Zoran Paunović / Darko Prebežac

Developing a Typology of Hostel Visitors Using the Bagged Clustering Approach

Abstract

This article is the first study to present a nuanced analysis of hostel visitors. Using the bagged clustering approach, a typology of hostel visitors was developed, involving four distinctive types of hostel visitors: (i) Hostel lovers, (ii) Landing point visitors, (iii) Flashpackers look-alikes, and (iv) Classical backpackers.

Keywords: hostel tourists, segmentation, typology, bagged clustering

1. Introduction

In recent years B.C. (before Corona), the hostel market has experienced constant growth in visitors and new hostel accommodation capacity. Despite being a specific tourist segment that goes beyond classical backpacker identity (Chen et al., 2020), relatively few studies have so far focused on hostel visitors (e.g. Nash et al., 2006; Thyne et al., 2012; Brochado et al., 2015; Mikulić et al., 2016; Seyitoğlu et al., 2020). The present note thus aims to contribute to this research stream and address the following research question: What types of tourists are staying in hostels, and what are their main characteristics? Applying a marketing strategy based on segments, rather than treating the whole market in the same way, may translate into significant competitive advantages, thus reflecting the practical relevance of this research question.

A bagged clustering approach is combined with the framework of "push and pull" factors of tourism motivation using the Croatian hostel market as research setting to achieve this goal. A disproportionate quota sample was used, thereby controlling for the geographical distribution of hostels, the diversity of hostel locations (continent/sea), and the size and type of hostels (small, medium, or large). Out of 34 hostels included in the sample and contacted, 28 agreed to participate in the study. Overall, 693 questionnaires were collected, of which 642 were usable for the subsequent analysis. The data collection combined several methods of communication with respondents (personal interviewing, self-completion and online surveying). A copy of the questionnaire containing all items underlying the segmentation variables is provided in Appendix A.

2. Analysis

The ranking and validation of the segmentation variables were performed using the "Random Forest" algorithm in the software package "R" based on decision tree classification. Decision trees are becoming increasingly popular in tourism research due to their applicability to categorical and numerical variables and good performance when working with significant variables. Recent tourism research shows the strength of the decision tree in profiling hotel visitors, segmenting tourists depending on travel characteristics and perceptions, as well as different behaviours (Pokryshevskaya & Antipov, 2017).

Darko Prebežac, PhD, Corresponding Author, Full Professor, Department of Tourism, Faculty of Economics and Business University of Zagreb, Zagreb, Croatia; ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4856-4668; e-mail: dprebezac@net.efzg.hr



Zoran Paunović, PhD, Mayor of Makarska, Makarska, Croatia;

ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0880-5666; e-mail: zoran.paunovi@gmail.com

The algorithm ranked 25 segmentation variables that covered various push and pull factors elicited via indepth interviews, focus groups, and a review of relevant literature (Appendix B). Rankings were obtained by ranking variables characterized by the highest disagreement levels. The bagged clustering algorithm was applied, keeping intra-group homogeneity at minimum levels and inter-group heterogeneity at maximum levels. Table 1 shows the final ranking of segmentation variables.

Table 1 Ranking of segmentation variables

Rank	Segmentation variable	Mean squared error (MSE)	Node purity
1	Additional services offered by the hostel (extended hostel offer)	4.588	4.714
2	Private car parking	4.499	4.877
3	Privacy at the hostel	4.306	4.908
4	Bar within the hostel	4.214	4.567
5	Landing point (first place when arriving at the destination)	4.210	4.394
6	Common rooms	4.204	4.156
7	Meeting new people	4.186	3.065
8	Entertainment and relaxation	4.101	4.483
9	Activities at the destination	3.653	4.230
10	Safety level at the hostel	3.642	4.274
11	Historical and cultural attractions	3.278	2.088
12	Breakfast option	3.259	3.930
13	Information at the reception	3.121	3.579
14	Experience (general)	2.718	3.162
15	Lifestyle	2.601	4.050
16	Atmosphere at the hostel	2.523	2.146
17	Beautiful scenery at the destination	2.514	1.618
18	Prices	2.087	2.359
19	Hostel location	2.066	3.200
20	Hostel rankings on search engines	2.039	2.436
21	Rest and relaxation	1.996	3.752
22	Internet at the hostel	1.935	2.234
23	Kitchen at the hostel	1.867	3.388
24	Cleanliness	1.797	1.867
25	Escape from daily routine	1.739	2.662

The ten highest-ranked variables were then selected for the bagged-clustering-based segmentation analysis (Figure 1).



Figure 1 Bagged clustering results



The first graph of Figure 1 displays the dendrogram after processing results. The thicker line on the graph below the dendrogram shows the standardized height at which each cluster is aggregated. The second thinner line, with the numbers on the lower graph of the image, shows the first difference in the standardized heights. More prominent folds of the lighter line suggest that hostel visitors can be divided into three or four groups. The analysis also indicates that a five-cluster solution is possible. Still, the four-cluster solution was finally selected to avoid creating a typology that was too fragmented with small groups. The horizontal dotted line on the dendrogram indicates the desired height when choosing a solution with the number of clusters. The size of the clusters is as follows: Cluster 1. - 140 (22%); Cluster 2. - 212 (33%); Cluster 3. - 196 (30%); Cluster 4. - 94 (15%). Central values of the segmentation variables across the identified clusters are presented in Table 2.

Table 2

		Central values				
Segmentation variable	Cluster 1 Cluster 2		Cluster 3	Cluster 4	mean	
Activities at the destination	2.583	1.659	2.506	2.667	2.291	
Meeting new people	1.090	1.234	1.565	1.207	1.276	
Entertainment	1.445	1.518	2.354	1.859	1.787	
Landing point	2.746	1.661	2.415	2.597	2.304	
Common rooms	1.400	1.487	2.093	1.766	1.676	
Bar within the hostel	1.886	1.785	2.528	2.703	2.164	
Privacy at the hostel	2.081	1.464	1.481	2.723	1.794	
Safety at the hostel	1.587	1.330	1.741	2.214	1.620	
Additional services offered	1.496	1.645	2.374	2.263	1.903	
Private car parking	2.307	1.652	1.853	2.787	2.016	

Central values of segmentation variables across clusters



3. Results and discussion

The following features of each cluster can be observed by analyzing the deviations across individual clusters together with respective socio-economic and demographic respondent characteristics (Appendix C).

Cluster 1 (22%) – True hostel lovers

For visitors that belong to the first cluster, a hostel is primarily a place where they can socialize with other people of similar interests and is perceived as a place for fun. They favour hostels over different types of accommodation and choose them intentionally. They are happy buyers of all the activities organized by the hostel, such as pub crawls, walking tours, excursions, etc. It is essential for them that the hostel has a bar and large common areas, but on the other hand, parking spaces and private rooms are not vital to them. Members of this cluster are mostly single (81.2%) and travel with friends (75.7%).

Concerning the frequency of staying in hostels, 60% of respondents in this cluster always choose a hostel as the place to stay. Although, in general, hostel visitors are mostly educated, this segment is by far the most educated - more than 86% are highly educated, of whom 14.4% are postgraduates. Usually, they stay in a particular hostel for 2-3 days, and their average journey lasts one month. More than any other segment, they prefer to travel by train and bus. Since members of this cluster like to stay in hostels and use everything hostels have to offer, the most appropriate name for them is "True Hostel Lovers".

Cluster 2 (33%) – Landing point visitors

This is the largest cluster of hostel guests (33%). Members of this cluster perceive hostels as a fun place that serves as the "landing point", where they first arrive at their destination until they find better accommodation. They have a slightly higher financial standard, and when choosing a hostel, they consider a bar important and, unlike cluster 1, also private rooms (ensuite) and private parking. Security is of utmost importance to them, and they highly rate a safe and/or a place where they can lock up personal items as one of their essential features in choosing a hostel. Shopping is one of the main motivating factors that drive members of this cluster to travel. They are not as loyal to hostels as the first cluster and are happy to book other types of accommodations as well. They spend an average of 30 days on the road, and they mostly prefer to travel by plane, while the train is a form of transport they least use. With this cluster, two characteristics stand out when compared with other clusters - shopping and landing point (the place of the first arrival). Because of this, this cluster was named "Landing point visitors".

Cluster 3 (30%) – Flashpackers look-alike

Cluster 3 includes hostel users who primarily value peace and privacy. They need private parking and private rooms, and the idea that hostels are commonly a place for partying is very annoying to them. Although they are happy to stay in a hostel, they do not have a strong desire for socialization, so they are indifferent to whether the hostel has a bar or other social areas. They also do not care much about the hostel's extra activities. Similarly, Cluster 2 members do not often stay in hostels. A few Cluster 3 members said they remained in a hostel when they had no other choice. Their average travel time is the shortest of all other groups (an average of 16.4 days); they like to travel as quickly as possible and stay fewer days at the destination. Members of this cluster are usually full-time employed and have, on average, the highest disposable income (more than 40% earn 1,500 euros or more per month). Also, this cluster has the lowest number of singles, and they are primarily with life partners. On average, it is the oldest segment, with almost 18% of its members over 35. As per the mode of transport, this segment mostly travels by car. Long-distance buses and public transport are the least preferred modes of travel. Characteristics of this segment have a lot of similarities to Flashpackers - a segment described in other studies and mentioned in focus groups when conducting exploratory research. Therefore, this segment has been named "Flashpackers look-alike", with new features discovered during this research.



Zoran Paunović / Darko Prebežac Typology of Hostel Visitors An International Interdisciplinary Journal Vol. 72/ No. 1/ 2024/ 105 - 114

Cluster 4 (15%) – Classical backpackers

Hostel visitors that were grouped in the fourth cluster, in essence, are the opposite of those in Cluster 2 and, at the same time, most like those in Cluster 1. When going on the trip, a push factor that is the least motivating for them is shopping. They see hostels as places to socialize with people of similar interests. They often choose it as a place to stay, and it is not essential to them if a hostel has a bar, private rooms, private parking or a safe. However, unlike Cluster 1, they rarely consume the additional services the hostel offers. They usually do not stay more than 2-3 days per hostel. They are the longest ones on the road (43.7 days on average), primarily students. This segment has the lowest monthly income (34% have less than 500 euros, and 29.7% have 500 to 1,000 euros a month available). They are also the youngest segment (74% are 18-25). They do not prefer to travel by car, except for hitchhiking, which a small part of this cluster frequently does. Mostly, they travel by bus and train, and the least frequent mode of transportation they use is by plane. This cluster has the highest number of hostel visitors travelling alone. Since it has all the features of typical backpackers, the best choice is to call them "Classical backpackers".

4. Limitations and future research directions

There are two limitations associated with the presented typology of hostel tourists. First, although in line with recommendations regarding the relationship between the number of variables and the sample size (56 statements plus socio-economic and demographic variables), a larger sample would facilitate more accurate and detailed descriptions of individual clusters. For example, if 1,200 respondents were surveyed, 20 statements could be included in the segmentation algorithm (instead of 10 formed in the present study). The second limitation is related to the fact that the research was conducted in Croatia. Although being a propulsive destination in recent years, it would be interesting to see whether the obtained typology also applies to other markets and whether some new niche segments would be discovered in different research settings.

References

- Brochado, A., Rita, P., & Gameiro, C. (2015). Exploring backpackers' perceptions of the hostel service quality. International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 27(8), 1839-1855. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-03-2014-0145
- Chen, G., Zhao, L., & Huang, S. (2020). Backpacker identity: Scale development and validation. Journal of Travel Research, 59(2), 281-294. https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287519829255
- Mikulić, J., Krešić, D., Miličević, K., Šerić, M., & Ćurković, B. (2016). Destination attractiveness drivers among urban hostel tourists: An analysis of frustrators and delighters. International Journal of Tourism Research, 18(1), 74-81. https://doi.org/10.1002/jtr.2034
- 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(3), 525-532. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2005.01.001
- Pokryshevskaya, E.B., & Antipov, E.A. (2017). Profiling satisfied and dissatisfied hotel visitors using publicly available data from a booking platform. International Journal of Hospitality Management, 67, 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2017.07.009
- Seyitoğlu, F., Çakar, K., & Karataş, G. (2020). Göreme (Cappadocia): Examining the hostel experiences of tourists. Anatolia, 31(1), 142-145. https://doi.org/10.1080/13032917.2019.1689516
- Thyne, M., Davies, S., & Nash, R. (2012). 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 and Tourism, 5(2-4), 95-119. https://doi.org/10.1300/J162v05n02_06



Appendix A

Questionnaire for hostel guests

	Thank you for taking the time to share information about yourself, your background, and reasons for visiting hostels. Your feedback is very valuable to us and all information that you provide will be used in the strictest confidence! THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME!					
	For each statement below please tick "Agree" box if that description ap agree nor disagree with the statement, please tick box "Neither Agree r	plies and "Disagree" box if it does not apply. If you neither or Disagree".				
	I travel because I want to:	use 🗶 to indicate your choice				
	M1 Escape from my daily routine	Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagre				
	M2 Feel free	Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagre				
al)	M3 Find adventure	Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagre				
ener	M4 Visit famous cultural and historical attractions	Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagre				
es (g	M5 Interact with local people	Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagre				
otive	M6 Meet new people	Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagre				
el m	M7 See some beautiful natural scenery	Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagree				
Trav	M8 Go shopping	Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagree				
	M9 Physically relax and rest during my travel	Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagree				
	M10 Party	Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagree				
	M11 Enjoy outdoor activities	Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagre				
	M12 Enjoy sport activities	Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagre				
	M13 Learn about the new culture	Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagree				
	M14 Visit festivals (music, food, wine, film, motorbike, etc.)	Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagre				
For each statement below please tick "Agree" box if that description applies and "Disagree" box if it does not apply. If you n agree nor disagree with the statement, please tick box "Neither Agree nor Disagree".						
	P1 Lots of fun	Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagre				
els)	P2 Inexpensive	Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagre				
hoste	P3 Cleaner than other types of accommodation	Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagre				
les (l	P4 Best way to get info about the destination (at the reception desk)	Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagre				
tituo	P5 Not a good way to get information about destination	Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagree				
ıd at	P6 Lifestyle choice	Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagre				
ıs ar	P7 Places with unique atmosphere	Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagre				
ptior	P8 Places to easily meet new people	Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagree				
erce	P9 Places to socialize with other people with similar interests	Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagre				
đ	P10 Place to party	Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagre				
	P11 Good value for money	Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagree				
	P12 Place to relax	Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagre				
	P13 "Landing point" before I find better accommodation	Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagre				
	P14 Place to feel young again	Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagre				



For each hostel facility below please tick "Agree" box if that descripti neither agree nor disagree with the statement, please tick box "Neith	on applies and "Disagree" box if it does not apply. If you er Agree nor Disagree".
When choosing a hostel to stay, it is very important to me	that hostel has:
F1 Good reviews on booking sites	Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagree
F2 Free Wi-Fi	Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagree
F3 24h reception	Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagree
F4 Up to date information at the reception about destination	Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagree
F5 Reception staff that speaks my language	
F6 Clean premises (bedrooms, toilets, social areas, etc.)	Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagree
F7 Good value for money	
F8 Big social areas	
59 Location in the city center	
Fig. Good atmosphere/character of the bostel	
F10 GOOD atmosphere/character of the hoster	
F11 Bar inside the hostel	
F12 Private bedrooms in the hoster	
F13 Separate male/remaie dorms in the noster	
P F14 Bunk beds with private curtains	
F15 Safety lockers	AgreeNeither Agree nor DisagreeDisagree
F16 Safety deposit box	AgreeNeither Agree nor DisagreeDisagree
F17 Safety luggage storage	AgreeNeither Agree nor DisagreeDisagree
F18 Activities organized by hostel (pub crawls, walking tours, etc.)	AgreeNeither Agree nor DisagreeDisagree
F19 Travel desk for tours info	AgreeNeither Agree nor DisagreeDisagree
F20 Laundry facilities	AgreeNeither Agree nor DisagreeDisagree
F21 Bicycle parking	AgreeNeither Agree nor DisagreeDisagree
F22 Transfer service to other destinations or/and airports	AgreeNeither Agree nor DisagreeDisagree
F23 Complementary coffee	AgreeNeither Agree nor DisagreeDisagree
F24 On-site restaurant that serves local food	AgreeNeither Agree nor DisagreeDisagree
F25 Private car parking	AgreeNeither Agree nor DisagreeDisagree
F26 Common kitchen	AgreeNeither Agree nor DisagreeDisagree
F27 Optional breakfast	AgreeNeither Agree nor DisagreeDisagree
F28 Interactive hostel staff	AgreeNeither Agree nor DisagreeDisagree
Generally, I travel Once a year Generally, whe	en Car Generally, when Friends
Twice a year traveling I pref	er Bus traveling, I travel with Partner
Every month answe	rs) Hitchhiking Alone
Every weekend	Plane Other
Other	Motorbike
	Other
How often do you Always How long do you stay in hostels Not very often usually stay in o	he 2-3 days particular trip last before
lt's my first time host	el3-5 days you return home
When I do not have other	1 week
para	2-4 weeks
ent	>1 month
Bigs Education level High school or equivalent Employment state	us Full time Approximate monthly Jup to 500 (
University/collage degree	Part time income 501 - 1000
Post-graduate degree	Not employed 1001-1500
	Other > 2000 €
Marital status Single	ge <18 Gender Male
Cohabitate	18-25 Kender Male
Married/no children	26-30
Married/with children	31-35 36-40 Country of your
Other	>41 citizenship
Thank you for you	ır time!



Appendix B

Hostel tourist segmentation variables

Segmentation variables		Source/elicitation	Pull or push factor	Relation to Likert items
1.	Internet access at the hostel	In-depth interview	Pull factor	F2
2.	Information at the reception	In-depth interview	Pull factor	F3, F4, F5, P4, P5
3.	Cleanliness	In-depth interview	Pull factor	F6, P3
4.	Prices	In-depth interview	Pull factor	F7, P2, P11
5.	Common rooms	In-depth interview	Pull factor	F8
6.	Meeting new people	In-depth interview	Push factor	M5, M6, P8, P9
7.	Hostel location	In-depth interview	Push factor	F9
8.	Activities at the destination	In-depth interview	Pull factor	M3, M8, M11, M12, M14
9.	Atmosphere (character) at the hostel	In-depth interview	Pull factor	F10
10.	Beautiful scenery at the destination	In-depth interview	Pull factor	M7
11.	Historical and cultural attractions	In-depth interview	Push factor	M4, M13
12.	Bar within the hostel	In-depth interview	Pull factor	F11
13.	Lifestyle	In-depth interview	Push factor	P6, P14
14.	Privacy at the hostel	In-depth interview	Pull factor	F12, F13, F14
15.	Safety at the hostel	In-depth interview	Pull factor	F15, F16, F17
16.	Additional services offered by the hostel (extended offer)	In-depth interview	Pull factor	F18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23,24
17.	Private car parking	In-depth interview	Pull factor	F25
18.	Kitchen at the hostel	In-depth interview	Pull factor	F26
19.	Breakfast option	In-depth interview	Pull factor	F27
20.	Entertainment	In-depth interview	Push factor	P1, P7, P10, P12, M10
21.	Experience (general)	In-depth interview	Push factor	F28
22.	Escape from daily routine	Literature review	Push factor	M1, M2
23.	Rest and relaxation	Literature review	Push factor	M9
24.	Landing point	Focus group	Pull factor	P13
25.	Hostel rankings on search engines	Focus group	Pull factor	F1



Appendix C

Socio-economic and demographic characteristics by cluster

	1.	2.	3.	4.	p.overall
	N=140	N=212	N=196	N=94	
Travel frequency:		(20.20())	42 (24 00)		0.369
Once a year	35 (26.1 <u>%)</u>	<u>61</u> (29.2%)	42 (21.8%)	25 (26.9%)	
I wice a year	52 (38.8 <u>%)</u>	<u>89</u> (42.6%)	88 (45.6%)	41 (44.1%)	
Every three months	35 (26.1 <u>%)</u>	<u>36</u> (17.2%)	45 (23.3%)	17 (18.3%)	
Every month	10 (7.46 <u>%)</u>	<u> 15</u> (7.18%)	11 (5.70%)	8 (8.60%)	
Every weekend	1 (0.75 <u>%)</u>	<u>/</u> (3.35%)	3 (1.55%)	0 (0.00%)	
Other	1 (0.75 <u>%)</u>	<u> 1</u> (0.48%)	4 (2.07%)	2 (2.15%)	
Frequency of staying at hostels	/ />		/		<0.001
Always	83 (59.7 <u>%)</u>	<u>85</u> (40.7%)	79 (40.5%)	56 (60.2%)	
Not too often	38 (27.3 <u>%)</u>	<u>87</u> (41.6%)	91 (46.7%)	20 (21.5%)	
This is my first time	17 (12.2 <u>%)</u>	<u>21</u> (10.0%)	10 (5.13%)	11 (11.8%)	
When I have no other option	1 (0.72 <u>%)</u>	<u> 16</u> (7.66%)	15 (7.69%)	6 (6.45%)	
Duration of stay at the hostel					0.004
1 day	11 (7.91 <u>%)</u>	<u>26</u> (12.4%)	28 (14.4%)	6 (6.45%)	
2-3 days	89 (64.0 <u>%)</u>	<u>119</u> (56.9%)	125 (64.1 <u>%)</u>	<u>72</u> (77.4%)	
3-5 days	26 (18.7 <u>%)</u>	<u>34</u> (16.3%)	25 (12.8%)	12 (12.9%)	
1 week	3 (2.16 <u>%)</u>	<u> 15</u> (7.18%)	12 (6.15%)	3 (3.23%)	
1-2 weeks	2 (1.44 <u>%)</u>	<u>10</u> (4.78%)	5 (2.56%)	0 (0.00%)	
2-4 weeks	4 (2.88 <u>%)</u>	<u>2</u> (0.96%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	
> 1 month	4 (2.88 <u>%)</u>	<u> </u>	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	
Travel duration:	34.4 (51.7)	29.5 (72.1)	16.4 (33.5)	43.7 (94.3)	0.005
Education:	0.214	ļ			
Highschool or similar	18 (12.9 <u>%)</u>	<u>46</u> (22.0%)	32 (16.4%)	17 (18.3%)	
College / University degree	100 (71.9 <u>%)</u>	<u>125</u> (59.8%)	125 (64.1 <u>%)</u>	<u>66</u> (71.0%)	
Postgraduate degree	20 (14.4 <u>%)</u>	<u> </u>	38 (19.5%)	10 (10.8%)	
Other	1 (0.72 <u>%)</u>	1 (0.48%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	
Employment:					0.165
Full time	58 (42.3%)	86 (41.5%)	96 (49.7%)	30 (32.3%)	
Part-time	19 (13.9%)	33 (15.9%)	25 (13.0%)	11 (11.8%)	
Unemployed	14 (10.2%)	19 (9.18%)	13 (6.74%)	10 (10.8%)	
Student	45 (32.8%)	68 (32.9%)	55 (28.5%)	42 (45.2%)	
Other	1 (0.73%)	1 (0.48%)	4 (2.07%)	0 (0.00%)	
Monthly income:	· (•··· • <u>···</u>	(00.00,00)	(,	- (,	0.013
<=500 €	46 (33,3%)	51 (24.4%)	46 (23.6%)	31 (34,1%)	
501-1000€	21 (15.2%)	45 (21.5%)	35 (17.9%)	27 (29.7%)	
1001-1500€	20 (14.5%)	44 (21.1%)	35 (17.9%)	10 (11.0%)	
1501-2000€	19 (13.8%)	31 (14.8%)	30 (15.4%)	15 (16.5%)	
>2000 €	32 (23.2%)	38 (18.2%)	49 (25 1%)	8 (8 79%)	
Marital status:	02 (2012 <u>70)</u>		(2011/0)	0 (011 2 /0)	< 0.001
Single	112 (81.2%)	138 (66.0%)	96 (49 2%)	73 (78 5%)	(0.001
Partnershin	20 (14 5%)	<u> </u>	<u></u>	18 (19.4%)	
Married / no children	20 (14.5 <u>70)</u> 3 (2.17%)	11 (5 26%)	8 (4 10%)	2 (2 15%)	
Married / with children	1 (0.72%)	<u> </u>	13 (6 67%)	0 (0.00%)	
Divorced	7 (0.72 <u>/0)</u> 2 (1.45%)	3 (1 4 4 %)	2 (1 03%)	0 (0.00%)	
Othor	2 (1.45 <u>%)</u>	- 3 (1.44%)	2 (1.0370)	0 (0.00%)	
Age	0 (0.00 <u>%)</u>	0.00%)	5 (1.54%)	0 (0.00%)	<0.001
Age	0 (0 000%)	2(1440/)	1 (0 5 10/)	0 (0 000%)	<0.001
 10 10 DE 	0 (0.00 <u>%)</u>	<u> </u>	I (U.J I%)	0 (0.00%)	
10-20	00 (03.3 <u>%)</u> 24 (24.504)	<u>(105.0%) 221</u>	07 (44.0%) 55 (20.204)	09 (74.2%)	
20-30	54 (24.5 <u>%)</u>	37 (1/./%)	22 (28.2%)	1/ (10.3%)	
31-33 26 40	14 (10.1%)		10 (9.23%)	S (S.∠3%) S (S.1504)	
30-4U	Z (1.44 <u>%)</u>	<u> </u>	13 (0.0/%)	2 (2.15%)	
>41	I (0.72 <u>%)</u>	<u> 5</u> (2.39%)	21 (10.8%)	2 (2.15%)	



Socio-economic and demographic characteristics by cluster (continued)

Gender:					0.939
Male	76 (55.1 <u>%)</u>	<u>108</u> (51.7%)	103 (52.8%)	50 (53.8%)	
Female	62 (44.9 <u>%)</u>	<u>101</u> (48.3%)	92 (47.2%)	43 (46.2%)	
Mode of traveling-car:					< 0.001
No	103 (73.6%)	142 (67.0 <u>%)</u>	<u>97</u> (49.5%)	73 (77.7%)	
Yes	37 (26.4 <u>%)</u>	<u>70</u> (33.0%)	99 (50.5%)	21 (22.3%)	
Mode of traveling-bus		0.007			
No	76 (54.3 <u>%)</u>	<u>103</u> (48.6%)	125 (63.8%)	44 (46.8%)	
Yes	64 (45.7 <u>%)</u>	<u>109</u> (51.4%)	71 (36.2%)	50 (53.2%)	
Mode of traveling-train:					< 0.001
No	64 (45.7%)	148 (69.8%)	125 (63.8 <u>%)</u>	<u>45</u> (47.9%)	
Yes	76 (54.3 <u>%)</u>	<u>64</u> (30.2%)	71 (36.2%)	49 (52.1%)	
Mode of traveling-hitchhiking:					0.037
No	138 (98.6%)	202 (95.3%)	185 (94.4 <u>%)</u>	<u>85</u> (90.4%)	
Yes	2 (1.43 <u>%)</u>	<u>10</u> (4.72%)	11 (5.61%)	9 (9.57%)	
Mode of traveling-plane:					0.721
No	89 (63.6%)	125 (59.0%)	119 (60.7 <u>%)</u>	<u>61</u> (64.9%)	
Yes	51 (36.4 <u>%)</u>	<u>87</u> (41.0%)	77 (39.3%)	33 (35.1%)	
Mode of traveling-motorbike:					0.314
No	136 (97.1%)	210 (99.1%)	194 (99.0 <u>%)</u>	<u>94</u> (100%)	
Yes	4 (2.86 <u>%)</u>	<u>2</u> (0.94%)	2 (1.02%)	0 (0.00%)	
Mode of travelling-bike:					0.175
No	138 (98.6%)	209 (98.6%)	187 (95.4%)	91 (96.8%)	
Yes	2 (1.43 <u>%)</u>	3 (1.42%)	9 (4.59%)	3 (3.19%)	
Travelling with friends:					0.886
No	34 (24.3 <u>%)</u>	<u>55</u> (25.9%)	55 (28.1%)	24 (25.5%)	
Yes	106 (75.7%)	157 (74.1%)	141 (71.9%)	70 (74.5%)	
Traveling with partner:					< 0.001
No	104 (74.3%)	140 (66.0%)	96 (49.0 <u>%)</u>	<u>75</u> (79.8%)	
Yes	36 (25.7 <u>%)</u>	72 (34.0%)	100 (51.0%)	19 (20.2%)	
Traveling with family					0.459
No	117 (83.6%)	168 (79.2%)	166 (84.7%)	75 (79.8%)	
Yes	23 (16.4 <u>%)</u>	44 (20.8%)	30 (15.3%)	19 (20.2%)	
Travelling alone:					< 0.001
No	93 (66.4%)	167 (78.8%)	163 (83.2 <u>%)</u>	<u>57</u> (60.6%)	
Yes	47 (33.6 <u>%)</u>	<u>45</u> (21.2%)	33 (16.8%)	37 (39.4%)	
Travelling with others: no	140 (100 <u>%)</u>	<u>212</u> (100%)	196 (100%)	94 (100%)	
-					

Submitted: 2023, February 24 Revised: 2023, June 10 Accepted: 2023, September, 03

