small parts of users’ friends.

5.2 Influential communities under contexts

Influential communities are constrained by contexts. For instance, a user has lunch with his colleagues and spends time with his family near where he lives. Here, the lunch hour and the home location can be considered as contexts, and the two communities (colleague and family) have impact on the user’s behavior under each of the context, respectively. Thus it is interesting to study whether this assumption holds generally.

Temporal contexts. First, we focus on temporal contexts. The first pair of contexts we choose are lunch (11am–1pm) and dinner (7pm–9pm) hours on weekdays. We first perform clustering to find users’ frequent movement areas during lunch and dinner, respectively. Then, we find the influential communities for users with respect to these two contexts. In the end, we count the number of distinct as well as common influential communities for each user. Fig. 10a shows the accumulated result above all users. As we can see, the number of different influential communities (marked as red) is about twice the commonly used ones (marked as blue), indicating that the influential communities of users during lunch and dinner time are indeed quite different. This simply reflects the fact that the people that users have lunch and dinner with are different. We also choose another pair of contexts, i.e., working hours (9am–6pm) and nightlife (10pm–6am) on weekdays. From Fig. 10b, we have a similar observation. Actually, the differences in the four metropolises are even bigger than the previous case.

Spatial contexts. Next we study the influence of spatial contexts. In each of the four metropolises, we pick two disjoint areas including Uptown and Downtown Manhattan, Downtown L.A. and Hollywood, San Francisco and Oakland, Downtown Dallas and Downtown Fort Worth. Then, we find frequent movement areas for users in these areas. We collect the number of distinct and common influential communities. Fig. 10c depicts the results in all four location pairs, again the number of common and distinct influential



(a) Lunch vs. dinner (temporal) (b) Working hours vs. nightlife (temporal) (c) Different areas (spatial)
 Figure 10: The number of common and distinct influential communities under temporal or spatial contexts.

communities are quite different, meaning that the influential communities are constrained by spatial contexts as well. Note that we choose the sub areas randomly, not with a special semantics in mind, e.g., business areas or living areas.

From the above analysis, we conclude that community impact is constrained under spatial and temporal contexts.

6. LOCATION PREDICTION

Location prediction can drive compelling applications including location recommendation and targeted advertising. On the other hand, it may also threaten users' privacy [27]. Following the previous analysis, we continue to investigate whether it is possible to use community information to effectively predict users' locations, using machine learning techniques. More precisely, the question we want to answer is: given a user's community information, whether he will check in at a certain place in the future or not. As shown in Sect. 4, the community impact is stronger than friends impact, thus we are also interested in whether the location predictor based on community information has better performance than the one based on friends. Having these two questions in mind, we build two location predictors based on community and friends information, respectively. Note that, besides social impacts, there are other non-social factors can be used to predict a user's location, such as time and location itself, which we also consider.


We first list all the features in the community-based location prediction model. Then, we present the friends-based predictor. Experimental results are described in the end.

6.1 Community-based location predictor

Community related features. We use the following features that are related to communities.

- Distance between communities and a location. We choose the shortest distance between the location and all of the user's communities' frequent movement areas. Thus, for the given location we select one community which is closest to it.
- Community size. Number of the user's friends in the community chosen above.
- Number of the community's frequent movement areas.
- Community's total number of check-ins.
- Community connectivity. This is the ratio between the number of edges in the community and the maximal number of possible edges.

Time. Check-ins are related to time as well. Fig. 11a (Fig. 11b) plots the total number of check-ins in the dataset in a daily (weekly) scale. The point marked in red depicts the rush hour of the day. In our model, we mainly consider four time-related features, including time entropy, day entropy, total numbers of check-ins at the time and the day (i.e., Monday to Sunday). The time and day entropies are



(a) Daily (b) Weekly
 Figure 11: Check-in time.

both Shannon entropy. Here, instead of using the exact time, we set up a two-hour range, i.e., one hour earlier and one hour later than the check-in time. For example, the total number of check-ins at 7:50 in the morning is the number of all check-ins performed during 6:50 and 8:50.

Location. The location related feature we consider is the popularity of the location. For example, a user doesn't need his friends' or communities' recommendation to visit a popular place such as Empire State Building or Hollywood. This means that the check-ins at a popular place should have less influence from social impacts. Location entropy (first proposed in [9]) is the standard way to measure the popularity of a location. Formally, it is

$$locent(\ell_a) = - \sum_{u_i \in \ell_a.u} \frac{|u_i.\ell_a|}{|\ell_a.ci|} \log\left(\frac{|u_i.\ell_a|}{|\ell_a.ci|}\right),$$

where $locent(\ell_a)$ is called the *location entropy* of ℓ_a . Similar to our community entropy, higher a location's entropy is, more popular it is. Fig. 12 depicts the heat map of the four metropolises with respect to location entropy. In all four maps, the hot or bright areas are the centers or landmarks of the metropolises, such as Manhattan, Hollywood, downtown San Francisco and Dallas. In previous works, location entropy is mainly used to infer friendships in LBSNs [9]. To the best of knowledge, we are the first to incorporate it into location prediction.

6.2 Friends-based location predictor

The time and location related features of this model are exactly the same as the ones for community-based model. We only replace the community related features with the following friends related ones.

- Distance between friends and a location. It is the distance between the location and the nearest movement area of the user's friends.
- Number of friends of the user.
- Number of friends' frequent movement areas.
- Friends' total number of check-ins.
- Friends connectivity.




Figure 12: Heat map of the four metropolises.

6.3 Experiment setup

We split the dataset into two time ranges. The one from March 1st to September 25th is used to extract information such as location entropy and a user’s community or friends’ frequent movement areas. The data from September 26th to October 23rd are used for location prediction.

Another restriction that we impose is that users have to *live* in the area, i.e., we only predict the location of the city *inhabitants* not *tourists*. As no ground truth is provided for users’ home location in the dataset, several ways have been proposed to address this problem (see [6, 7]). Here, we use a simple one: the user who lives in an area has to check-in the area for at least 50 times in the last one month. This leaves us 12,573 check-ins for New York, 16,352 for L.A., 17,720 for Bay Area and 28,871 for Dallas.

We partition the four metropolises into 0.01×0.01 degree latitude and longitude cells, a user is said to be in a cell if he checked in at any place belonging to the cell. We construct a balanced dataset for each metropolis. We exploit the support vector machines (SVM) with Gaussian kernel to perform classification: 70% of the data are used for training and 30% used for test.

6.4 Results

We adopt accuracy and precision-recall to compare the community-based model with the friends-based one.

Accuracy. As shown in Fig. 13, for all users (users with community entropy ≥ 0), the accuracy is fairly reasonable (around 70%) for all the four metropolises. The results from our two prediction models are similar when community entropy is small. With the increase of community entropy, the accuracy grows faster for the community-based model which means the predictor works better for users with high community entropies. This validates our observation in Sect. 4 that users with high social diversities get more impacts from their communities than friends. Especially, in New York and Dallas the accuracy is more than 80% when community entropies are larger than 1.5. We can conclude that community information can be explored to achieve promising location predictions, especially for those users with high community entropies, and the predictor using community information’s performance is better the one using friends information.

Precision-recall. Fig. 14 summarizes the precision-recall results for users with community entropies higher than 1.0. The posterior probability of SVM is calculated by the Platt’s method [23]. First, our location predictor based on community data performs better than the one based on friends’ information in the four metropolises. Second, the community-based model’s performance itself is promising. In L.A., at

recall 60%, the precision can still be almost 80%. The result in Dallas and Bay Area are similar. The predictor in New York has the best performance, it can achieve 85% precision with recall around 80%.

Difference between cities. For both metrics, we observe that the models’ performance are different in the four metropolises. New York has the best performance in terms of both accuracy and precision-recall, with Dallas being the second. Meanwhile, the difference between our two models is small in L.A.. The reason could be due to the density of the metropolis (e.g., New York’s population density is higher than the other three), or the adoption of Gowalla by users in the four metropolises. In the dataset, users in western US have more check-ins than the ones in eastern. We leave the investigation as a future work.

6.5 Other strategies to choose community

So far, we have shown that exploring community information is more effective in location prediction than friends information. The community we choose is the one that has the closest frequent movement area to the target location. This involves collecting check-ins from all users’ friends and clustering them community by community. We would like to know if other strategies to choose community that can achieve similar results. We consider three strategies including choosing the community with most users (**max-size**), the community with highest connectivity (**max-con**) and random community (**random**). We plot these strategies’s performance on the data of New York in Fig. 15. Our original strategy outperforms these three. For these three strategies, **max-size** performs better than the other two, but it is still relatively worse than our original strategy to choose community. This again validates our observation in Sect. 5 that influential communities are constrained by contexts (spatially or temporally), in other words one community cannot influence every location of the user.

7. RELATED WORK

Since LBSNs become available, mobility as well as its connection with social relations have been intensively studied [6, 26, 11]. There are mainly two directions of research going on in the area. One direction is to use the location information to predict friendships, see e.g. [15, 9, 8, 4, 25, 22], the other studies the impact from friendships on locations [1, 4, 7, 25, 20] which is what we focus on in the current work.

Backstrom, Sun and Marlow [1] study the friendship and location using the Facebook data with user-specified home addresses. They find out that the friendship probability as a function of home distances follows a power law, i.e., most




Figure 13: Prediction accuracy for users in the four metropolises.




Figure 14: Precision-recall curves for users with community entropy ≥ 1.0 .




Figure 15: Performance of different strategies.

of friends tend to live closely. They also build a model to predict users' home location based on their friends' home. Their model outperforms the predictor based on IP addresses. The authors of [4] use the Facebook place data to study check-in behaviors and friendships. They train a logistic model to predict users' locations. Besides that, they also investigate how users respond to their friends' check-in and use the location data to predict friendships. Cho, Myers and Leskovec [7] investigate the mobility patterns based on the location data from Gowalla, Brightkite as well as data from a cellphone company. Based on their observation, they build a dynamic Gaussian mixture model for human mobility involving temporal, spatial and social relations features. Sadilek, Kautz and Bigham [25] propose a system for both location and friendship prediction. For location prediction, they use dynamic Bayesian networks to model friends' locations (unsupervised case) and predict a sequence of locations of users over a given period of time. McGee, Caverlee and Cheng [20] introduce the notion of social strength based on their observation from the geo-tagged twitter data and incorporate it into the model to predict users' home locations, and their model outperforms the one of [1].

The main difference between previous works and ours is the way of treating friends. We consider users' friends at a community level while most of them treat them the same (except for the paper [20] which introduce 'social strength', which is based on common features but not on communities). Moreover, like the unsupervised algorithm in [25], our location predictor doesn't need any user's own information but his friends'. Our predictor's performance in terms of accuracy is quite good, especially for users' with high community entropies. Other minor differences include the prediction target: we want to predict users' certain location not their home [1, 20] or a dynamic sequences of locations [25].

8. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

In this paper, we have studied the community impact on user's mobility. Analysis leads us to several important conclusions: (1) communities have a stronger impact than friends on users in general and especially on the ones with high social diversities; (2) the communities which influence a user's mobility only take a small part of all his friends; and (3) different communities have influences on mobility under different spatial and temporal contexts. Based on these, we use machine learning techniques to predict users' future locations focusing on community information. The experimental results on a real-life dataset are consistent with our analysis and show that our prediction model is very effective. The scripts for conducting the analysis and experiments are available at <http://satoss.uni.lu/yang/communities.zip>.

In the future, we plan to extend our work in several directions. First, we would like to conduct the analysis of community impact on other behaviors such as interests adoption. Second, considering the different results for location prediction in the metropolises we will investigate their different characteristics. Third, so far we only focus on the impact from community on mobility, we also would like to perform community detection based on users' check-in behaviors.

9. REFERENCES

- [1] BACKSTROM, L., SUN, E., AND MARLOW, C. Find me if you can: improving geographical prediction with social and spatial proximity. In *Proc. 19th International Conference on World Wide Web (WWW)* (2010), ACM, pp. 61–70.
- [2] BLONDEL, V. D., GUILLAUME, J.-L., LAMBIOTTE, R., AND LEFEBVRE, E. Fast unfolding of communities in large networks. *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment* 2008, 10 (2008), P10008.
- [3] CASTLES, S., MILLER, M. J., AND AMMENDOLA, G. *The Age of Migration: International Population Movements in the Modern World*. Taylor & Francis, 2005.
- [4] CHANG, J., AND SUN, E. Location³: How users share and respond to location-based data on social networking sites. In *Proc. 5th AAAI Conference on Weblogs and Social Media (ICWSM)* (2011), The AAAI Press, pp. 74–80.
- [5] CHEN, X., PANG, J., AND XUE, R. Constructing and comparing user mobility profiles. *ACM Transactions on the Web* (2014). Accepted.
- [6] CHENG, Z., CAVERLEE, J., LEE, K., AND SUI, D. Z. Exploring millions of footprints in location sharing services. In *Proc. 5th AAAI Conference on Weblogs and Social Media (ICWSM)* (2011), The AAAI Press, pp. 81–88.
- [7] CHO, E., MYERS, S. A., AND LESKOVEC, J. Friendship and mobility: user movement in location-based social networks. In *Proc. 17th ACM Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining (KDD)* (2011), ACM, pp. 1082–1090.
- [8] CRANDALL, D. J., BACKSTROM, L., COSLEY, D., SURI, S., HUTTENLOCHER, D., AND KLEINBERG, J. Inferring social ties from geographic coincidences. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 107, 52 (2010), 22436–22441.
- [9] CRANSHAW, J., TOCH, E., HONE, J., KITTUR, A., AND SADEH, N. Bridging the gap between physical location and online social networks. In *Proc. 12th ACM International Conference on Ubiquitous Computing (UbiComp)* (2010), ACM, pp. 119–128.
- [10] GAO, H., TANG, J., HU, X., AND LIU, H. Exploring temporal effects for location recommendation on location-based social networks. In *Proc. 7th ACM Conference on Recommender Systems (RecSys)* (2013), ACM, pp. 93–100.
- [11] GAO, H., TANG, J., AND LIU, H. Exploring social-historical ties on location-based social networks. In *Proc. 6th AAAI Conference on Weblogs and Social Media (ICWSM)* (2012), The AAAI Press, pp. 114–121.
- [12] GHOSH, S., VISWANATHAND, B., KOOTIAND, F., SHARMA, N. K., KORLAM, G., BENEVENUTO, F., GANGULY, N., AND GUMMADI, K. P. Understanding and combating link farming in the twitter social network. In *Proc. 21st International Conference on World Wide Web (WWW)* (2012), ACM, pp. 61–70.
- [13] GONZALEZ, M. C., HIDALGO, C. A., AND BARABASI, A.-L. Understanding individual human mobility patterns. *Nature* 453, 7196 (2008), 779–782.
- [14] LANCICHINETTI, A., AND FORTUNATO, S. Community detection algorithms: a comparative analysis. *CoRR abs/0908.1062* (2010).
- [15] LI, Q., ZHENG, Y., XIE, X., CHEN, Y., LIU, W., AND MA, W.-Y. Mining user similarity based on location history. In *Proc. 16th ACM SIGSPATIAL international conference on Advances in geographic information systems (GIS)* (2008), ACM, p. No.34.
- [16] LIU, B., AND XIONG, H. Point-of-interest recommendation in location based social networks with topic and location awareness. In *Proc. 13th SIAM International Conference on Data Mining (SDM)* (2013), SIAM, pp. 396–404.
- [17] M. BOYD, D., AND ELLISON, N. B. Social network sites: Definition, history, and scholarship. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* 13, 1 (2007), 210–230.
- [18] MARTELOT, E. L., AND HANKIN, C. Fast multi-scale detection of relevant communities in large-scale networks. *The Computer Journal* 56, 9 (2013), 1136–1150.
- [19] MCAULEY, J. J., AND LESKOVEC, J. Learning to discover social circles in ego networks. In *Proc. 26th Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS)* (2012), NIPS, pp. 548–556.
- [20] MCGEE, J., CAVERLEE, J., AND CHENG, Z. Location prediction in social media based on tie strength. In *Proc. 22nd ACM International Conference on Information & Knowledge Management (CIKM)* (2013), ACM, pp. 459–468.
- [21] NEWMAN, M. E. Modularity and community structure in networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 103, 23 (2006), 8577–8582.
- [22] PHAM, H., SHAHABI, C., AND LIU, Y. EBM: an entropy-based model to infer social strength from spatiotemporal data. In *Proc. 2013 ACM International Conference on Management of Data (SIGMOD)* (2013), ACM, pp. 265–276.
- [23] PLATT, J. Probabilistic outputs for support vector machines and comparisons to regularized likelihood methods. In *Advances in Large Margin Classifiers* (2000), MIT Press, pp. 61–74.
- [24] ROSVALL, M., AND BERGSTROM, C. T. Multilevel compression of random walks on networks reveals hierarchical organization in large integrated systems. *PLoS ONE* 6, 4 (2011), e18209.
- [25] SADILEK, A., KAUTZ, H., AND BIGHAM, J. P. Finding your friends and following them to where you are. In *Proc. 5th ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining (WSDM)* (2012), ACM, pp. 459–468.
- [26] SCCELLATO, S., NOULAS, A., LAMBIOTTE, R., AND MASCOLO, C. Socio-spatial properties of online location-based social networks. In *Proc. 5th AAAI Conference on Weblogs and Social Media (ICWSM)* (2011), The AAAI Press, pp. 329–336.
- [27] SHOKRI, R., THEODORAKOPOULOS, G., BOUDEC, J.-Y. L., AND HUBAUX, J.-P. Quantifying location privacy. In *Proc. 32nd IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (S&P)* (2011), IEEE CS.
- [28] YANG, J., AND LESKOVEC, J. Overlapping community detection at scale: a nonnegative matrix factorization approach. In *Proc. 6th ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining (WSDM)* (2013), ACM, pp. 587–596.
- [29] YANG, J., MCAULEY, J. J., AND LESKOVEC, J. Community detection in networks with node attributes. In *Proc. 13th IEEE International Conference on Data Mining (ICDM)* (2013), IEEE CS, pp. 1151–1156.
- [30] YANG, J., MCAULEY, J. J., AND LESKOVEC, J. Detecting cohesive and 2-mode communities in directed and undirected networks. In *Proc. 7th ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining (WSDM)* (2014), ACM, pp. 323–332.
- [31] ZHENG, V. W., ZHENG, Y., XIE, X., AND YANG, Q. Collaborative location and activity recommendations with GPS history data. In *Proc. 19th International Conference on World Wide Web (WWW)* (2010), ACM, pp. 1029–1038.
- [32] ZHENG, Y., LIU, F., AND HSIEH, H.-P. U-air: when urban air quality inference meets big data. In *Proc. 19th ACM Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining (KDD)* (2013), ACM, pp. 1436–1444.
- [33] ZHENG, Y., ZHANG, L., MA, Z., XIE, X., AND MA, W.-Y. Recommending friends and locations based on individual location history. *ACM Transactions on the Web* 5, 1 (2011).
- [34] ZHENG, Y., ZHANG, L., XIE, X., AND MA, W.-Y. Mining interesting locations and travel sequences from GPS trajectories. In *Proc. 18th International Conference on World Wide Web (WWW)* (2009), ACM, pp. 791–800.