

A study on the convenience of the transportation and accommodation location for backpackers

¹Pin-Fenn Chou*, ²Ying-Chun Wang

¹Department of Business Administration, Far East University, Tainan City, Taiwan, R.O.C.

²Department of Airline and Transport Service Management, National Kaohsiung University
of Hospitality and Tourism, Kaohsiung City, Taiwan, R.O.C.

Abstract

Self-service travel has now become a trend in today's tourism. More and more tourists do not want to be bound by group travel and remain unchanged, gradually prefer free and flexible individual tourism activities.

With the rapid circulation of internet information and numerous travel books, more and more travel-loving people like the sense of accomplishment and satisfaction brought by self-help travel. Backpackers are also one of the important visitors to the sightseeing area for these reasons.

This study adopts the questionnaires to backpackers. The research analysis method is use the path analysis by the AMOS software. The results found that the convenience of the transportation had significantly and positive to affect its behavior intention. The convenience of accommodation location also had significantly and positive to affect its behavior intention. These research hypotheses received the empirical support.

Keywords: backpackers, convenience of the transportation, convenience of accommodation location

* **Corresponding Author**

Motivation

Excepting to group travel, self-service travel has now become a trend in today's tourism (Tsaur et al., 2010). Travelers, from relying on travel agencies to backpacking,

that confirmed the growth of self-help travel has become a trend of tourism (Pryor, 2001; Chesshyre, 2002). When reflects general trends towards self-directed travel and backpacking is more popular, the hostelries have to respond to these needs (Thyne, et al., 2005).

However, today's backpackers are no longer limited to the budget traveled in the past (Maoz, 2007). Most backpackers just love to buy their own tickets and book self-guided trip to the hotel (Germann and Paris, 2015)

Literatures and Hypotheses

With the leader group of tourists or backpackers, the place of accommodation may be a relay station, after a short rest, they will go to the next destination; or it may be the terminal to complete the journey. A good place to stay if it meets consumer needs, then it increases travelers' convenience and will be motivate loyalty (Chou, Hsu and Chen, 2008), positive word-of-mouth effects, and encourage travelers to re-accommodation or recommend them to others (Musa and Thirumoorthi, 2011).

Firth and Hing (1999) argued that, the factors that travelers consider when choosing to stay in a youth hostel are price, location, facilities, and finally to consider the environmental protection issues. Lockyer (2002) pointed out that when choosing a place to stay, consumers are more inclined to choose an accommodation hotel in the city than in the suburbs. Hecht and Martin(2006) pointed out that the location of the accommodation is also a factor of consideration for most backpackers.

In addition, Hecht and Martin (2006) also suggest that whether transportation is convenient, it is an important factor for backpackers to consider accommodation options. In the service process, companies must establish more convenience if they want to retain consumers (Reichheld and Schefter, 2000). Barry et al. (2002) proposed

that five aspects of service convenience: decision convenience, access convenience, transaction convenience, post-benefit convenience, and benefit convenience. It is clear that transaction convenience is one of the important factors for passengers to consider consumer services.

Hence, this study proposed that following hypotheses:

H1: The convenience of the transportation will be significantly to affect its behavior intention.

H2: The convenience of accommodation location will be significantly to affect its behavior intention.

Empirical and results

This study use tool AMOS software to process analysis for the research model and to test the research hypothesis. Results shown that these indicators of the model are: $\chi^2/df=2.64$, CFI = 0.970, GFI = 0.975, AGFI = 0.952, RMR = 0.028, RMSEA = 0.056. All of indicators are reached acceptable level. Also, showing this mode is an acceptable mode.

Next, the reliability and validity of this mode are to verification. As shown in Table 1, in terms of internal reliability, the convenience of transportation, Convenience of accommodation location, and behavior intention their Cronbach's α value for each: 0.731, 0.760, 0.775, respectively. The CR value are: 0.749, 0.760, and 0.776 for convenience of transportation, convenience of accommodation location, and behavior intention, and the AVE value are: 0.501 \cdot 0.514 \cdot 0.635; which are reached reliability and validity level.

Table1: The reliability and validity of research model

| Construct | Cronbach's α | CR | AVE |
|-------------------------------|---------------------|-------|-------|
| convenience of transportation | 0.731 | 0.749 | 0.501 |

| | | | |
|---------------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|
| convenience of accommodation location | 0.760 | 0.760 | 0.514 |
| behavior intention | 0.755 | 0.776 | 0.635 |

Further, this study is to test the research hypotheses and process the H1 and H2. The convenience of transportation had a positively and significant on the behavior intention ($\beta = 0.170$, $p=0.000$). The H1 was accepted. To test the H2, whether the convenience of accommodation location had a positively and significant on the behavior intention by path analysis, also was reached the verified ($\beta = 0.355$, $p=0.000$). The empirical results of research hypotheses are as flowing Table 2.

Table 2 The results of hypotheses analysis

| Constructs | Standardization β | t-value | p-value | Whether supported |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------|---------|---------|-------------------|
| H1: convenience of transportation→behavior intention | 0.170 | 2.348 | 0.019 | supported |
| H2: convenience of accommodation location→behavior intention | 0.355 | 4.709 | 0.000 | supported |

Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to understand and empirical the backpackers they consider to choose the hotels or homestays whether had a percept difference with the convenience of transportation and accommodation location. The results of research pointed that both factors of the convenience of transportation and convenience of accommodation location are all affect the behavior intention. However, the hotels and homestays to provide the accommodation services, which have to attention to the two factors and then can attain the accommodations' re-service or recommendation to others.

Especially, in the convenience of accommodation location, because it has shown a higher weight score was than convenience of transportation. It is most important of

indicated that, the hotels or homestays to choose the location to open for business and to provide the accommodation services for backpackers.

References

Berry, K., Seiders, K. and D. Grewal(2002). Understanding Service Convenience. *Journal of Marketing*, 66(3), 1-17.

Chesshyre, T. (2002). Independent spirit? This is for you. *The Times*, February 9, p. 4.

Chou, T. Y., Hsu, C. L. and M. C., Chen (2008). A fuzzy multi-criteria decision model for international tourist hotels location selection. *International journal of hospitality management*, 27(2), 293-301.

Firth, T. and N. Hing (1999). Backpacker hostels and their guests: Attitudes and behaviours relating to sustainable tourism. *Tourism Management*, 20(2), 251-254.

Germann J. G. and C. M. Paris (2015). The social affordances of flashpacking: Exploring the mobility nexus of travel and communication. *Mobilities*, 10(2), 173-192.

Hecht, J. A. and D. Martin (2006). Backpacking and hostel-picking: An analysis from Canada. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 18(1), 69- 77.

Lockyer, T. (2002). Business guests' accommodation selection: The view from both sides. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 14(6), 294-300.

Maoz, D. (2007). Backpackers' motivations: The role of culture and nationality. *Annals of Tourism Research* 34(1), 122-140.

Musa, G. and T. Thirumoorthi (2011). Red Palm: Exploring service quality and service scape of the best backpacker hostel in Asia. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 14(2), 103-120.

Pryor, C. (2001). Japanese pack for a longer stay. *The Australian*, August 14(5).

Reichheld, F., F. and P. Schefter (2000). E-Loyalty: Your secret weapon on the web. *Harvard Business Review*, 78(4), 105-113.

Thyne, M., Davies, S., and R. Nash (2005). A lifestyle segmentation analysis of the backpacker market in Scotland: A case study of the Scottish Youth Hostel Association. *Journal of Quality Assurance in Hospitality & Tourism*, 5(2-4), 95-119.

Tsaur, S. H., Yen, C. H. and C. L. Chen (2010). Independent tourist knowledge and skills. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 37(4), 1035-1054.