

Repositório ISCTE-IUL

Deposited in *Repositório ISCTE-IUL*:

2024-09-09

Deposited version:

Accepted Version

Peer-review status of attached file:

Peer-reviewed

Citation for published item:

Brochado, A. & Rita, P. (2018). Exploring heterogeneity among backpackers in hostels. *Current Issues in Tourism*. 21 (13), 1502-1520

Further information on publisher's website:

10.1080/13683500.2016.1252728

Publisher's copyright statement:

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: Brochado, A. & Rita, P. (2018). Exploring heterogeneity among backpackers in hostels. *Current Issues in Tourism*. 21 (13), 1502-1520, which has been published in final form at <https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2016.1252728>. This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with the Publisher's Terms and Conditions for self-archiving.

Use policy

Creative Commons CC BY 4.0

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a link is made to the metadata record in the Repository
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Exploring heterogeneity among backpackers in hostels

Ana Brochado & Paulo Rita (2018)
Exploring heterogeneity among
backpackers in hostels, *Current Issues
in Tourism*, 21:13, 1502-1520, DOI:
[10.1080/13683500.2016.1252728](https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2016.1252728)

ABSTRACT

This study's goal was to validate the core dimensions of hostel service quality and to test whether each dimension has a different impact on behavioural intentions across guest segments defined by age, gender and nationality. This research targeted guests staying at Lisbon hostels ($N = 313$). Both covariance-based structural equation modelling (SEM) and variance-based SEM were used to meet this study's exploratory and confirmatory objectives. The results confirm that service quality in this sector is a multidimensional construct comprising four core dimensions: quality of staff, social atmosphere, hostel tangibles and city connection. These four aspects are relevant when explaining levels of satisfaction, recommendation and revisiting intentions. Moreover, these dimensions allow the identification of differences across market segments in regards to responses to marketing outcomes, thus providing useful insights into how best to meet guests' needs.

Keywords: backpackers hostel; hostel industry; demographic market segmentation; service quality

1. Introduction

Hostels are formatted to fit the youth market, constituting a hybrid product that combines accommodation services with an informal, friendly atmosphere. Because of the rapid growth of this type of accommodation around the world, hostel guests are now considered an important market segment to target (Musa & Thirumoorthi, 2011). Moreover, clusters of niche tourism products targeting youth tourists and encompassing hostel networks can improve the competitiveness of mature destinations (Gardiner & Scott, 2014).

According to Brochado, Gameiro, and Rita (2015), the likelihood to return and willingness to recommend hostels depend on perceived service quality. Therefore, hostel managers need to understand properly their guests' most important features when evaluating their hostels' performance. Nevertheless, researchers have paid limited attention to service quality in this type of accommodation (Musa & Thirumoorthi, 2011), as compared to the tourism industry's other segments. Only a few academic studies have attempted to assess the service quality hostels provide their guests (e.g. Brochado et al., 2015; Chitty, Ward, & Chua, 2007; Hecht & Martin, 2006; Musa & Thirumoorthi, 2011; Nash, Thyne, & Davies, 2006). In particular, social atmosphere appears as a specific dimension of service quality for this type of accommodation (Brochado et al., 2015). Given hostel businesses' rapid growth, increased levels of competition and heterogeneity of guests, hostels are facing new challenges in managing their guests' experiences and heterogeneity.

Crawford-Welsch (1990) and Dolnicar (2002) maintain that coping with market segmentation is important in tourism, and Marques and Reis's (2015) recent work highlights the effect of heterogeneity on tourism-related constructs, emphasising that tourism researchers need take this aspect into consideration. In service quality research, each dimension might contribute different impacts, producing varied outcomes such as behavioural intentions and overall service quality and satisfaction (Bujisic, Hutchinson, & Parsa, 2014; Ladhari, 2012). Although previous studies have reported that contexts of studies play an important role in determining the predictive power of each service quality dimension, studying whether the pattern of these aspects' relationships varies across market segments is still an under-researched area (Marques & Reis, 2015).

The present study's objectives were to (1) confirm the main dimensions of backpackers hostels' perceived service quality, (2) determine the relative impact of these dimensions on overall service quality, satisfaction, likelihood to return and recommend hostels and (3) test for heterogeneity of responses in different ex ante segments of hostel guests. This paper is structured as follows. The next section provides a brief literature review regarding backpackers' profile, service quality in the hospitality industry and service quality studies conducted in hostels. The third section describes the research methods used. Next, the results are presented, namely, the underlying dimensions of hostel service quality and the findings regarding heterogeneous responses. The last section discusses these findings' implications.

2. Background

2.1. *Backpacking and backpackers' hostels*

Backpacker travel has clearly existed for decades. However, the ideas behind the backpacker travel mode have changed over time (Musa & Thirumoorthi, 2011). In the 1960s, backpackers were mainly associated with 'hippies' and 'drifters' (Hampton, 1998). In the 1970s, backpackers became long-term budget travellers, but, since the 1990s, the term 'backpacker' has been accepted by both tourism researchers and the tourism industry as characterising contemporary youth tourism.

On a semantic level, a backpacker is merely a traveller who carries a backpack on his or her back. However, defining contemporary backpackers is not a simple task. According to Pearce (1990), backpackers are not easily distinguishable demographically or economically. Rather, they need to be characterised in social terms. Previous studies have attempted to define the profile of backpackers. These studies generally describe backpackers as young tourists, aged between 15 and 29 years old, who look for budget and low-cost accommodation options (Hecht & Martin, 2006). They have a high propensity to spend money on locally owned services and facilities, stay for longer rather than briefer vacations, self-organise their travel plans (Hecht & Martin, 2006; Scheyvens, 2002; Westerhausen & Macbeth, 2003) and often journey to multiple destinations (Sorensen, 2003).

Backpackers look for aid in guidebooks, maps and the Internet (Nash et al., 2006). Backpackers are socially active and they enjoy meeting other people, prefer informal and participatory recreational activities and look for memorable experiences (Loker-Murphy & Pearce, 1995; Nash et al., 2006; Pearce, 1990; Thyne, Davies, & Nash, 2005). Backpackers are less motivated by the need for luxury and relaxation than mainstream tourists (Larsen, Ogaard, & Brun, 2011). The destination itself is not, most of the time, backpackers' main motivation for travelling (Hecht & Martin, 2006). They tend to make new friends, enjoy meeting fellow travellers and locals, share experiences, want to improve their

knowledge, welcome experiences of new cultures and environments, seek personal development and a sense of discovery (Leslie & Wilson, 2006).

Backpacking has become more about travelling choices than about age or income, although the choice of budget accommodations (e.g. hostels, campsites and guesthouses) is a still major criterion in defining backpackers (Loker-Murphy & Pearce, 1995; Pearce, Murphy, & Brymer, 2009). Hostels are backpackers' most typical choice of accommodation (Hecht & Martin, 2006; Larsen et al., 2011; Loker-Murphy, 1996; Murphy, 2001). Because of the growing network of hostels, the popularity of low-cost airlines and the relative ease of international travel, hostel backpacking is now considered a global, cultural, economic and social phenomenon (Thyne et al., 2005). Hostels also serve as meeting places, offering backpackers multiple opportunities to interact with other like-minded travellers (Murphy, 2001). The emphasis backpackers put on meeting other people is reflected in their need to interact with fellow travellers – either on the road or in places where they stay – and to immerse themselves in local communities.

Therefore, the backpacker market nowadays includes more than just young and budget-conscious tourists (Reisinger & Mavondo, 2002). This preconception of backpackers is being challenged by 'Peter Pan' travellers looking for opportunities to live a second youth (Loker-Murphy & Pearce, 1995). As a result, a 'backpacker-plus' market has also emerged (Hampton, 1998; Musa & Thirumoorthi, 2011), comprising well-educated travellers with clear intentions to escape and then return to their 'normal life'. Paris (2012) discusses the emergence of the 'flashpacker' subculture, which encompasses backpackers who are generally older, have more disposable income and frequently use communications technology and mobile devices. At the same time, hostels are rolling out features expected in hotels. When travellers think of hostels, they are likely to conjure up images of shared dorm rooms, noisy late-night parties, quirky design features, varied activities and funky communal areas. However, some hostels are going upscale and offering extras such as bar offers, en suite bathrooms, private rooms and washrooms, safe storage facilities and restaurant and dining areas.

The studies by Loker-Murphy (1996), Ryan and Mohsin (2001) and Thyne et al. (2005) provide a travel lifestyle segmentation of backpackers. For instance, Thyne et al. (2005) identify five market segments: 'typical backpackers', 'discoverers', 'outdoors', 'family ties' and 'routine travellers'. The literature on backpackers' hostels has also recognised this market's heterogeneity, particularly in terms of age, gender and nationality (Brochado & Gameiro, 2013; Hecht & Martin, 2006). Backpackers are clearly not a homogeneous group, and the market is shifting to include more diverse demographics and motivations (Hindle, Martin, & Nash, 2015). The complexity of the hostel backpacker phenomenon, the specific characteristic of this group of travellers and the potential sources of heterogeneity generate the need to study service quality dimensions in this segment of the accommodation industry.

2.2. Service quality measurement in hostels

The main features of services, such as inseparability, perishability and heterogeneity, have caused some difficulties for researchers with regards to measuring service quality (Parasuraman, Zeithaml, & Berry, 1991). A conceptual model of service quality was proposed by Parasuraman, Zeithaml, and Berry (1985) based on consumer perceptions and addressing comparisons between expectations and performance. This model identified also gaps between the marketer perceptions of service quality and the different tasks associated with the delivery of the service to consumers. In recent decades, researchers have

devoted a considerable amount of effort to developing measures of service quality. Since the introduction of one such measure, SERVQUAL (Parasuraman, Zeithaml, & Berry, 1988), studies have adopted this model to assess service quality in different contexts. SERVQUAL conceptualises service quality as the gap between customers' expectations and perceptions of service quality. It assesses customer perceptions of service quality through a 22-item instrument representing various facets of 5 service quality dimensions, specifically tangibles (4 items), reliability (5), responsiveness (4), assurance (4) and empathy (5). Despite the popularity of this model, several researchers have raised questions regarding its use as a generic measure of service quality, including the ambiguity of its service quality definition and difficulties in the measurement of service expectations. Therefore, SERVPERF (Cronin & Taylor, 1994) proposes measuring service quality based only on perceived quality. Researchers also have suggested that industry-specific measures need to be developed.

The literature provides some evidence that service quality perceptions positively affect positive behavioural intentions (Zeithaml, Berry, & Parasuraman, 1996). These last include customer satisfaction (Cronin & Taylor, 1992, 1994), repurchase intentions, positive things to say about service companies and willingness to recommend the company (Parasuraman et al., 1988). However, each study's context also plays an important role in determining the predictive power of individual dimensions.

In the tourism and hospitality industry, as in service industries, the quality of services offered to guests is known to be critically important for business success (Oh & Parks, 1997). Guests who are pleased with the quality of services will return and recommend the business in question (see, for example, Wu, 2013). Several studies have, therefore, attempted to develop new instruments to assess service quality in the tourism and hospitality sector (see Taylan Dortyol, Varinli, & Kitapci, 2014 for a review of service quality studies in the tourism and accommodation sector and Pizam, Shapoval, & Ellis, 2016 for a review of service quality scales in the tourism and hospitality industry).

Tourism experiences can include the following elements: the environment, staff behaviours and attitudes and the product itself in a narrow, material sense (Reuland, Coudrey, & Fagel, 1985). For instance, in the context of lodging, a greater intensity of these elements exists because services are provided for prolonged periods and, in these extended encounters, employees become 'hosts' and customers become 'guests' (Crick & Spencer, 2011). Therefore, satisfaction can be defined as the sum total of satisfaction with the attributes of all the products and services that make up each hospitality experience (Pizam et al., 2016).

Examples of scales that specifically target the hostel business are LODGSERV (Knutson, Stevens, Wullaert, Patton, & Yokoyama, 1991), LOGQUAL (Getty & Thompson, 1994), HOLSERV (Mei, Dean, & White, 1999) and SSQH (Wu & Ko, 2013). In addition, ECOSERV (Khan, 2003) measures service quality from the perspective of ecotourists, and a scale developed by Mohsin and Lockyer (2010) applies to luxury hotels.

A few studies have addressed service quality in the hostel business (Brochado et al., 2015; Chitty et al., 2007; Hecht & Martin, 2006; Musa & Thirumoorathi, 2011; Nash et al., 2006). These studies highlight the need to study service quality in this type of accommodation mainly because they reveal the complexity of the hostel backpackers' phenomenon and the hostel business's rapid growth and intense competition in top tourism destinations.

The research literature has not been alone in identifying a need to develop instruments to assess service quality in the context of backpackers' hostels. Hostelling International has recognised the market's need to develop a reliable battery of customer service 'assured

standards' and performed 'mystery shopper' evaluations to verify whether these standards of comfort are being met. The current battery of standards includes a warm welcome, clean facilities, a comfortable night's sleep, adequate washing and shower facilities, good security for backpackers and their possessions and privacy in showers, washing areas and toilets.

Previous studies have also listed a number of important variables in backpackers' hostel service quality. Regarding the drivers of service quality, Nash et al. (2006) reveal that the most important are cleanliness of rooms, value for money and self-catering facilities. Hecht and Martin (2006) state that the five most important service aspects for respondents are cleanliness, location, personal service, security and hostel services (e.g. Internet and laundry facilities). Chitty et al. (2007) conclude that brand image and the functional dimension (i.e. staff behaviour) have a positive impact on backpackers' satisfaction and that brand loyalty is also directly influenced by brand image. Musa and Thirumoorthi's (2011) research revealed that the most important tangible elements in service quality are equipment, atmosphere, cleanliness, facilities, central location and welcome and homeliness. Staff excellence elements include courtesy, willingness to help, relevant knowledge and individualised attention. Brochado et al. (2015) provide a more conceptually sound approach than previous studies, which were based on either descriptive analysis or on the adaptation of previous scales for assessing service quality. The cited authors maintain that hostel service quality includes six dimensions: staff, cleanliness, security, facilities, social atmosphere and location and city connection. The above-mentioned study's results are innovative in that they identify social atmosphere as a core service dimension crucial to creating hostel guests' overall sense of quality, a dimension that is specific to the hostel business.

In summary, due to the nature of the hostel market there is a need to measure service quality using appropriate dimensions, including context-specific ones. The application of these scales is important to understand how service quality can impact not only satisfaction but also recommendation and return intentions. An overview of past studies, summarised in Table 1, confirms that hostel service quality is a multidimensional construct.

The present study used as its starting point the scale developed by Brochado et al. (2015) as it offers a broad overview of the dimensions of service quality in the context of backpackers' hostels. These dimensions were developed to ensure the proposed scale's face validity. However, in answer to the cited authors' call for further research, the present study sought to employ confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) to check further the validity and reliability of the proposed scale and the dimensions of service quality in this type of accommodation. Furthermore, based on Marques and Reis's (2015) recent call for research on heterogeneity, the current study sought to contribute to the literature by testing the existence of heterogeneity in the tourism constructs identified. Thus, this research focuses on studying not only four dimensions of service quality in hostels (quality of staff, social atmosphere, hostel tangibles, city connection) but also the overall satisfaction experienced by the hostel guest/backpacker as well as the likelihood to recommend the hostel to a friend/family and the likelihood for the guest to come back.

2.3. Research propositions

Previous studies done in the service research literature have revealed that service quality dimensions can have an impact on consumers' behavioural intentions and attitudes (e.g. Zeithml et al., 1996). In the context of hostel businesses, Brochado et al. (2015) conclude that staff are the most important dimension in explaining the likelihood to return and willingness to recommend hostels but that atmosphere is the most important dimension for

Table 1. Hostel service quality studies.

Reference	Sample	Dimensions/No. of items	Research methods
Nash et al. (2006)	Scotland ($N = 309$)	15 items	Surveys Importance-performance analysis Descriptive analysis
Hecht and Martin (2006)	Canada: qualitative study ($N = 20$); quantitative study ($N = 309$)	15 items	Interviews, survey Descriptive analysis
Chitty et al. (2007)	Australia ($N = 281$)	Image, technical dimension, functional dimension, price, perceived value, satisfaction, loyalty	Survey European Customer Satisfaction Index Structural equation modelling
Musa and Thirumoorthi (2011)	18 in-depth interviews; website comments ($N = 192$) Red Palm, Malaysia	5 dimensions: tangibles, assurance, empathy, responsiveness, reliability; 25 items	In-depth interviews, content analysis of website comments SERVQUAL
Brochado et al. (2015)	Lisbon ($N = 202$)	6 dimensions: atmosphere, location, staff, cleanliness, security, facilities; 26 items	Focus group, content analysis of booking websites, in-depth interviews with managers, survey Modified SERVQUAL Exploratory factor analysis, regression analysis

overall service quality. The above findings in the literature resulted in the following research proposition:

Proposition 1: Hostel service quality dimensions play different roles in explaining variations in behavioural intentions and attitudes including (a) overall service quality, (b) satisfaction, (c) likelihood to return and (d) likelihood to recommend hostels.

Market segmentation is an important concept in the tourism literature (e.g. Crawford-Welsch, 1990; Dolnicar, 2002). Marques and Reis (2015) emphasise that assuming homogeneity among tourism constructs (i.e. when estimating an overall model) can lead to misleading results and interpretations. The cited authors recommend tourism researchers test for heterogeneity in the relationships among constructs when applying structural equation modelling (SEM) techniques.

In the literature on hostel backpackers, researchers have identified three market segmentation demographic variables: age, gender and nationality (Brochado & Gameiro, 2013; Hecht & Martin, 2006). Moreover, despite the increasing interest in lifestyle or psychographic information among marketing practitioners, demographic variables are still considered a basic tool used to guide strategic decisions. Managers in the travel industry need 'to take the views of certain demographic segments into account if they want to maximise perceived service quality. Overall, the indication is that service quality should be more

closely tailored to some demographic characteristics' (Ganesan-Lim, Russell-Bennett, &

Dagger, 2008, p. 561). Therefore, the present study included the following research proposition:

Proposition 2: Segments of hostel backpackers – defined by (i) age, (ii) gender and (iii) nationality – exhibit different responses in terms of (a) overall service quality, (b) satisfaction, (c) likelihood to return and (d) likelihood to recommend hostels.

3. Study methods

The current study targeted hostels located in Lisbon. According to Hostelworld (2015), Lisbon is a top hostel destination globally, with five of the six best medium-sized hostels worldwide located in this city. A search of Hostelworld's booking website on March 2016 returned the names of 94 establishments.

The data were gathered in 313 personal interviews of backpackers staying at 5 Lisbon hostels that agreed to take part in this survey. The number of responses obtained in each hostel ranged from 55 to 73. The five participating hostels were listed among the 10 top-rated hostels in Lisbon in 2015. A convenience sampling procedure was used. The backpackers who agreed to answer the survey were interviewed in their hostels' communal area, while they were experiencing the hostels' services.

The questionnaire's first part included questions regarding the respondents' trip profile and booking behaviour. The study used the framework for items that originally appeared in Brochado et al. (2015). Next, the backpackers were asked to evaluate each of the 26 items proposed by Brochado et al. (2015) on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 'strongly disagree' (1) to 'strongly agree' (7). The survey was conducted using a single English version. In order to examine predictive validity, four additional variables measuring attitudinal and behavioural outcomes were added. These were as follows: overall service quality, overall satisfaction, likelihood to come back to the hostel in the future and willingness to recommend the hostel to friends and/or family (Taylan Dortyol et al., 2014). Last, the questionnaire included items to determine four demographic variables: age, gender, marital status and nationality. A pretest of the questionnaire was conducted with five personal interviews of backpackers staying in one of the hostels.

4. Results

4.1. *Guest profile*

Of the 313 respondents, 50.8% were male and 49.2% female. The majority of respondents were single at the time, representing 82.7% of the sample. The remaining hostel backpackers were married or living with a partner (16.0%), and a small percentage were divorced (1.3%). A large proportion of hostel backpackers were between 15 and 25 years old (62.6%). Around 14% of the respondents were 30 or more years old, which was a not unexpected result as researchers have found that the age of hostel guests is becoming more diversified (Hecht & Martin, 2006; Ryan & Mohsin, 2001). The backpackers came from a large variety of countries around the world. Guests from Europe represented the majority of the sample (57.5%), followed by the US and Canada (19.8%), Australia (10.5%) and Latin America (7.7%).

Of the hostel backpackers who participated in this survey, 70.6% were visiting Lisbon for the first time. Only 21.1% of the backpackers (42) were staying in a hostel for the first time. Of the remaining 247 respondents, 21.1% had already stayed in one to three hostels,

36.4% in four to seven and 42.5% in seven or more hostels. A large percentage of the backpackers (60.1%) were travelling through more countries than Portugal. This profile agrees with previous studies that report that hostel backpackers seek to travel to more travel destinations than traditional tourists do.

Booking websites were the main source of reservation information for the majority of the backpackers surveyed (50.8%), followed by tips from friends and family (28.8%). The findings also show that booking was mainly done through the Internet and that the respondents used a range of prominent online travel agencies. Moreover, guest reviews were of utmost importance to these backpackers. Out of the 247 hostel backpackers who had stayed in at least one hostel before, 47.3% reported that they had read reviews and checked the hostel's ratings before booking a room, and 51.8% of the respondents thought that hostel ratings and reviews were mostly right. The backpackers surveyed not only trust the feedback provided by other guests but also write their own reviews. Indeed, 52.1% of the respondents revealed that they usually give ratings and reviews for the hostels in which they stay, and 81.3% rate or review hostels, regardless of whether their opinion is positive or negative.

4.2. Dimensions of backpackers' hostel service quality

In order to meet the first objective of this research, this section reports the results of the CFA conducted to identify the dimensions of hostel service quality that needed to be retained for further analysis. Each of the 26 items proposed by Brochado et al. (2015) was restricted to loading only on its predefined factor, allowing the first-order factors to correlate freely between them. However, the CFA revealed that the seven-factor measurement model did not fit the data well. Three additional pieces of evidence required a model specification, namely, poor indicator loadings, high cross-loadings and high interfactor correlations. Following the CFA purification, the initial 26 items were reduced to 18, and the six dimensions to four. Each factor included at least three items, as suggested by the relevant literature (Hair, Black, Balin, & Anderson, 2010).

Table 2 displays the final items and the corresponding constructs. Dimension one combines staff qualities such as appearance, friendliness, efficiency, comfortable ambiance and promptness in service delivery. Therefore, factor one represents the quality of staff service.

The second dimension, social atmosphere, combines social and atmosphere aspects. These are the communal room size, the hostel's value for money, the fun to be in the hostel, the right environment to meet people, the availability of 24-hour desk service, the quality of the Internet and computer facilities and, finally, the fact that guests did or did not like the people he or she met at the hostel.

Dimension three relates to the hostels' tangible assets and appearance. This factor combines overall cleanliness and décor, kitchen and bathroom cleanliness and hostel and room decoration and design.

The final dimension represents the hostels' city connection and combines the relationship of the hostels' atmosphere with Lisbon, the distance from the hostels to transportation (e.g. metro, bus and tram) and the hostels' ability to help guests integrate with each other and the city, including group activities (e.g. city tours, pub crawls and cinema sessions). Overall, the goodness of fit of the model with four first-order factors indicates that it matches the data well. The root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) is 0.035, below the cut-off point of 0.07. The model's goodness of fit index (GFI), comparative fit index (CFI) and Tucker–Lewis index (TLI) are 0.941, 0.977 and 0.973, respectively.

Table 2. Confirmatory factor analysis results.

	Mean	SD	Model I		Model II	
			Beta	t-values	Beta	t-values
<i>Quality of staff</i> ($\alpha = 0.92$; CR = 0.91; AVE = 0.63)	6.45	0.58				
The hostel provides a comfortable ambiance	6.41	0.80	0.645		0.664	
The staff is friendly and polite	6.50	0.70	0.689	10.459	0.713	10.536
The staff knows Lisbon well and is helpful	6.50	0.70	0.723	10.735	0.721	9.589
The staff makes my stay here a better experience	6.40	0.84	0.774	11.315	0.769	10.055
The staff provides efficient service	6.43	0.79	0.686	10.25	0.698	8.543
The staff has a good appearance	6.47	0.73	0.736	10.764	0.765	8.71
<i>Social atmosphere</i> ($\alpha = 0.81$; CR = 0.83; AVE = 0.55)	6.34	0.76				
This hostel has the right environment in which to meet new people	6.28	0.98	0.65	8.791	0.642	7.943
I generally like the people I meet here during my stay	6.37	0.98	0.729	9.406	0.717	8.429
I have fun at this hostel	6.38	1.02	0.798	8.209	0.793	7.415
There is a large communal room/space	6.18	0.89	0.635		0.651	
<i>Hostel tangibles</i> ($\alpha = 0.79$; CR = 0.92; AVE = 0.71)	6.32	0.65				
The rooms/dorms are clean	6.10	1.00	0.62		0.647	
The bathrooms are clean	6.23	0.91	0.64	7.946	0.583	7.629
The social area/communal room is clean	6.18	0.89	0.834	6.804	0.712	7.006
The hostel has an appealing decorative design	6.40	0.90	0.887	9.3	0.9	8.06
The interior design of the rooms is good	6.18	0.89	0.82	9.172	0.828	8.183
<i>City connection</i> ($\alpha = 0.72$; CR = 0.86; AVE = 0.68)	6.05	0.84				
This hostel promotes group activities (e.g. pub crawls and city tours)	5.73	1.41	0.686	5.795	0.731	5.41
The hostel's atmosphere fits in with, and relates well to, the city of Lisbon	6.10	1.00	0.892	7.639	0.696	8.381
This hostel is close to transportation: metro, bus, tram, etc	6.40	0.90	0.643		0.668	
<i>Quality of staff</i>					0.931	
<i>Social atmosphere</i>					0.91	6.385
<i>Hostel tangibles/appearance</i>					0.849	6.894
<i>City connection</i>					0.754	5.817
Model fit estimates						
χ^2			174.545		151.265	
X2/gl			1.374		1.173	
RMR			0.035		0.045	
GFI			0.941		0.946	
CFI			0.977		0.929	
TLI			0.973		0.933	
RMSEA			0.035		0.024	
AIC			262.545		235.265	
BIC			427.378		392.605	

Notes: *B* = standardised loadings; α = Cronbach's alpha; CR = composite reliability; AVE = average variance extracted; *X* = specific brand and - = path parameter set to 1. Therefore, no *t*-values are given. All loadings are significant at 0.001.

Given that these are higher than 0.92, they collectively show evidence of a good fit of the final model.

To determine convergent validity, the items included in a particular construct need to share a high proportion of the variance in common. Therefore, three indicators were considered to test convergent validity: factor loadings, reliability and average variance

extracted (AVE) (Hair et al., 2010). An analysis was done of the size of the standardised loading estimates and the statistical significance of each estimated coefficient. The average of the standardised loadings is 0.73, and 50% of the standardised loading estimates are 0.70 or higher. Critical ratio values indicate that all factor loadings are statistically significant.

Finally, the AVE was also calculated, resulting in the values shown in Table 2. AVE displays the percentage of variation explained among the items of a construct. AVE is assessed as the mean variance calculated for each item's loading on a construct. The AVE of the four constructs in the present model range from 0.55 to 0.71, above the cut-off point of 0.5 for good convergence.

The model's reliability was further analysed using Cronbach's alpha coefficients and composite reliability (CR). The Cronbach's alpha coefficients range from 0.72 to 0.92, and the CR of all four constructs displays the desired level (i.e. over 0.70), with a minimum of 0.83. Therefore, the measures all consistently represent the same latent construct and show construct reliability. Overall, the proposed first-order factor model shows adequate convergent validity.

Next, discriminant validity was assessed. High discriminant validity indicates that the construct is unique and that it is truly distinct from other constructs. First, in order to purify the model, all the cross-loadings were verified as low. Discriminant validity among the constructs is also evidenced by low correlation estimates between any two constructs. Second, discriminant validity was assessed by comparing the AVE extracted values for any two constructs with the square of the correlation estimate between these two constructs. As the AVE estimates are higher than the squared correlation estimate, this allows the conclusion that none of the correlations is sufficiently high to jeopardise discriminant validity.

Last, the decision was made to model higher-order factors, which include the four first-order factors, observable indicators and measurement errors. Quality of staff has a factor loading, as the highest factor, of 0.931, social atmosphere has a factor loading of 0.91, hostel tangibles has 0.849 and city connection has 0.754. The fit indices suggest a good fit of the model (i.e. $\chi^2/df = 1.173$, root mean residual = 0.045, GFI = 0.946, CFI = 0.929, TLI = 0.933 and RMSEA = 0.024). These fit indices compare well with the factor model with four factors correlated. In order to compare these two model formulations, a second-order factor model was estimated, and the values for Akaike information and Bayesian information criteria were calculated for both models. According to these criteria, Model II performs better than Model I. Consequently, the conclusion was reached that hostel backpackers assess their overall hostel experience based on the above-defined four basic dimensions.

4.3. *Predictive validity*

In order to demonstrate the predictive validity of the identified dimensions and meet the second objective of this study, four models were estimated (see Table 3). The first dependent variable relates to the overall service quality provided by hostels. The second represents a related conceptual construct – overall satisfaction with the relevant hostel. The remaining items measure behavioural intentions: the likelihood to return in the future and the willingness to recommend a hostel to friends and/or family.

Moreover, as the second-order model reveals that the four first-order constructs are related to a higher-order construct, these four models could operate as a further test of discriminant validity. The model estimates allow an assessment of whether each dimension operates somewhat independently on each attitudinal or behavioural outcome and whether the dimensions are not the same construct measured with four different scales.

Table 3. Analysis of the factors' impact on four different outcomes.

	Overall service quality in this hostel	Overall satisfaction I experienced in the hostel	Likelihood to come back in the future	Likelihood to recommend this hostel to a friend/family
Quality of staff	0.185 2.771***	0.126 1.971**	0.318 5.237***	0.336 5.430***
Social atmosphere	0.192 3.318***	0.259 4.686***	0.228 4.366***	0.236 4.423***
Hostel tangibles	0.274 4.485***	0.242 4.179***	0.234 4.264***	0.157 2.776***
City connection	0.104 2.034**	0.21 4.282***	0.064 1.375	0.104 2.186**
Adj. R ²	0.416	0.475	0.537	0.515

Note: Statistically significant at the ***1% and **5% levels.

The model estimates reveal that the quality of staff has the strongest influence on the respondents' likelihood to return in the future and their willingness to recommend a hostel. The social atmosphere is the most important dimension in explaining satisfaction, and hostel tangibles has the strongest impact on explaining hostels' overall service quality. As regards the first proposition of this study, the results show that service quality dimensions positively correlate with behavioural intentions, with the sole exception of city connection and the likelihood to return (positive but no statistically significant at either 5% or 1% levels). However, these dimensions play different roles in terms of behavioural intentions and attitudes. In fact, whereas quality of staff shows to be the most critical dimension affecting tourist behaviour (both recommendation and return intentions), social atmosphere is a close second and also has a leading impact on hostel backpackers' satisfaction. Hence, this context-specific dimension is raised to the top within the hostel environment. Moreover, hostel tangibles have clearly higher impact on return intentions than on recommendation but are important for customer satisfaction and is the leading dimension for assessing service quality perceptions by guests. Finally, city connection stands out only regarding its influence on overall satisfaction.

4.4. Testing for heterogeneous responses

In the second part of this study, variance-based SEM was used instead of variable SEM because it is less restrictive, namely, when the sample size is small at the group level (Davick, 2014; Marques & Reis, 2015). In order to meet the third objective of this work, partial least squares path modelling was employed, as well as variance-based SEM and multigroup analysis, to uncover heterogeneity by considering ex ante segments based on three variables – age, gender and nationality – regarding their response to marketing outcomes.

The estimated coefficients by gender reveal that quality of staff and hostel tangibles have a stronger impact on female hostel backpackers than on males (see Table 4). In addition, social atmosphere has, in general, higher coefficients for males than for females. Notably, social atmosphere also has the highest impact on the likelihood to recommend and return for both males and females, which is in line with the previous observation of the influence of the hostel contexts' specific social atmosphere on tourist behaviour.

Generally, perceived social atmosphere appears to have the strongest influence on hostel backpackers aged 15–25, across all models, and quality of staff on hostel backpackers over 29 years old (see Table 5). The hostel tangibles dimension appears to have a stronger

Table 4. Model estimates by gender.

	Overall service quality in this hostel		Overall satisfaction I experienced in the hostel		Likelihood to come back in the future		Likelihood to recommend this hostel to a friend/family	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Quality of staff	0.169 2.211**	0.189 1.957**	0.239 3.212***	0.334 3.704***	0.112 1.417	0.269 3.533***	0.210 2.479***	0.228 2.957 **
Social atmosphere	0.274 2.582**	0.139 1.484	0.257 2.599***	0.03 0.336	0.323 3.069***	0.330 4.376***	0.333 3.225***	0.354 4.445***
Hostel tangibles	0.136 1.395	0.369 4.643***	0.061 0.67	0.343 4.549***	0.225 2.295**	0.248 3.929***	0.041 0.416	0.23 3.445***
City connection	0.125 1.575	0.105 1.473	0.243 3.233***	0.145 2.150**	0.01 0.125	0.118 2.093**	0.128 1.629	0.165 2.765***
Adj. R^2	0.305	0.439	0.391	0.484	0.315	0.636	0.34	0.597

Note: Statistically significant at the ***1% and **5% levels.

Table 5. Model estimates by age group.

Age group	Overall service quality in this hostel			Overall satisfaction I experienced in the hostel			Likelihood to come back in the future			Likelihood to recommend this hostel to a friend/family		
	15–25	26–29	> 29	15–25	26–29	> 29	15–25	26–29	> 29	15–25	26–29	>29
Quality of staff	0.104 1.084	0.196 2.008**	0.400 0.015**	0.067 0.743	0.174 1.697*	0.442 3.251***	0.287 3.337***	0.183 1.597	0.471 4.274***	0.304 3.586***	0.283 2.569**	0.461 3.145***
Social atmosphere	0.153 0.1929*	0.384 0.761***	−0.053 0.68	0.361 3.484***	0.216 2.948***	0.270 2.513**	0.276 3.943***	0.116 0.981	0.175 1.984**	0.317 4.602***	0.094 0.78	0.092 0.753
Hostel tangibles	0.465 5.604***	0.111 1.099	0.235 0.068*	0.100 0.971	0.428 5.587***	0.072 0.664	0.206 2.351**	0.239 2.089**	0.293 4.027***	0.133 1.176	0.197 1.615	0.204 2.811***
City connection	0.015 0.817	0.302 3.050***	0.306 0.033*	0.139 2.302**	0.306 3.00***	0.217 1.815*	0.012 0.208	0.125 1.069	0.233 2.388**	0.044 0.766	0.291 2.583**	0.190 1.441
Adj. <i>R</i> ²	0.425	0.358	0.544	0.513	0.289	0.666	0.558	0.087	0.781	0.569	0.198	0.588

Note: Statistically significant at the ***1%, **5% and *10% levels.

Table 6. Model estimates by origin.

Origin	Overall service quality in this hostel				Overall satisfaction I experienced in the hostel			
	US/Canada	Latin America	Europe	Australia	US/Canada	Latin America	Europe	Australia
Quality of staff	0.224	0.121	0.259	0.513	0.121	0.147	0.259	0.513
	2.286**	1.035	3.485***	4.439***	1.035	1.178	3.485***	4.439***
Social atmosphere	0.177	0.102	0.186	0.258	0.166	0.136	0.186	0.358
	0.892	0.678	2.312**	2.009**	1.121	1.286	2.312**	2.009**
Hostel tangibles	0.303	0.302	0.277	0.127	0.302	0.393	0.277	0.127
	2.070***	2.533**	4.062***	0.918	2.533**	1.970**	4.062***	0.918
City connection	0.460	0.207	0.181	0.372	0.207	0.237	0.181	0.372
	4.768***	1.726*	3.090***	2.943***	1.726*	1.078	1.090***	2.943***
Adj. R^2	0.407	0.157	0.533	0.542	0.157	0.745	0.533	0.542
Origin	Likelihood to come back in the future				Likelihood to recommend this hostel to a friend/family			
	US/Canada	Latin America	Europe	Australia	US/Canada	Latin America	Europe	Australia
Quality of staff	0.448	0.325	0.075	0.263	0.218	0.297	0.093	0.162
	4.479***	1.623	1.038	1.683*	1.913**	1.997**	1.299	1.158
Social atmosphere	0.248	0.099	0.300	0.406	0.164	0.180	0.351	0.422
	2.417**	0.321	2.010**	5.144***	1.381	0.868	2.160**	5.416***
Hostel tangibles	0.110	0.235	0.239	0.176	0.899	0.324	0.206	0.102
	1.071	2.018**	3.619***	1.091	0.767	3.092***	3.140***	0.789
City connection	0.303	0.115	0.183	0.821	0.229	0.048	0.257	0.191
	3.004***	0.435	2.230***	0.932	2.104**	0.169	1.987**	3.401***
Adj. R^2	0.375	0.212	0.562	0.183	0.215	0.388	0.573	0.371

Note: Statistically significant at the ***1%, **5% and *10% levels.

influence on guests aged 26–29 and 29 or more than for those aged 15–25. City connection has a higher impact on the likelihood to return and recommend for those aged 29 or above than for younger hostel backpackers. However, this dimension is statistically significant for all age groups in the overall satisfaction regression.

Social atmosphere has a lower coefficient across the regression for hostel backpackers from Latin America than for other guests, while social atmosphere has the strongest influence across all models for those who are from Australia (see Table 6). City connection is not statistically significant for hostel backpackers from Latin America. The regression for this nationality group identifies hostel tangibles as the most important dimension to explain outcomes. Regarding Europeans, all the dimensions are statistically significant in explaining overall service quality and experience of hostels. Therefore, the results support the second proposition. Gender, age group and nationality are a source of heterogeneity in the relationship between each service quality dimension and behavioural intentions.

5. Conclusions

5.1. *Theoretical contribution*

As regards this study's first objective, the results confirm that backpackers' hostels' service quality is a multidimensional construct. Moreover, it can be modelled with four core dimensions: quality of staff, social atmosphere, hostel tangibles and city connection. These results offer a more parsimonious solution than Brochado et al.'s (2015) study, reducing the number of items from 26 to 18 and dimensions from six to four. Although three out of the four dimensions are shared by previous studies – Quality of Staff (Hai-yan & Baum, 2006; Kashyap & Bojanic, 2000), Hotel Tangibles (Taylan Dortyol et al., 2014; Tamagni & Zanfardini, 2006) and City Connection (Shoval, McKercher, Ng, & Birenboim, 2011; Urtasun & Gutiérrez, 2006) – the Social Atmosphere dimension emerges as specific to the backpackers' hostel context.

In terms of the second objective, the results reveal that these dimensions are related to hostel backpackers' satisfaction, overall perception of service quality and recommend and revisit intentions. The quality of staff dimension has the strongest impact on the likelihood to return and willingness to recommend a hostel. This finding of the importance of staff in the hostel business is in line with the empirical evidence offered by Brochado et al. (2015) and Musa and Thirumoorthi (2011), which highlights the role of human resource management. Social atmosphere is the most relevant dimension in explaining overall satisfaction, and hostel tangibles are an important variable to explain overall service quality. These results match those of previous studies in that service quality dimensions may be correlated with attitudinal and behavioural intentions.

Regarding the third objective, the present study's approach is innovative as each service quality dimension's impact on attitudes and intentions was estimated for different segments of hostel backpackers defined in terms of age, gender and nationality. Overall, the model estimates reveal the existence of observed heterogeneity in hostel backpackers' responses. In the context of the backpacker market, these results confirm that age, gender and nationality offer actionable demographic market segmentation variables (Brochado & Gameiro, 2013; Hecht & Martin, 2006).

The present research highlights a number of interesting points regarding the heterogeneous responses of different hostel backpacker segments, thus adding to the literature on this topic. The results are a direct response to Marques and Reis's (2015) call for researchers to check for heterogeneity in their constructs.

5.2. *Managerial implications*

These four constructs of hostel backpackers' overall hostel experiences can inform hostel managers about which dimensions are unsatisfactory for a given hostel, thereby encouraging better guest experiences and helping to develop strategies to eliminate these shortfalls. The same approach can be used to identify dimensions generating backpacker satisfaction, which can then be used as strengths to position hostels in the market. Guest evaluations of these four dimensions need to be monitored properly for continuous improvement.

Moreover, this survey's results can help hostel managers to understand better their guests' experiences and to assess and improve hostel services more effectively. Managers should, in particular, be aware of the importance of recruiting the right staff, ensuring that the latter share the hostel company's mission and values and understand the need for continuous training. Musa and Thirumoorthi (2011) also highlight this dimension, identifying courtesy, willingness to help, relevant knowledge and individualised attention as necessary characteristics in excellent staff members.

As regards social atmosphere, hostels need to provide backpackers with an open and exciting environment that stimulates guest interaction. Staying in a hostel is a choice for more than just cheaper accommodation, and both hostels' activities and physical environment (i.e. communal rooms) should enhance hostel backpackers' opportunities to meet other like-minded individuals and make new friends (Leslie & Wilson, 2006).

The tangibles dimension encompasses cleanliness and design and decoration, including the choice of room types, private rooms, and their design and décor. Finally, as city connection emerges in this study as a relevant dimension, managers can improve their offer by designing their hostel's décor and physical environment to enhance guests' knowledge about the host city and by offering activities that meet the needs of different hostel backpackers' lifestyles, as identified by Thyne et al. (2005).

The present study's results can assist hostel managers to identify the dimensions of service quality that are appropriate targets of improvement, identifying their company's particular strengths and weakness. Moreover, hostel managers need to be aware of how each dimension's impact on service quality outcomes varies according to hostel backpacker segments.

This research offers potentially valuable information to hostel managers who seek to understand hostel backpackers' heterogeneous responses and key service quality dimensions affecting guests' intentions to revisit hostels and recommend them to others. On the basis of these findings, hostel managers can better understand hostel backpackers and formulate their hostels' offer to fulfil the needs of a heterogeneous market. In this context, hostels' social media and Internet communications should highlight their offer according to the four dimensions identified, focusing on specific dimensions to target particular market segments defined in terms of gender, age and nationality.

When addressing the male market, in particular, hostel managers need to emphasise even more the importance they give to creating a social atmosphere, while, when targeting the female market, they should promote the tangibles their hostel provides to guests. Furthermore, to generate higher levels of satisfaction, managers need to place stress on a social atmosphere for 15- to 25-year-old backpackers, hostel tangibles and city connections for the 26- to 29-year-old age group and quality of staff for the over 29-year-old segment. This will also trigger positive behavioural intentions regarding recommendations and revisits.

In addition, the new proposed service quality dimension of social atmosphere is most highly valued by Australian tourists, followed by Europeans. In order to improve hostels' social atmosphere, managers can check whether facilities promote socialisation between guests, such as a bar, large kitchen and dining room, lounge with vending

machines and coffee station and garden with ottoman poufs or terrace. Moreover, managers can promote offers and activities that encourage guest interactions, such as happy hour, free drinks, sunset parties or karaoke.

The quality of staff depends on recruitment practices, traineeships and the quality of working life. Hostels can share their team on websites and/or Facebook pages. In order to extend city connections, hostel managers can invite young local artists to improve hostel décor, offer weekly dinners cooked by staff that allow guests to taste local cuisine or provide walking tours to get guests involved with the surrounding city.

Further enhancing tangibles' quality could require making sure that the hostel offers a comfortable experience by meeting the heterogeneous demands of guests (e.g. double rooms, family rooms and dorms) and by offering the desired amenities (e.g. hairdressers and large lockers). As hostel guests are known to use the Internet and social media quite actively, hostel managers can share a photo gallery highlighting various dimensions of hostel experiences and encouraging guests to share their experiences through web-generated content (i.e. text or pictures) after their stay.

To summarise, this study's results help hostel managers to understand their customers better and to develop clearer communication with them. In the end, customer satisfaction is the cheapest way of promoting a hostel.

5.3. Limitations and future research avenues

Although this study offers contributions to the literature, as well as practical implications for hostel managers, some limitations need to be pointed out in the results. First, as the data were collected only in Lisbon, this could compromise the findings' generalisability. Second, due to the sample size, moderators could not be included that would have enabled testing for interaction effects between backpackers' characteristics. Third, the present study only offers an ex-ante demographic market segmentation. In future studies, researchers could gather empirical data on other geographical regions, to test for differences across segments defined by lifestyle variables, given that, despite the relevance of demographics, other approaches are worth investigating. Regarding methods, post hoc analysis could be used to test for heterogeneity, namely, to identify an unknown number of market segments based on the impact of service quality on marketing outcomes and to profile these segments by means of demographics and psychographics.

References

- Brochado, A., & Gameiro, C. (2013). Toward a better understanding of backpackers' motivations. *Tékhné – Review of Applied Management Studies*, 11, 92–99.
- Brochado, A., Gameiro, C., & Rita, P. (2015). Exploring backpackers' perceptions of the hostel's service quality. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 27(8), 1839–1855.
- Bujisic, M., Hutchinson, J., & Parsa, H. G. (2014). The effects of restaurant quality attributes on customer behavioral intentions. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 26(8), 1270–1291.
- Chitty, B., Ward, S., & Chua, C. (2007). An application of the ECSI model as a predictor of satisfaction and loyalty of satisfaction and loyalty of backpacker hostel. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, 25(6), 563–580.
- Crawford-Welsch, S. (1990). Market segmentation in the hospitality industry. *Hospitality Research Journal*, 14(2), 295–308.
- Crick, A. P., & Spencer, A. (2011). Hospitality quality: New directions and new challenges. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 23(4), 463–478.
- Cronin Jr, J. J., & Taylor, S. A. (1992). Measuring service quality: A reexamination and extension. *Journal of Marketing*, 56 (July), 55–68.
- Cronin, J. J., & Taylor, S. A. (1994). SERVPERF versus SERVQUAL: Reconciling performance based and perceptions-minus-expectations measurement of service quality. *Journal of Marketing*, 58(1), 125–131.
- Davick, N. S. (2014). The use and misuse of structural equation modelling in management research. A review and critique. *Journal of Advances in Management Research*, 11(1), 47–81.
- Dolnicar, S. (2002). A review of data-driven market segmentation in tourism. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, 12(1), 1–22.
- Ganesan-Lim, C., Russell-Bennett, R., & Dagger, T. (2008). The impact of service contact type and demographic characteristics on service quality perceptions. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 22(7), 550–561.
- Gardiner, S., & Scott, N. (2014). Successful tourism clusters: Passion in paradise. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 46, 171–184.
- Getty, J. M., & Thompson, K. N. (1994). A procedure for scaling perceptions of lodging quality. *Hospitality Research Journal*, 18(2), 75–96.
- Hai-yan, K., & Baum, T. (2006). Skills and work in the hospitality sector: The case of hotel front office employees in China. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 18(6), 509–518.
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Balin, B. j., & Anderson, R. E. (2010). *Multivariate data analysis*. New York: Maxwell Macmillan International Editions.
- Hampton, M. P. (1998). Backpacker tourism and economic development. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 25(3), 639–660.
- Hecht, J.-A., & Martin, D. (2006). Backpacking and hostel-picking: An analysis from Canada. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 18(1), 69–77.
- Hindle, N., Martin, A., & Nash, R. (2015). Tourism development and the backpacker market in Scotland. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 15(3), 178–192.
- Hostelworld. (2015). *Welcome to the 2015 Hostel Awards*. Retrieved from <http://www.hostelworld.com/hoscars-2015>
- Kashyap, R., & Bojanic, D. C. (2000). A structural analysis of value, quality, and price perceptions of business and leisure travelers. *Journal of Travel Research*, 39(1), 45–51.
- Khan, M. (2003). ECOSERV: Ecotourists' quality expectations. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 30(1), 109–124.
- Knutson, B. J., Stevens, P., Wullaert, C., Patton, M., & Yokoyama, F. (1991). LODGSERV: A service quality index for the lodging industry. *Hospitality Research Journal*, 14(2), 277–284.
- Ladhari, R. (2012). The lodging quality index: An independent assessment of validity and dimensions. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 24(4), 628–652.
- Larsen, S., Ogaard, T., & Brun, W. (2011). Backpackers and mainstreamers. Realities and myths. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 38(2), 690–707.
- Leslie, D., & Wilson, J. (2006). The backpacker and Scotland: A market analysis. *Tourismos: An International Multidisciplinary Journal of Tourism*, 1(2), 11–28.
- Loker-Murphy, L. (1996). Backpackers in Australia: A motivation-based segmentation study. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, 5(4), 23–45.
- Loker-Murphy, L., & Pearce, P. (1995). Young budget travellers: Backpackers in Australia. *Annals of*

- Tourism Research*, 22(4), 819–843.
- Marques, C., & Reis, E. (2015). How to deal with heterogeneity among tourism constructs? *Annals of Tourism Research*, 52, 172–174.
- Mei, A. W. O., Dean, A. M., & White, C. J. (1999). Analyzing service quality in the hospitality industry. *Managing Service Quality*, 9(2), 136–143.
- Mohsin, A., & Lockyer, T. (2010). Customer perceptions of service quality in luxury hotels in New Delhi, India: An exploratory study. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 22(2), 160–173.
- Murphy, L. (2001). Exploring social interactions of backpackers. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 28(1), 50–67.
- Musa, G., & Thirumoorathi, T. (2011). Red Palm: Exploring service quality and servicescape of the best backpacker hostel in Asia. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 14(2), 103–120.
- Nash, R., Thyne, M., & Davies, S. (2006). An investigation into customer satisfaction levels in the budget accommodation sector in Scotland: A case study of backpacker tourists and the Scottish Youth Hostels Association. *Tourism Management*, 27, 525–532.
- Oh, H., & Parks, S. C. (1997). Customer satisfaction and service quality: A critical review of the literature and research implications for the hospitality industry. *Hospitality Research Journal*, 20(3), 35–64.
- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. L. (1985). A conceptual model of service quality and its implications for future research. *Journal of Marketing*, 49 (Fall), 41–50.
- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. L. (1988). SERVQUAL: A multiple-item scale for measuring consumer perceptions of services quality. *Journal of Retailing*, 64(1), 12–40.
- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. L. (1991). Refinement and reassessment of the SERVQUAL scale. *Journal of Retailing*, 67(4), 420–450.
- Paris, C. M. (2012). Flashpackers: An emerging subculture? *Annals of Tourism Research*, 39(2), 1094–1115.
- Pearce, P. (1990). *The backpacker phenomenon: Preliminary answers to basic questions*. Townsville: James Cook University of North Queensland.
- Pearce, P., Murphy, L., & Brymer, E. (2009). *Evolution of the backpacker market and the potential for Australian tourism*. Nathan, Queensland: Cooperative Research Centre for Sustainable Tourism (CRC), Griffiths University.
- Pizam, A., Shapoval, V., & Ellis, T. (2016). Customer satisfaction and its measurement in hospitality enterprises: A revisit and update. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 28(1), 2–35.
- Reisinger, Y., & Mavondo, F. (2002). Determinants of youth travel markets: Perceptions and tourism destinations. *Tourism Analysis*, 7, 55–66.
- Reuland, R., Coudrey, J., & Fagel, A. (1985). Research in the field of hospitality. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 4(4), 141–146.
- Ryan, C., & Mohsin, A. (2001). Backpackers. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 10(1), 69–92.
- Scheyvens, R. (2002). Backpacker tourism and third world development. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 29(1), 144–164.
- Shoval, N., McKercher, B., Ng, E., & Birenboim, A. (2011). Hotel location and tourist activity in cities. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 38(4), 1594–1612.
- Sorensen, A. (2003). Backpacker ethnography. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 30(4), 847–867.
- Tamagni, L., & Zanfardini, M. (2006). Perceived quality of hotels in Neuquen Province, Argentina. *Journal of Hospitality & Leisure Marketing*, 13(3–4), 79–102.
- Taylan Dortyol, I., Varinli, I., & Kitapci, O. (2014). How do international tourists perceive hotel quality? An exploratory study of service quality in Antalya tourism region. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 26(3), 470–495.
- Thyne, M., Davies, S., & Nash, R. (2005). A lifestyle segmentation analysis of the backpacker market in Scotland. *Journal of Quality Assurance in Hospitality & Tourism*, 5, 95–119.
- Urtasun, A., & Gutiérrez, I. (2006). Hotel location in tourism cities: Madrid 1936–1998. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 33(2), 382–402.
- Westerhausen, K., & Macbeth, J. (2003). Backpackers and empowered local communities: Natural allies in the struggle for sustainability and local control. *Tourism Geographies*, 5(1), 71–86.
- Wu, H. C. (2013). An empirical study of the effects of service quality, perceived value, corporate image, and customer satisfaction on behavioral intentions in the Taiwan quick service restaurant industry. *Journal of Quality Assurance in Hospitality and Tourism*, 14(4), 364–390.
- Wu, H. C., & Ko, Y. J. (2013). Assessment of service quality in the hotel industry. *Journal of Quality Assurance in Hospitality & Tourism*, 14(3), 218–244.
- Zeithaml, V. A., Berry, L. L., & Parasuraman, A. (1996). The behavioural consequences of service quality. *Journal of Marketing*, 60, 31–46.