2020

Backpacker identity: Scale development and validation

Ganghua Chen

Lijun Zhao

Songshan (Sam) Huang
Edith Cowan University

Backpacker Identity: Scale Development and Validation

Ganghua Chen

School of Tourism Management

Sun Yat-sen University

No. 329 Building, No. 135 Xingangxi Road, Haizhu District, Guangzhou, 510275, P.R. China

Tel. and fax: +86-20-84113621

Email: ganghuachen0311@126.com

Lijun Zhao

(Graduate student)

School of Tourism Management

Sun Yat-sen University

Tangjiawan, Zhuhai, Guangdong Province, 519082, P.R. China

Tel. and fax: +86-20-84113621

Email: 1147860281@qq.com

Songshan (Sam) Huang*

(*****_Corresponding author_)

(Professor of Tourism & Services Marketing)

School of Business and Law

Edith Cowan University

270 Joondalup Drive, Joondalup, WA 6027, Australia

Email: s.huang@ecu.edu.au

Acknowledgements

Author Bio：

Ganghua Chen, PhD, is Associate Professor in Tourism Management in the School of Tourism Management, and a member of the Center for Tourism Planning and Research at Sun Yat-sen University, Guangzhou, China. He obtained his PhD in Tourism Management from Sun Yat-sen University in 2012. His research interests include tourist behavior, destination marketing, backpacker tourism, resort governance, and resort environment restorativeness.

Lijun Zhao is a graduate student in Tourism Management in the School of Tourism Management at Sun Yat-sen University, Zhuhai, China. Her research interests include tourist behaviors and backpacker tourism.

Songshan (Sam) Huang, PhD, is Professor of Tourism & Services Marketing, School of Business and Law, Edith Cowan University. He obtained his PhD in Tourism Management from the Hong Kong Polytechnic University. His research interests include tourist behavior, destination marketing, tour guiding, and various Chinese tourism and hospitality issues.

Abstract

Backpacker identity has attracted growing attention in backpacker tourism research. However, there still lacks a valid scale to measure backpacker identity. Guided by Social Identity Theory (SIT), this study aims to develop and validate a scale to measure backpacker identity in the Chinese context. The study used two Chinese backpacker samples in two stages (Study 1, n=190; Study 2, n=323) to establish the psychometric properties of a backpacker identity scale (BIS). Following the process of scale development, a three-dimension (i.e., *self-categorization*, *group self-value*, and *group self-evaluation*) backpacker identity measurement model was identified. The refined scale with 16 measurement items was finally identified with sufficient reliability and validity. Theoretical and practical implications were discussed.

Keywords: Backpacker identity, Social Identity Theory (SIT), scale development, Chinese backpackers, self-categorization, group self-value, group self-evaluation

Introduction

As a reflective cognition construct that answers the question of "Who am I?" (e.g.,

Stryker and Serpe 1982; Tajfel 1982), identity has been recognized not only as a main

motivational source of human behavior (e.g., Burke 2004; McCall and Simmons

1978; Stryker and Serpe 1982; Tajfel 1982), but also to be highly related to personal

mental health. Identity is believed to influence an individual's self-verification (e.g.,

Ellemers, Kortekaas, and Ouwerkerk 1999), self-consistency (e.g., Burke 2004), self-

esteem and self-efficacy (e.g., Erez and Earley 1993; Hornsey 2008; Tajfel 1982), and

emotions (e.g., Burke 2004). Recently, identity has gained increasing attention in

travel and tourism research (e.g., Desforges 2000; Hibbert 2013; Milde 2010),

particularly in backpacker studies (e.g., Anderskov 2002; S. Cohen 2011; Elsrud

2001; Kerry 2013; Noy 2004; Noy and E. Cohen 2005; O'Reilly 2005; Zhang,

Morrison, Tucker, and Wu 2018; Zhang, Tucker, Morrison, and Wu 2017).

Specifically, recent research has questioned the usefulness of previously widely-

used objective criteria (i.e., length of trip, budget, itinerary, and activity preferences)

in distinguishing backpackers from other types of tourist (e.g., Dayour, Kimbu, and

Park 2017; Larsen, Øgaard, and Brun 2011; Sørensen 2003; Zhang et al. 2017; Zhang

et al. 2018). Researchers have generally argued that objective characteristics should

best be deemed as guidelines to understand backpackers, because many travelers who

do not necessarily meet these criteria still label themselves as backpackers (e.g.,

Sørensen 2003). Furthermore, as Social Identity Theory (SIT; Tajfel 1982; Tajfel and

Turner 1979) posits, individuals have a fundamental need to belong to a specific,

readily labeled, and self-selected group (i.e., self-categorization); therefore, their

social identities are constructed through their identification with a particular social

group and the evaluative (i.e., group self-esteem) and affective (i.e., commitment to a

group) consequences of such a grouping (e.g., Hornsey 2008; Tajfel 1982). According

to SIT, it is reasonable to argue that certain travelers identify themselves as

backpackers not only because they meet some tangible criteria, but more importantly

also because they accept and manifest the socially constructed meanings and values of

backpacking and thus may have a sense of belonging and emotional commitment to

backpacking and the backpacker group (e.g., Liu, Zhang, Wu, and Morrison 2018;

Zhang et al. 2017; Zhang et al. 2018).

Nevertheless, a review of extant literature shows that tourism researchers have

only sporadically studied the different aspects of backpacker identity. Pertinent

important questions like "what are the dimensions of backpacker identity" and "how

could backpacker identity be effectively measured?" still remain largely unanswered.

As such, using SIT as a guiding theory, this study aims to:

(1) identify the dimensions of backpacker identity; and,

(2) develop and validate a valid and reliable scale to measure backpacker

identity.

The findings are believed to be able to advance our understanding of backpacker

identity as a significant construct with the growing backpacker market (e.g., Chen and

Huang 2017; Liu et al. 2018; Zhang et al. 2018) and thus provide practical

implications for backpackers, educational and health institutions, tourism policy-

makers, tourism marketers, and tourism industry practitioners.

Theoretical Backgrounds

Understanding Backpackers: "Who are they?" and "Who am I?"

In his milestone work, E. Cohen (1972) categorized tourist roles into four types by familiarity and novelty (i.e., the microenvironment attributes that different types of tourists seek to experience at a destination): *the organized mass tourist*, *the individual mass tourist*, *the explorer*, and *the drifter*. The last two types have often been regarded as "non-institutionalized" tourists. Furthermore, *the drifter* has been referred as the prototype for *the backpacker* (E. Cohen 2003), which was subsequently characterized as independent travelers who prefer budget accommodation, longer holidays, itinerary flexibility, meeting other travelers, and social and participatory holiday activities (Loker-Murphy and Pearce 1995; Pearce 1990).

Since Cohen's (1972) seminal work, tourism researchers have studied the characteristics of backpackers and subsequently classified them into distinctive groups (e.g., G. Chen, Bao, and Huang 2014a; Larsen, Øgaard, and Brun 2011; Liu et al. 2018; Loker-Murphy 1997; Pearce 1990; Riley 1988; Ryan and Mohsin 2001; Sørensen 2003; Uriely, Yonay, and Simchai 2002). Tourism researchers have tried to

identify and use objective criteria to distinguish these travelers from the more

"institutionalized" tourists (e.g., Loker-Murphy and Pearce 1995; Uriely, Yonay, and

Simchai 2002; Riley 1988). In their influential work, Uriely, Yonay, and Simchai

(2002) employed two concepts (i.e., 'form' and 'type') to further classify

backpackers. Form-related attributes refer to those 'visible institutional arrangements

and practices by which tourists organize their journey' (Uriely et al., 2002, p.521),

such as length of trip (e.g., Elsrud 2001; O'Reilly, 2006), flexibility of the itinerary

(e.g., Pearce 1990; Vogt 1976), means of transportation and accommodation (e.g., E.

Cohen 1972; Pearce 1990; Riley 1988; Zhang et al. 2017; Zhang et al. 2018; Zhu

2007), interaction with locals and fellow travelers (e.g., Riley 1988), visited

destinations and attractions (e.g., E. Cohen 1972; Riley 1988; Vogt 1976), and so

forth. Type-related attributes refer to 'less tangible psychological attributes' (Uriely,

Yonay, and Simchai 2002, p.521), such as tourists' motivations for travel (e.g., G.

Chen, Bao, and Huang 2014a; Loker-Murphy 1997; Ryan and Mohsin 2001),

attitudes toward fundamental values of their own society and culture, and the

meanings they assign to their experiences (e.g., E. Cohen 1972; S. Cohen 2011).

8

Drawing on an empirical study on the 'types' of Israeli backpackers based on travel

motivations and the meanings assigned to backpacking experiences, Uriely et al.

(2002) argued that backpacking should only be defined as a form of tourism, due to

the heterogeneous nature of backpacking in terms of its type-related aspects.

Nonetheless, with the evolution of backpacking as a globalized travel style, some

tourism scholars have questioned and challenged the use of objective criteria to

distinguish backpackers from other types of tourists. For example, Sørensen (2003)

argued that the above-mentioned form-related attributes (i.e., length of trip, budget,

and itinerary) can only be used as a guideline to understand backpackers, because

many travelers who do not meet the criteria still consider themselves as backpackers.

On the contrary, in a recent study on Chinese backpackers, Zhang et al. (2018) found

that among backpacker respondents who 'were operationalized as independent

travelers, who carry backpacks, and who stay in backpacker hostels during their trips'

(p.529), 66% (205 out of 310) did not identify themselves as backpackers in the

question 'Are you a backpacker?'. Similarly, Larsen, Øgaard, and Brun (2011) found

that there were very limited differences between backpackers (who were identified as

travelers staying in Hostelling International hostels) and mainstream tourists in terms

of some psychological variables, including motivations, subjective judgments of risk,

total tourist worries, and tourist role preferences (i.e., *drifter*, *explorer*, *individual*

mass tourist, and *organized mass tourist*). These studies have all presented a

challenge in understanding 'what makes a backpacker a backpacker' (e.g., Zhang et

al. 2018) and 'who is a backpacker' (e.g., Dayour, Kimbu, and Park 2017).

Backpacker Identity: A Social Identity Theory Perspective

Social identity is '. . . that part of an individual's self-concept which derives from his

knowledge of his membership of a social group (or groups) together with the value

and emotional significance attached to that membership.' (Tajfel 1978, p. 63). As one

of the most influential identity theories (e.g., Ellemers, Kortekaas, and Ouwerkerk

1999; Hogg, Terry and White 1995; Hornsey 2008), Social Identity Theory (SIT) has

provided an integrated theoretical framework to answer the above questions regarding

backpacker identity (e.g., Hornsey 2008; Liu et al. 2018). According to SIT,

individuals have a fundamental need to belong to a specific, readily labeled, and self-

selected group or category (e.g., nationality, political affiliation, and sports team; e.g.,

Tajfel 1982; Tajfel and Turner 1979). Based on SIT, with its three interlinked

components: cognitive component (self-categorization), evaluative component (self-

esteem), and emotional component (commitment to a group) (e.g., Ellemers,

Kortekaas, and Ouwerkerk 1999; Hogg, Terry and White 1995; Hornsey 2008; Tajfel

1978, 1982), social identity can be used to synthesize past research on backpackers'

identities. Even though most of existing studies have not explicitly used the term

social identity in their inquiries, similar terms like *collective identity* (e.g., Noy 2004;

Desforges 2000; Zhang et al. 2017) and *group identity* (e.g., Currie, Campbell-Trant,

and Seaton 2011) have been widely applied in the backpacker literature. These

previous studies are summarized in Table 1.

Backpacker Self-categorization

As social psychologists posit, the cognitive component of social identity, in the sense

of awareness of one's membership in a specific social group, highlights the process of

an individual's self-categorization (e.g., Ellemers, Kortekaas, and Ouwerkerk 1999;

Tajfel 1982). Self-categorization depends on a series of basic understanding of the

fundamental characteristics defining ingroups ('us') and outgroups ('them')

(Ellemers, Kortekaas, and Ouwerkerk 1999). Often, individuals identify themselves as part of a particular social category, in which their cognitive understanding of self or ideal self could be achieved (Tajfel 1982).

In correspondence to the cognitive component of social identity, tourism researchers have mentioned the self-categorization of backpackers sporadically. Specifically, prior studies (e.g., Elsrud 2001; Hibbert 2013; Liu et al. 2018; Muzaini 2006; O'Reilly 2005; Richards and Wilson 2004; Tucker 2003; Welk 2004; Zhang et al. 2017) show the most commonly used way for backpackers to establish their salient identity is social differentiation, i.e., to label them as 'travelers' or 'backpackers', rather than 'tourists', as the term 'tourist' in their eyes has negative connotations. According to Noy (2004), when telling their transformative travel stories, Israeli backpackers usually emphasize the authenticity of their experiences to establish and strengthen their identities as backpackers. In addition, among the narratives, being a backpacker has become an important part of their personal identity/social status (Noy 2004). In another case, Zhang et al. (2017) recorded that, in becoming a backpacker, Chinese backpackers mostly reinforced their identity through social differentiation to

distinguish themselves from mass tourists. In a following study, Zhang et al. (2018)

adopted Mael and Ashforth (1992)'s six-item *Organizational Identification Scale* in

the organizational behavior context to measure Chinese backpackers' social identity

(self-identification). It is found that external-oriented motivation, work alienation, and

detachment from home centers are factors that mostly indicate social identities of

Chinese backpackers (Zhang et al. 2018). However, according to Liu et al. (2016),

this context-specific scale (Mael and Ashforth 1992) is only capable of measuring the

group identity (group categorization) of backpackers, which according to SIT (e.g.,

Ellemers, Kortekaas, and Ouwerkerk 1999; Tajfel 1982), may not be able to

comprehensively measure the social identity dimensions of backpackers.

Backpacker Group Self-esteem

Self-esteem has been defined as an overall appraisal of one's self-worth (Rosenberg

1965). The evaluative component of social identity associates group awareness

(cognition) with selection of meanings and value bestowed to the group membership

(e.g., Hornsey 2008; Ellemers, Kortekaas, and Ouwerkerk 1999; Tajfel 1978, 1982).

As Hogg, Terry and White (1995) claim, perceived group characteristics can

coordinate an individual's behavior based on normative values associated with a

specific group membership. Social psychologists posit that members of a group are

greatly motivated to adopt behavioral strategies to maintain a positive in-group

identity compared to outgroups (e.g., Tajfel 1982). Through comparing, an individual

often aims to establish an ingroup superiority. Consequently, an evaluatively positive

self-esteem (self-evaluation and self-value) can be achieved (e.g., Hogg and Abrams

1993; Tajfel 1978, 1982).

In the backpacking setting, tourism researchers have occasionally mentioned the

group self-esteem (i.e., self-evaluation and self-value) of backpackers. Many previous

studies (e.g., Kerry 2013; Jane 2013; Liu et al. 2018; Power 2010; Zhang et al. 2017)

have demonstrated that backpackers have, or perceive themselves to have, many

unique personality traits (i.e., independence, freedom, responsibility, tolerance, and

openness). Backpackers were believed to have unique ways of traveling and possess a

unique travel culture (e.g., Anderskov 2002; Currie, Campbell-Trant, and Seaton

2011; Kerry 2013; Liu et al. 2018; Noy 2004; Ong and du Cros 2012; O'Reilly 2005;

Sørensen 2003; Zhang et al. 2018; Zhang et al. 2017).

With regard to backpackers' self-value perception, recent research has focused

on personal growth and development as a consequence of backpacking travels. In this

regard, Chen and colleagues (G. Chen, Bao, and Huang 2014b; G. Chen and Huang

2017) identified five backpacker personal development (BPD) domains; namely

capability, *emotion*, *self-consciousness*, *skill*, and *worldview*. Other important aspects

of backpacking research include backpackers' life transition (e.g., Desforges 2000;

Milde 2010; Noy and E. Cohen 2005), meanings of backpacking as a lifestyle (e.g., S.

Cohen 2011; Desforges 2000), and social impacts of backpacking on the local

communities (e.g., Milde 2010; Loker-Murphy and Pearce 1995; Scheyvens 2002).

Commitment to the Backpacker Group

The third component in social identity consists of an emotional input based on the

other two components: self-categorization and self-esteem (e.g., Hornsey 2008; Tajfel

1982). Specifically, as SIT posits, an individual's cognitive understanding of both

positive and negative meanings and value connotations of a group leads to affective

commitment to a specific self-selected group (e.g., Ellemers, Kortekaas, and

Ouwerkerk 1999; Hornsey 2008), as he/she searches for a distinctive self-concept

(Hogg, Abrams, and Brewer 2017). As a result, if people are strongly committed to a

group, they commit themselves emotionally to improving the status of the in-group

and continuing their membership in the group (Ellemers, Kortekaas, and Ouwerkerk

1999).

However, in the context of backpacking, unlike the relatively rich literature

documenting backpackers' self-categorization and group self-esteem, very little

research has been conducted on backpackers' commitment to the backpacker group

(Anderskov 2002; S. Cohen 2011; Zhang et al. 2017). Among the few empirical

studies, Anderskov (2002) examined the different ways through which backpackers

build backpacking or values of the backpacker culture into their narratives about their

personal futures. While most of the informants (16 out of 20) in the study expressed

their likelihood and willingness to continue backpacking, some backpackers simply

stated that they wanted to make the current trip the last one in their backpacking

career, and find a job (or start their own businesses) or study abroad (Anderskov

2002). Similarly, in the context of Chinese backpacking, Zhang et al. (2017) found

that Chinese backpackers facing an 'identity crisis' either rejected the backpacker

identity in the end, or continued to struggle to (re)negotiate their backpacker identity.

As stated above, most of the extant literature has only sporadically and partially

studied the different domains of backpacker identity (see Table 1). The only

exception, to the knowledge of the authors, was a recent study by Liu et al. (2018),

which used a self-developed questionnaire to classify Chinese backpackers by identity

(i.e., 'proficient Chinese backpackers' and 'novice Chinese backpackers') and

correlate the two segments with their destination choices. Employing a questionnaire

survey, Liu et al. (2018) used Mael and Ashforth (1992)'s *Organizational*

Identification Scale in the context of organizational behavior to measure Chinese

backpackers 'group identity'. In addition, both 'group involvement' and 'group

evaluation' dimensions in the study (Liu et al. 2018) were measured using items

which had been extracted from qualitative studies engaging a backpacker's emic

perspective (i.e., interview and online content analysis). While Liu et al.'s (2018)

study has laid a solid theoretical foundation for future studies of backpacker identity

and has well justified the usefulness of SIT in understanding backpacker identity, it

did not aim to identify the dimensions of backpacker identity, nor did it purport to

develop and validate a measurement scale of this construct. More importantly, the

psychometric properties of the preliminary measurement have not been established

(Liu et al. 2018). Therefore, a dedicated backpacker identity scale (BIS) with

sufficient validity and reliability is still much needed for a better understanding of the

dimensions of backpacker identity and an effective measurement of this significant

construct. As such, the objectives of this study are to identify the dimensions of

backpacker identity and to develop and validate a measurement scale for backpacker

identity.

Overview of the Scale Development and Validation

As commonly suggested by previous studies on scale development and validation in general (e.g., G. Chen, Gully, and Eden 2001; Churchill 1979; Nunnally 1978) and in travel and tourism settings in particular (e.g., G. Chen, Bao, and Huang 2014b; G. Chen and Huang 2017; G. Chen and Zhao 2017; Kim, Ritchie, and McCormick 2012; Lehto 2013), there are six basic steps in developing and validating a measurement scale with satisfactory psychometric properties. The steps and widely employed techniques are: (1) specification of construct domains (literature search); (2) generation of scale items (i.e., literature search, panel of experts); (3) data collection (questionnaire survey); (4) purification of measures (exploratory factor analyses); (5) assessment of reliability (Cronbach's alpha and composite reliability) and validity (i.e., content validity, construct validity, and criterion-related validity; confirmatory factor analyses and correlation analyses); and (6) development of norms (developing standards and norms for decision makers).

In line with these scale development steps, two successive studies were conducted independently using two different Chinese backpacker samples. Chinese

backpackers were targeted for the following three reasons. First, backpacking in

China has become increasingly popular in recent decades (e.g., G. Chen, Huang, and

Hu 2018; Xu, Di, and Wu 2014; Zhu 2007). Second, correspondingly, an increasing

number of studies have been conducted to investigate various issues on Chinese

backpackers, such as travel motivations (e.g., G. Chen, Bao, and Huang 2014a),

personal development (e.g., G. Chen, Huang, and Hu 2018; Xu, Di, and Wu 2014),

and identities (e.g., Liu et al. 2018; Zhang et al. 2017; Zhang et al. 2018). Third, two

authors are based in a mainland Chinese university, which gives the current study the

accessibility for data collection.

Specifically, study 1 was performed to conduct scale development following the

above mentioned steps 1 to 4, and assessed the content validity of the scale. Study 2

was conducted to establish the reliability and validity (i.e., Cronbach's alpha,

composite reliability, content validity, construct validity, and criterion-related

validity) of the measurement scale, following the above mentioned step 5 and step 6.

Study 1: Scale Development

Specification of Construct Domains and Generation of Items

To specify the construct domains of the BIS and generate an initial pool of scale

items, a thorough literature search was performed from March to May, 2016 and a

panel of six experts was consulted in June, 2016. Specifically, as suggested by social

identity studies (e.g., Ellemers, Kortekaas and Ouwerkerk 1999; Rogers 1959), three

initial constructs of BIS, namely *self-categorization*, *group self-evaluation/group self-*

value, and *commitment to the backpacker group*, were identified. Meanwhile, an

initial item pool of 23 measurement items (Table 1) was developed. Subsequently, the

constructs and measurement items were sent to six experts (all university scholars) in

the areas of backpacker tourism and measurement development in Australia (one

expert), the UK (two experts), and mainland China (three experts) for comments and

suggestions. Finally, according to feedbacks from the six experts, 6 initial items were

deleted and 3 items were added; and the statement of each of the final 20 items was

modified and finalized (Table 1).

(Please insert Table 1 about here)

Data collection

To operationalize the research, backpackers in this study were technically defined as independent travelers mostly staying in hostels and using a backpack as their main travel luggage. This technical definition of backpackers is in line with the purposes of the current research.

A questionnaire survey was conducted during June 2016 to March 2017. The questionnaire consisted of two parts. The first part was designed with choice questions and open questions to screen qualified respondents and record their trip characteristics and socio-demographic information (see Table 2). The second part consisted of all 20 BIS items measuring backpacker identity, using a 7-point Likert-type scale, ranging from 1 for "I do not agree at all" to 7 for "I agree very much".

The questionnaire survey was administered with a total of 10 college students (8 undergraduate and 2 graduate students) as field interviewers (in three groups). Following previous studies on domestic Chinese backpackers (G. Chen, Bao, and Huang 2014a, 2014b; G. Chen and Huang 2017; G. Chen, Huang, and Hu 2018; Su and Ma 2009; Xu, Di, and Wu 2014; Zhu 2007), the field interviewers were allocated

to 8 international youth hostels (IYHs) in Guilin (June 2016, February 2017),

Yangshuo (June 2016, February 2017), and Guangzhou (March 2017). Guilin and

Yangshuo are both popular destinations in China for domestic Chinese backpackers

(e.g., G. Chen, Bao, and Huang 2014a; Xu, Di, and Wu 2014; Zhu 2007), while

Guangzhou is a gateway city for domestic Chinese backpackers (e.g., G. Chen,

Huang, and Hu 2018; Su and Ma 2009; Zhu 2007).

Field interviewers approached potential eligible respondents in public areas of

the IYHs and asked them to fill in the self-administered questionnaire. Afterwards,

field interviewers stayed nearby for possible queries while respondents were filling in

the questionnaires. Each questionnaire took an average of 10 minutes to complete.

Eventually, out of the 202 questionnaires distributed through convenience sampling;

190 copies were returned and deemed usable, representing an overall response rate of

94.06%.

Surveyed participants of this study did not report any problem of understanding

the questionnaire items. Furthermore, an extensive review of extant literature and six

expert consultations for developing measurement items (Table 1) provided sufficient

evidence for content validity of the BIS.

Respondents' socio-demographics are shown in Table 2. Male participants

outnumbered their female counterparts (60.80 vs. 39.10%). The majority of

respondents were in the age group of 21-35 (82.6%), followed by the age group of 18

and below (8.4%). Regarding educational background, 53.7% of the respondents

reported an education level of undergraduate degree. As for occupation, about one

third of the respondents (34.1%) were students, followed by enterprise staff (24.0%),

and private business owner (10.6%) and government staff (10.6%). With regard to

income, 26.6% of the respondents earned a monthly income of above 7,500 RMB

(26.6%), followed by less than 1,500 RMB (23.1%) and 3001-4500 RMB (17.3%).

Moreover, trip characteristics of the respondents are also shown in Table 2.

(Please insert Table 2 about here)

Purification of Measures

Before assessing the reliability and validity of the BIS, descriptive statistics of

measurement items were examined in order to remove those items that exhibit

inadequate psychometric properties. Among the 20 measurement items, 14 (70.0%)

had a mean value over the midpoint (4.0), and another 3 items had a mean value very

close to the midpoint (4.0), which indicates that respondents generally agreed with the

statements. Item-to-total correlations showed that no item was poorly ($r<0.40$)

correlated with the total score. In addition, no item should be deleted as judged by the

change of Cronbach's α value if an item was removed from the scale. Thus, all the 20

items were included in further analysis.

Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was subsequently conducted on the retained

20 items using the Principal Axis Factoring Method with VARIMAX rotation to

identify the dimensionality of the proposed BIS. The appropriateness of EFA was first

determined by examining the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling

adequacy and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity. Later, items with a factor loading below

0.5 or a cross-loading above 0.5 (Nunnally 1978) were examined and removed.

Furthermore, the number of dimensions was determined based on eigenvalue (>1.0;

Tabachnick and Fidell 2007a). Following this procedure, in the first round of EFA

(KMO=0.905; Bartlett's Test of Sphericity=2693.889; $df=190$; $p<0.001$), the item of

BIS-7 was removed due to low factor loading (0.327). In the subsequent rounds of

EFA, the items of BIS-14 (FL: 0.367), BIS-4 (FL: 0.374), and BIS-18 (FL: 0.414)

were removed in turn due to loadings lower than .50. Eventually, the 5th round of

EFA (KMO=0.886; Bartlett's Test of Sphericity=2044.905; *df* =120; *p<0.001*)

identified three factors with 16 items, explaining 67.491% of the total variance (Table

3). The Cronbach's α values of the three factors were all above 0.80, demonstrating

adequate reliabilities.

As shown in Table 3, the first factor (Factor 1; labeled as *Group self-value*)

contained those items measuring group self-value (8 items). It is worth noting that,

two remained items (BIS-19 and BIS-20) originally designed to measure

backpackers' commitment to the backpacker group was loaded on the group self-

value factor. However, this is not difficult to understand, as these two items (i.e., "I

will choose to backpack to actualize personal growth in the future" and "I will

continue to do things that are beneficial to destination and social development in the

future") also denote the perceived benefits or social value of backpacking/being a

backpacker. Factor 2, labeled as *Self-categorization* accordingly, included 5 items

denoting backpackers' self-categorization/self-identification with the backpacker

group; while factor 3, labeled as *group self-evaluation*, contained 3 items measuring

backpackers' self-evaluations of having unique travel cultures, styles, and personality

traits (Table 3).

(Please insert Table 3 about here)

Study 2: Scale Validation

Data collection

Following previous studies (e.g., G. Chen, Bao, and Huang 2014b; G. Chen and Huang 2017; Sirakaya-Turk, Ekinci, and Kaya 2008), a second study was further conducted to validate the BIS. Specifically, a new round of questionnaire survey was administrated. The questionnaire consisted of three parts. The first part used exactly the same choice questions and open questions as in Study 1, to screen qualified respondents and record their trip characteristics and socio-demographic information (see Table 2). The second part includes the retained 16 BIS items (using the same 7-point Likert-type scale as in *Study 1*) to collect data for the assessment of reliability, discriminant validity, and convergent validity. In the third part, in order to test the criterion-related validity of the BIS, based on previous studies on backpackers (e.g., G. Chen, Bao, and Huang 2014b; G. Chen and Huang 2017; G. Chen, Huang, and Hu 2018) and studies that have confirmed the significant correlations between individuals' identity and personal development constructs (Erez and Earley 1993), four scales were included.

Specifically, the four scales were the Neuroticism subscale in the Eysenck

Personality Questionnaire (EPQ; a scale measuring individuals' emotional stability by

using a "Yes/No" measurement with "Yes" scoring 1 and "No" scoring 0; see

Eysenck and Eysenck 1975), the A subscale in the Texas Social Behavior Inventory

(TSBI; a scale measuring individuals' social self-esteem and social competence by

using a 5- point Likert-type scale; see Helmreich and Stapp 1974), the Rosenberg

Self-Esteem Scale (RSES; a scale measuring individuals' self-value/ self-worth by

using a 5-point Likert-type scale; see Rosenberg 1965), and the New General Self-

Efficacy Scale (NGSES; a scale measuring individuals' perception of their ability to

perform across a variety of different situations by using a 5-point Likert-type scale;

see G. Chen, Gully, and Eden 2001). The Chinese editions of the four mentioned

measurement scales were employed for their well-tested and recognized measurement

qualities (G. Chen, Huang, and Hu 2018).

The questionnaire survey was conducted in two IYHs in Guangzhou and two

IYHs in Chengdu, Sichuan province, from August 2017 to September 2017. Chengdu

was additionally chosen as a data collection site as it has been confirmed to be a

popular destination for Chinese backpackers (e.g., G. Chen and Huang 2017; Zhang et

al. 2018; Zhu 2007). The same survey administration procedure as reported in Study 1

was applied in Study 2.

A total of 331 questionnaires were distributed and 323 copies were returned and

deemed usable, presenting an overall response rate of 97.58%. As shown in Table 2,

the profiles and trip characteristics of respondents were very similar to those of Study

1. Similarly, the chosen participants of the Study 2 did not report any problem of

understanding the questionnaire items.

Assessment of Reliability and Validity

The 323-case validation sample was used to validate the latent model identified in

Study 1, through confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) by using AMOS21.0. The overall

model fit was statistically evaluated by Chi-square (χ^2) test and a number of

goodness-of-fit measures. The CFA results are reported in Table 4. The χ^2/df value

was 2.193($1<\chi^2/df<3$) and other goodness-of-fit measures (i.e., RMSEA [Root Mean

Square Error of Approximation] =0.061; GFI [Goodness-of-Fit index]=0.939; CFI

[Comparative Fit Index] = 0.979; IFI [Incremental Fit Index] = 0.979; NFI [Normed

Fit Index] = 0.962; TLI [Tucker–Lewis index] = 0.968) also suggested a good fit of

the three-factor model to the data.

The next step is to assess the reliability and validity of BIS. As shown in Table 4,

the factor loadings for the 16 items were between 0.578 and 0.898, R^2 for all the items

were between 0.334 and 0.908 (>0.30; Tabachnick and Fidell 2007b), and the

composite reliability (CR) scores were between 0.866 and 0.931, all indicating

sufficient reliability. Convergent validity was evaluated by checking all factor

loadings (r >0.40) and the values of average variance extracted (AVE; >0.50). As

shown in Table 4, the t values for 16 items were between 3.658 and 12.772 (p<0.001),

and the AVE values were between 0.569 and 0.630, thereby confirming the

convergent validity of the BIS. The discriminant validity of the scale was also

examined. Following Fornell and Larcker's (1981) suggestion, the square root of the

AVE of each latent construct should be higher than the construct's highest correlation

with any other latent construct. As indicated in Table 5, the indicators for all the

constructs met this requirement, suggesting sufficient discriminant validity. Therefore,

it can be concluded that the assessment of the measurement model showed strong

evidence of reliability, discriminant validity, and convergent validity of the latent

constructs.

(Please insert Table 5 about here)

As mentioned earlier, a test of criterion-related validity was conducted to further

assess the validity of the BIS. As indicated by Table 6, the mean values of the BIS

(including its subscales), NGSE, RSES, and TSBI scores were in the upper band

(59.09%-80.54%) of the total score ranges, which indicated that respondents generally

reported a high-level perception of identities, self-efficacy, self-esteem, and social

self-esteem, respectively. In addition, the mean value of the EPQ (Neuroticism

subscale) indicated that respondents generally reported a low level of emotional

instability. Furthermore, the univariate skewness and kurtosis values showed that the

data did not appear to have "extremely" deviated from normal distribution (Kline

1998). As shown in Table 7, three backpacker identity dimensions (i.e., *self-*

categorization, *group self-value*, and *group self-evaluation*) and the overall BIS scale

score were found to be significantly and negatively correlated with Neuroticism; on

the other hand, they are all significantly and positively correlated with the RESE,

GSES, and TSBI. These results provided sufficient support to criterion-related validity of the backpacker identity scale (BIS).

(Please insert Table 7 about here)

Finally, in order to confirm whether the three-factor model was the more appropriate conceptualization of backpacker identity, a dimensionality test was conducted. Specifically, a CFA with all items of the three BIS components loading on one factor was performed. As shown in Table 8, the one-factor model exhibited a significantly worse fit than the three-factor model ($\triangle\chi^2(11)=174.12$, $p<0.001$). Similarly, a two-factor model was estimated by combining the two most highly correlated components (i.e., group self-evaluation and group self -value) into one factor and leaving the other one factor (i.e., self-categorization) unchanged. As shown in Table 8, the two-factor model had a significantly worse fit than the three-factor model ($\triangle\chi^2(9)=102.226$, $p<0.001$). This dimensionality test provided sufficient evidence to support the three-factor model.

(Please insert Table 8 about here)

Discussions and Conclusion

The purpose of this study was twofold. First, the study aimed to identify the

dimensions to measure backpacker identity as a significant research construct with the

rapidly growing backpacker market (e.g., Noy 2004; S. Cohen 2011; O'Reilly 2005).

Guided by Social Identity Theory (SIT; Hornsey 2008; Tajfel 1982; Tajfel and Turner

1979), and with a prescribed theoretical framework consisting of three potential

constructs (see Table 1), the study identified *group self-value*, *self-categorization*, and

group self-evaluation as related but distinct aspects of backpacker social identity (e.g.,

Ellemers, Kortekaas, and Ouwerkerk 1999; Hornsey 2008; Tajfel 1982; see Table 4

and Table 5).

Second and more importantly, the study was intended to develop and validate a

measurement scale with sufficient reliability and validity. Following previous studies

on scale development and validation, the current research established the validity and

reliability of the backpacker identity scale (BIS), through two successive studies

(Study 1 and Study 2). Specifically, through EFA, with the three backpacker identity

dimensions, 16 items were finally retained in the refined scale. The dimension

structure and measurement scale were then verified through CFA. In addition to the

satisfactory convergent validity and discriminant validity, statistical findings also

demonstrated sufficient criterion-related validity of the BIS.

Theoretical Implications

While tourism researchers have conducted a great number of studies on backpacker

identity (e.g., Anderskov 2002; Liu et al. 2018; Noy 2004; S. Cohen 2011; O'Reilly

2005; Zhang et al. 2017; Zhang et al. 2018), very limited research has been dedicated

to examining the dimensions of this construct. Especially, no empirical research has

been conducted to develop and validate a measurement scale regarding backpacker

identity. This study provides a better understanding of backpacker identity as a social

psychological concept. The three backpacker identity dimensions (i.e., *group self-*

value, *self-categorization*, and *group self-evaluation*) have been sporadically

mentioned in the backpacker literature. However, it is believed that this study, by

identifying and confirming significant dimensions of backpacker identity, has

contributed to the growing body of knowledge of this specific and important topic.

The three-dimension measurement scale could be further utilized as a research tool in

future studies to evaluate how backpackers, and even broadly travelers, in different

cultural backgrounds, reflect upon the important question of 'who am I'.

Unexpectedly, *commitment to the backpacker group* was not confirmed as an

independent backpacker identity dimension in this study. Specifically, one initial item

(i.e., 'I will continue to be a backpacker in the future') was removed due to low factor

loading (0.414) in the process of EFA. Subsequently, in the final round of EFA, two

other items (i.e., 'I will choose to backpack to actualize personal growth in the future'

and 'I will continue to do things that are beneficial to destination and social

development in the future') within this prescribed dimension were instead loaded on

the factor *group self-value*, suggesting that the originally assumed *commitment to the*

backpacker group dimension has not been perceived to be a salient component of

backpacker identity.

There are three possible explanations for the above circumstance. First, as Xie

(2017) suggested, in contemporary China, backpacking as a travel style has been

romanticized as a symbol of persuing freedom and independence, but backpacking as

a lifestyle has been stigmatized as being irresponsible and regressive. Therefore,

facing such pressure from their families and the society, Chinese young backpackers

have often been confronted with a dilemma when they need to plan for their futures.

Practically, there is a great number of options for their future lives (e.g., settling

down, finding a job, further study, getting married and starting a family; see Xie

2017; Zhang et al. 2017). Second, as Zhang et al. (2017) found, some Chinese

backpackers would detach themselves from the backpacker group after they have

completed their backpacking trips, as they come to realize the gaps between the

romanticized images and the experienced reality of backpacking. Third, backpacking

has been commonly perceived as contributing to their personal development, such as

capability, emotion, and skill (e.g., G. Chen, Bao, and Huang 2014b; G. Chen and

Huang 2017), and further to their self-esteem and self-efficacy (G. Chen, Huang, and

Hu 2018). Such social psychological develeopment has well enabled backpackers to

adjust to their new life and work in the mainstream society, which in turn may have

prompted them to abandon backpacking as a temporary travel or transient lifestyle. To

sum up, a decisive and salient emotional commitment to the backpacker

group/backpacking may not exisit ontologically.

As shown in Table 3, judged by the eigenvalue and variance explained, *group self-value* was identified as the most salient component of backpacker identity, followed by *self-categorization* and *group self-evaluation*. This indicated that the benefits of personal development, as well as perceived contributions to local communities, have been perceived to be the most important element in backpacker identity construction. This finding is in line with some previous narrative studies which confirmed that backpackers' identity stories powerfully consisted of their experience of self-change and responsible travel behaviors (e.g., Noy 2004; O'Reilly 2005; Zhang et al. 2018; Zhu 2007).

It is noteworthy that, *self-categorization* was identified as a second important component of backpacker identity (also judged by the eigenvalue and variance explained). It suggested that although backpackers generally recognize the benefits of personal development, they may not necessarily accept the label of backpackers (Zhang et al. 2018). As mentioned earlier, in the backpacking context, the term *backpacker* has not been a widely accepted label (e.g., Elsrud 2001; Muzaini 2006; O'Reilly 2005; Richards and Wilson 2004; Tucker 2003; Welk 2004; Zhang et al. 2018). Instead, most backpacking travellers would prefer to be called a *traveller*.

Particularly, in Mainland China, *backpacker* (in Chinese *Pinyin*: '*Beibaoke*') as a term

translated from English, has not gained its dominant position in the discourse and

communications among Chinese backpackers. Alternatively, the more culturally

colloquial term *Donkey Friends* ('*lvyou*'), with its pronunciation in Chinese being

very similar to that of travel, has been widely used (c.f., H. Chen and Weiler 2014;

Luo, Huang, and Brown 2014;). This circumstance may have primarily caused self-

categorization to be a relatively less recognized identity component (e.g., "I am a

typical backpacker" and "Everyone calls me a backpacker"; see Table 1).

In addition, *group self-evaluation* (i.e., backpackers' unique travel style, culture,

and personality traits) was identified as the least contributive/important component to

backpacker identity. Possibly due to the convergence of backpackers and mainstream

tourists in terms of travel behaviors, especially in the context of China (e.g., Larsen,

Øgaard, and Brun 2011; Zhang et al. 2018) and with the emerging 'fake backpackers'

(Zhang et al. 2018), the previously well-recognized ethos of backpackers may have

been blurred and diluted in the Chinese context.

Finally, as shown in Table 7, the three backpacker identity components and BIS

as a whole were all found to be significantly and positively related to self-esteem

(SE), generalized self-efficacy (GSE) and social self-esteem, and negatively related to

neuroticism. In other words, with a strong backpacker identity, a backpacker will

have high levels of SE, GSE, and social self-esteem. These associations are consistant

with findings in previous studies such as G. Chen, Bao, and Huang (2014a), G. Chen

and Huang (2017), and G. Chen, Huang, and Hu (2018) that generally confirmed the

positive correlations bettween backpacker personal development (BPD) and other

human development constructs, such as SE, GSE, and social self-esteem.

Practical Implications

This study has some practical implications. Backpackers, educational and health

institutions, tourism policy-makers, tourism marketers, and practitioners could use the

findings of this research to have a better understanding of the identity issues of

backpackers. For instance, the present study has demonstrated that group self-value is

the most contributive component to backpackers' identity. In order to enhance a

backpacker's identity, efforts should be focussed on strengthening the perceived

psychological benefits of personal development (e.g., capability, skills, and self-

consciousness) through backpacking as well as social and ecological contributions to

local communities enabled by backpacking. To this end, tourism product and service

providers (e.g., hostels) could use local resources to create customized programs (i.e.,

professional schools, outdoor expand training activities, and backpacking seminars).

Similarly, destination marketing organizations (DMOs) could highlight the resources,

attractions, activities, and atmosphere that could facilitate backpackers' personal

development (i.e., worldview, self-consiousness, skills, emotions, and capability) to

attract potential backpackers, especially those who are in need of enhancing their

backpacker identity.

Finally, as an important component to backpacker identity, self-evaluation of

backpackers should be fully taken into account by tourism operators and DMOs. For

instance, youth hostels could strengthen the local cultural atmosphere and symbolic

representation in order to differentiate their services from mass tourism products to

attract backpackers.

Limitation and Future research

Several limitations of the current research should be acknowledged. First, this study

was based on two Chinese backpacker samples. It should be acknowledged that the

findings may not be generalizable to backpackers from other cultures. The dimension

structure and the scale (including its items) may not be fully applicable to other

national samples of backpackers, considering the cultural differences and

heterogeneity of the global backpacker market. Fellow researchers are therefore

encouraged to further verify this scale in different cultural contexts. Second, initial

items of the BIS were based on a literature review and expert feedbacks. Fellow

researchers can employ other qualitative methods (e.g., interviews with backpackers)

to see if there are new measurement items to further verify and expand the BIS. Last,

future research is encouraged to apply the BIS in examining the antecedents and

consequences of backpacker identity.

References

Anderskov, C. 2002. *Backpacker Culture: Meaning and Identity Making Processes in the Backpacker Culture among Backpackers in Central America.*

Burke, P. J. 2004. "Identities, Events and Moods." In *Theory and Research on Human Emotions,* edited by J. H. Turner, 25–49. New York: Elsevier.

Chen, G., J. Bao, and S. S. Huang. 2014a. "Segmenting Chinese Backpackers by Travel Motivations." *International Journal of Tourism Research* 16(4): 355–367.

Chen, G., J. Bao, and S. S. Huang. 2014b. "Developing a Scale to Measure Backpackers' Personal Development." *Journal of Travel Research* 53(4): 522-536.

Chen, G., S. M. Gully, and D. Eden. 2001. "Validation of a New General Self-efficacy Scale." *Organizational Research Methods* 4(1): 62-83.

Chen, G., and S. S. Huang. 2017. "Toward a Theory of Backpacker Personal Development: Cross-cultural Validation of the BPD Scale." *Tourism Management* 59: 630-639.

Chen, G., S. S. Huang, and X. Hu. 2018. "Backpacker Personal Development, Generalized Self-Efficacy, and Self-Esteem: Testing a Structural Model." *Journal of Travel Research*. OnlineFirst publication. Doi: 10.1177/0047287518768457.

Chen, G., and L. Zhao. 2017. "Measurement Scale Development in the Study of Tourism: An Analysis of Publications in Six Tourism Journals." *Tourism and Hospitality Prospects* 1(6): 66-85; 109.

Chen, H., and B. Weiler. 2014. "Chinese Donkey Friends in Tibet–Evidence from the

Cyberspace Community." *Journal of China Tourism Research* 10(4): 475-492.

Churchill, G. A. 1979. "A Paradigm for Developing Better Measures of Marketing Construct." *Journal of Marketing Research* 16: 64-73.

Cohen, E. 1972. "Toward a Sociology of International Tourism." *Social Research* 39 (1): 164–82.

Cohen, E. 2003. "Backpacking: Diversity and Change." *Journal of Tourism and Cultural Change* 1(2): 95-110.

Cohen, S. A. 2011. "Lifestyle Travellers: Backpacking as a Way of Life." *Annals of Tourism Research* 38(4): 1535-1555.

Currie, R. R., T. Campbell-Trant, and S. Seaton. 2011. "Joining the In-crowd: Symbols for Backpacker Identity." *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research* 5(1): 47-56.

Dayour, F., A. N. Kimbu, and S. Park. 2017. "Backpackers: The Need for Reconceptualization." *Annals of Tourism Research* 66: 191-193.

Desforges, L. 2000. "Travelling the World: Identity and Travel Biography." *Annals of Tourism Research* 27(4): 926-945.

Ellemers, N., P. Kortekaas, and J. W. Ouwerkerk. 1999. "Self -categorization, Commitment to the Group and Social Self-esteem as Related but Distinct Aspects of Social Identity." *European Journal of Social Psychology 29*: 371-389.

Elsrud, T. 2001. "Risk Creation in Traveling: Backpacker Adventure Narration." *Annals of Tourism Research* 28(3): 597-617.

Erez, M. and P. C. Earley. 1993. *Culture, Self-Identity, and Work*. New York: Oxford

University Press.

Eysenck, H. J., and S. B. G. Eysenck. 1975. *Manual of the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

Fornell, C., and F. Larcker. 1981. "Evaluating Structural Equation Models with Unobservable Variables and Measurement Error." *Journal of Marketing Research* 18(1): 39-50.

Hall. S. 1996. "Introduction: Who Needs Identity?" In *Questions of Cultural Identity*, edited by Hall. S., and D. G. Paul, 1-17. London: Sage Publications.

Helmreich, R., and J. Stapp. 1974. "Short Forms of the Texas Social Behavior Inventory (TSBI): An Objective Measure of Self-esteem." *Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society* 4: 473-75.

Hibbert, J. F. 2013. "Understanding the Role of the Tourists' Identity in Travel." Unpublished PhD diss., Bournemouth University, Bournemouth, UK.

Hogg, M. A., and D. E. Abrams. 1993. *Group Motivation: Social Psychological Perspectives*. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Hogg, M. A., D. Abrams, and M. B. Brewer. 2017. "Social identity: The Role of Self in Group Processes and Intergroup Relations." *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations* 20(5): 570-581.

Hogg, M. A., D. J. Terry, and K. M. White. 1995. "A Tale of Two Theories: A Critical Comparison of Identity Theory with Social Identity Theory." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 58(4): 255-269.

Hornsey, M. J. 2008. "Social Identity Theory and Self-categorization Theory: A Historical Review." *Social and Personality Psychology Compass* 2(1): 204-222.

Jane, G. 2013. "Unpacking backpacking: How young budget travellers in New Zealand perceive themselves and each other." In *CAUTHE 2013: Tourism and Global Change: On the Edge of Something Big*, edited by Joanna F. and M. Kevin, 234-237. Christchurch, New Zealand: Lincoln University.

Kanning, M. 2008. "Influence of Overseas Travel Experiences on the Worldviews of U.S. Backpackers." Unpublished PhD diss., Clemson University, South Carolina.

Kerry, E. 2013. "Backpacker Selves in a Hostel: Discourse, Identity, and Existential Authenticity." Unpublished Master's thesis, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

Kim, J. H., J. B. Ritchie, and B. McCormick. 2012. "Development of a Scale to Measure Memorable Tourism Experiences." *Journal of Travel Research* 51(1): 12-25.

Kline, R. B. 1998. *Principles and Practice of Structural Equation Modeling*. New York: Guilford.

Larsen, S., T. Øgaard, and W. Brun. 2011. "Backpackers and Mainstreamers: Realities and Myths." *Annals of Tourism Research* 38(2): 690-707.

Lehto, X. Y. 2013. "Assessing the Perceived Restorative Qualities of Vacation Destinations." *Journal of Travel Research* 52 (3): 325-339.

Liu, L., J. Zhang, B. Wu, and A. M. Morrison. 2018. "The Destination Choice Behavior of Chinese Backpackers: From a Perspective of Identity Theory." *Tourism Tribune* 33(4): 80-89.

Liven. 2011. "Off the Beaten Thread: Backpackers and Identity on Online Discussion Groups."http://idoliven.com/2011/03/off-the-beaten-thread-backpackers-and-identity-on-online-discussion-groups/ (accessed June 12, 2018).

Loker-Murphy, L. 1997. "Backpackers in Australia: A Motivation-based Segmentation Study." *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing* 5(4): 23-45.

Loker-Murphy, L., and P. L. Pearce. 1995. "Young Budget Travelers: Backpackers in Australia." *Annals of Tourism Research* 22(4): 819-843.

Luo, X., S. Huang, and G. Brown. 2015. "Backpacking in China: A Netnographic Analysis of Donkey Friends' Travel Behaviour." *Journal of China Tourism Research* 11(1): 67-84.

Mael, F., and B. E. Ashforth. 1992. "Alumni and Their Alma Mater: A Partial Test of the Reformulated Model of Organizational Identification." *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 13(2): 103-123.

McCall, G. J. and J. L. Simmons. 1978. *Identities and Interactions.* New York: The Free Press.

Milde, M. L. 2010. Who Am I?: The Reflexivity of Self-identity through Tourism. Unpublished Master's thesis. San Jose State University, San Jose, CA.

Muzaini, H. 2006. "Backpacking Southeast Asia: Strategies of " Looking Local." *Annals of Tourism Research* 33(1): 144-161.

Noy, C. 2004. "This Trip Really Changed Me: Backpackers' Narratives of Self-change." *Annals of Tourism Research* 31(1): 78-102.

Noy, C., and E. Cohen. 2005. "Introduction: Backpacking as a Rite of Passage in Israel." In *Israeli Backpackers and Their Society: A View from Afar*, edited by Noy, C., and E. Cohen, 1-30. New York: State University of New York Press.

Nunnally, J. C. 1978. *Psychometric Theory*, 2nd edition. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Ong, C. E., and H. du Cros. 2012. "The post-Mao Gazes: Chinese Backpackers in

Macau." *Annals of Tourism Research* 39(2): 735-754.

O'Reilly, C. C. 2005. "Tourist or Traveller? Narrating Backpacker Identity." In *Discourse, Communication, and Tourism*, edited by Jaworski, A., and A. Pritchard, 150-169. Clevedon: Channel View Publications.

O'Reilly, C. C. 2006. "From Drifter to Gap Year Tourist: Mainstreaming Backpacker Travel." *Annals of Tourism Research* 33(4): 998-1017.

Pearce, P. L. 1990. "*The Backpacker Phenomenon: Preliminary Answers to Basic Questions.*" Department of Tourism, James Cook University of North Queensland.

Pearce, P. L., and F. Foster. 2007. "A 'University of Travel': Backpacker Learning." *Tourism Management* 28(5): 1285-1298.

Power, L. 2010. "Backpackers as a Subculture." *Socheolas: Limerick Student Journal of Sociology* 3(1): 25-37.

Richards, G., and J. Wilson, 2004. "Travel Writers and Writers Who Travel: Nomadic Icons for the Backpacker Subculture?" *Journal of Tourism and Cultural Change* 2(1): 46-68.

Riley, P. J. 1988. "Road Culture of International Long-Term Budget Travelers." *Annals of Tourism Research* 15: 313-28.

Rogers, C. R. 1959. *A Theory of Therapy, Personality, and Interpersonal Relationships: As Developed in the Client-centered Framework*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Rosenberg, M. 1965. *Society and the Adolescent Self-Image.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Ryan, C., and A. Mohsin. 2001. "Backpackers: Attitudes to the 'Outback'." *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing* 10(1): 69-92.

Scheyvens, R. 2002. "Backpacker Tourism and Third World Development." *Annals of Tourism Research* 29(1): 144-164.

Sirakaya-Turk, E., Y. Ekinci, and A. G. Kaya. 2008. "An Examination of The Validity of SUS-TAS in Cross-cultures." *Journal of Travel Research* 46(4): 414-421.

Sørensen, A. 2003. "Backpacker Ethnography." *Annals of Tourism Research* 30 (4): 847–67.

Stryker, S., and R. T. Serpe. 1982. "Commitment, Identity Salience, and Role Behavior: Theory and Research Example." In *Personality, Roles, and Social Behavior*, Edited by Ickes W., and E. S. Knowles, 199-218. New York: Springer.

Su, H., and Y. Ma. 2009. "On Spatial Travel Flow Pattern of International Backpackers Visiting China." *Tourism Tribune* 24 (1): 61–65.

Tabachnick, B. G., and L. S. Fidell. 2007a. *Experimental Designs Using ANOVA*. Belmont: Thomson/Brooks/Cole.

Tabachnick, B. G., and L. S. Fidell. 2007b. *Using Multivariate Statistics*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Tajfel, H. 1978. "Social categorization, social identity and social comparison." In *Differentiation between Social Groups: Studies in the Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations*, edited by H. Tajfel, 61-76, London: Academic Press.

Tajfel, H. 1982. "Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations." *Annual Review of Psychology* 33(1): 1-39.

Tajfel, H., and J. C. Turner. 1979. "An Integrative Theory of Intergroup Conflict." In *The Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations*, edited by Austin W. G., and S. Worchel, 33-47, Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Thatcher, C. A. 2010. "International Learning Adventures: A Phenomenological Exploration of International Backpacker Style Study Abroad." Unpublished PhD diss., Prescott College, Arizona.

Ting, A. E., and Kahl, C. 2016. "Self Discovery and Backpackers: A conceptual Paper about Liminal Experience." *International Journal of Religious Tourism and Pilgrimage* 4(1): 49-58.

Tucker, H. (2003). *Living with Tourism: Negotiating Identities in a Turkish Village*. London, UK: Routledge.

Uriely, N., Y. Yonay, and D. Simchai. 2002. "Backpacking Experiences: A Type and Form Analysis." *Annals of Tourism Research* 29(2): 520-538.

Vogt, J, W. 1976. "Wandering: Youth and Travel Behavior." *Annals of Tourism Research* 4 (1): 25-41.

Wearing, S. L. 1998. "The Nature of Ecotourism: The Place of Self, Identity and Communities as Interacting Elements of Alternative Tourism Experiences." Unpublished PhD diss., Charles Sturt University, Bathurst, Australia.

Wearing, S. L., and Neil, J. 2000. "Refiguring Self and Identity through Volunteer Tourism." *Society and Leisure* 23(2): 389-419.

Welk, P. 2004. "The Beaten Track: Anti-tourism as an Element of Backpacker Identity Construction." In *The Global Nomad: Backpacker Travel in Theory and Practice*, edited by Richards G. and J. Wilson, 77-91. Clevedon: Channel View Publications.

Wilson, J., and G. Richards. 2008. "Suspending Reality: An Exploration of Enclaves and the Backpacker Experience." *Current Issues in Tourism* 11(2): 187-202.

Xie, J. 2017. "The pursuit of freedom and its risks: the dreams and dilemmas of young Chinese backpackers" Unpublished PhD diss., University of Glasgow, Glasgow.

Xu, H., L. Di, and H. Wu. 2014. "A Study of the Changes of Backpackers' Generic Skills Based on Tourist Interaction." *Tourism Science* 28 (1): 1–13; 21.

Zhang, J., A. M. Morrison, H. Tucker, and B. Wu. 2018. "Am I a Backpacker? Factors Indicating the Social Identity of Chinese Backpackers." *Journal of Travel Research*, 57 (4): 525-539.

Zhang, J., H. Tucker, A. M. Morrison, and B. Wu. 2017. "Becoming a Backpacker in China: A Grounded Theory Approach to Identity Construction of Backpackers." *Annals of Tourism Research* 64: 114-125.

Zhu, X. 2007. "Backpacker Tourism: Theoretical and Empirical Study Based on China." Unpublished PhD diss., East China Normal University, Shanghai.

Table 1. Supporting evidence sources of initial constructs and items.

Constructs and items	Supporting evidence source
Self-categorization	
BIS-1. I am a typical backpacker	Rogers (1959); Wearing (1998); Wearing and Neil (2000).
BIS-2. Everyone calls me a backpacker	Zhang et al. (2017); Expert focus group.
BIS-3. I am a backpacker, not a mass tourist	Hall (1996); Liven (2011); O'Reilly (2005); Welk (2004); Zhang et al. (2017).
BIS-4. I am glad that I am a backpacker	Liu et al. (2018); Expert focus group.
BIS-5.Being a backpacker is an important part of my personal identity/status	Wearing (1998); Wearing and Neil (2000); Noy (2004); Expert focus group.
BIS-6. I have a strong sense of belonging to backpackers	Liu et al. (2018); Noy (2004); Noy and E. Cohen (2005); Zhang et al. (2018); Zhang et al. (2017).
BIS-7. I feel warm when I see other backpackers on the trip	Liu et al. (2018); Zhu (2007); Expert focus group.
Group Self-evaluation/Group Self-value	
BIS-8. Backpackers have unique way of traveling	Anderskov (2002); Kerry (2013); Liu et al. (2018); Noy (2004); Ong and du Cros (2012); O'Reilly (2005); Sørensen (2003); Zhang et al. (2018); Zhang et al. (2017).
BIS-9. Backpackers have unique travel culture	Anderskov (2002); Currie, Campbell-Trant, and Seaton (2011); Kerry (2013); Liu et al. (2018); O'Reilly (2005); Richards and Wilson (2004); Sørensen (2003); Welk (2004); Wilson and Richards (2008); Zhang et al. (2017); Expert focus group.
BIS-10. Backpackers have many unique personality traits (i.e., independence, freedom)	Kerry (2013); Jane (2013); Liu et al. (2018); Power (2010); Zhang et al. (2017); Expert focus group.
BIS-11. Backpacking (being a backpacker) strengthens my sense of self-identity	Anderskov (2002); G. Chen, Bao, and Huang (2014a); Desforges (2000); Kerry (2013); Milde (2010); Noy (2004); Thatcher (2010); O'Reilly (2006); Zhang et al. (2017); Zhang et al. (2018); Expert focus group.
BIS-12. Backpacking (being a backpacker) is important to my personal growth	G. Chen, Bao, and Huang (2014a); Desforges (2000); Kerry (2013); Milde (2010); Noy (2004); Noy and E. Cohen (2005); Pearce and Foster (2007); Riley (1988); Zhu (2007); Zhang et al. (2018).
BIS-13. Backpacking (being a backpacker) is important in my life transition	Desforges (2000); Milde (2010); Noy and E. Cohen (2005); Ting and Kahl (2016);

	Zhang et al. (2017); Expert focus group.
(Continued)	
BIS-14. Backpacking (being a backpacker) is a way of my life	S. Cohen (2011); Desforges (2000); Welk (2004); Zhang et al. (2018); Zhang et al. (2017).
BIS-15. Backpacking (being a backpacker) is beneficial to individual's growth and development	G. Chen, Bao, and Huang (2014a); Kanning (2008); Kerry (2013); Milde (2010); Noy (2004); O'Reilly (2006).
BIS-16. Backpacking (being a backpacker) contributes to the development of the destination community	Milde (2010); Loker-Murphy and Pearce (1995); Scheyvens (2002).
BIS-17. Backpacking (being a backpacker) promotes the development of whole society	G. Chen, Bao, and Huang (2014a); Loker-Murphy and Pearce (1995); Scheyvens (2002).
Commitment to the Backpacker Group	
BIS-18. I will continue to be a backpacker in the future	Anderskov (2002); Hibbert (2013); Zhang et al. (2017).
BIS-19. I will choose to backpack to actualize personal growth in the future	G. Chen, Bao, and Huang (2014b); S. Cohen (2011); Zhang et al. (2017).
BIS-20. I will continue to do things that are beneficial to destination and social development in the future	Hibbert (2013); Expert focus group; Zhang et al. (2017).

Table 2. Demographic profile of respondents and their trip characteristics.

Variable	Category	Distribution (Study 1)	Distribution (Study 2)
Gender	Male	120(63.2%)	193(59.8%)
	Female	70(36.8%)	130(40.2%)
Age	≤20	16(8.4%)	53(16.2%)
	21-35	157(82.6%)	226(70.0%)
	36-50	16(8.4%)	32(9.9%)
	51-65	1(0.5%)	10(3.1%)
	>65	0	2(0.3%)
Education background	Junior middle school and below	7(3.7%)	8(2.5%)
	Senior middle school	27(14.4%)	38(11.8%)
	Junior college	31(16.5%)	53(16.4%)
	Undergraduate	101(53.7)	155(48.0%)
	Graduate and above	22(11.7%)	69(21.4%)
Occupation	Enterprise staff	43(24.0%)	86(26.2%)
	Private business owner	19(10.6%)	32(9.8%)
	Student	61(34.1%)	113(34.5%)
	Government staff	18(10.06%)	30(9.1%)
	Teacher	5(2.8%)	19(5.8%)
	Freelance	7(3.9%)	13(4.0%)
	Others	26(14.5%)	30(9.3%)
Personal monthly income (RMB)	<1500	40(23.1%)	119(36.8%)
	1500-3000	23(13.3%)	24(7.4%)
	3001-4500	30(17.3%)	33(10.3%)
	4501-6000	28(16.2%)	26(8%)
	6001-7500	6(3.5%)	47(14.6%)
	>7500	46(26.6%)	74(22.9%)
Number of backpacking travels already taken when being surveyed	1-3	59(39.1%)	116(41.1%)
	4-10	73(48.3%)	131(46.5%)
	>10	19(12.6%)	35(12.4%)
Length of this backpacking trip (days)	1-5	72(40.2%)	54(16.9%)
	6-10	55(28.0%)	120(37.6%)
	11-20	24(13.4%)	79(24.8%)
	>20	33(18.4%)	66(20.7%)

Note: The percentages were rounded up to one decimal point. Therefore, the percentage may not add to 100.0 because of rounding errors.

Table 3. Exploratory factor analysis results.

Factors	Factor loading	Eigenvalue	Variance Explained (%)	Cumulative Variance Explained (%)
Group Self-value (0.902[a])		7.507	46.921	46.921
BIS-16	0.731			
BIS-17	0.715			
BIS-15	0.707			
BIS-19	0.610			
BIS-12	0.565			
BIS-11	0.545			
BIS-13	0.539			
BIS-20	0.527			
Self-categorization (0.877)		1.976	12.348	59.269
BIS-2	0.864			
BIS-1	0.819			
BIS-3	0.729			
BIS-6	0.605			
BIS-5	0.562			
Group Self-evaluation (0.890)		1.316	8.222	67.491
BIS-9	0.842			
BIS-8	0.816			
BIS-10	0.681			

[a] Cronbach's α.

Table 4. CFA Results for the Backpackers' Self-identity Scale (N=323).

Factors	Factor loading	t Value	SMC (R^2)	CR	AVE
Group self-value				0.931	0.630
BIS-16	0.732	12.772	0.536		
BIS-17	0.799	10.338	0.638		
BIS-15	0.840	10.301	0.705		
BIS-19	0.794	11.668	0.630		
BIS-12	0.848	10.373	0.719		
BIS-11	0.831	10.351	0.690		
BIS-13	0.814	11.466	0.663		
BIS-20	0.675	12.083	0.456		
Self-categorization				0.866	0.569
BIS-2	0.578	11.884	0.334		
BIS-1	0.699	11.600	0.488		
BIS-3	0.740	11.154	0.547		
BIS-6	0.865	8.380	0.748		
BIS-5	0.852	8.839	0.725		
Group Self-evaluation				0.924	0.803
BIS-9	0.953	3.658	0.908		
BIS-8	0.898	7.938	0.806		
BIS-10	0.834	8.583	0.695		

Note: CFA=Confirmatory Factor Analysis; SMC=Squared Multiple Correlation; CR=Composite

Reliability; AVE=Average Variance Extracted.

Table 5. Construct correlations (Pearson Correlation Coefficient).

	Group Self-value	Self-categorization	Group Self-evaluation
Group Self-value	0.794[a]		
Self-categorization	0.699	0.754[a]	
Group Self-evaluation	0.714	0.677	0.896[a]

[a] Square root of average variance extracted (AVE).

Table 6. Descriptive statistics.

	Total score range	Minimum	Maximum	Mean(%)[a]	Skewness		Kurtosis	
					Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Std. Error
Group Self-value	8-56	8	56	41.26(73.68%)	-0.585	0.136	0.057	0.271
Self-categorization	5-35	5	35	20.68(59.09%)	0.036	0.136	-0.509	0.271
Group Self-evaluation	3-21	3	21	15.41(73.39%)	-0.590	0.136	0.523	0.271
BIS	16-112	16	112	77.36(69.07%)	-0.417	0.136	0.004	0.271
Neuroticism Scale	0-12	0	12	2.27(18.92%)	1.313	0.136	0.914	0.271
RSES	10-50	22	50	40.27(80.54%)	-0.587	0.136	-0.325	0.271
NGSE	8-40	8	40	30.36(75.90%)	-0.245	0.136	0.786	0.271
TSBI	16-80	31	72	52.37(65.46%)	0.152	0.136	0.138	0.271

Note: BIS=backpacker identity scale; RSES= Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale; NGSE= New General Self-Efficacy Scale; TSBI= Texas Social Behavior Inventory. As for BIS and its subscales, NGSE, RESE, TSBI, and EPQ (Neuroticism sub-scale), the higher the score is, the higher the level of self-perceptions in each area.

[a] %=actual mean value/upper limit of the total score range. Neuroticism is one of the 'Big Five' personality traits in Psychology; an individual who scores high on neuroticism is more likely than average to be moody and to experience such feelings as anxiety, worry, fear, anger, frustration, jealousy, guilt, and loneliness (Eysenck and Eysenck 1975). Self-esteem reflects an individual's overall subjective evaluation of his/her own worth (Rosenberg, 1965). Self-efficacy is an individual's belief in his/her innate ability to achieve goals (G. Chen, Gully, and Eden 2001). Social competence consists of cognitive, emotional, social, and behavioral skills needed for successful social adaptation (Helmreich and Stapp 1974).

Table 7. Correlations (Pearson Correlation Coefficient).

	Neuroticism Scale	RSES	GSES	TSBI
Group Self-value	-0.249**	0.355**	0.364**	0.323**
Self-categorization	-0.310**	0.223**	0.353**	0.432**
Group Self-evaluation	-0.148**	0.285**	0.363**	0.271**
BIS	-0.278**	0.331**	0.400**	0.388**

Note: $*p < 0.05$, $**p < 0.01$; BIS=backpacker identity scale; RSES= Rosenberg Self-Esteem

Scale; NGSE= New General Self-Efficacy Scale; TSBI=Texas Social Behavior Inventory.

Table 8. Model Comparisons for Dimensionality.

Competing models	χ^2	df	χ^2/df	p value	GFI	NFI	TLI	CFI	RMSEA	IFI
One-factor model	349.545	91	3.841	.00	0.881	0.924	0.924	0.943	0.094	0.943
Two-factor model	277.651	89	3.120	.00	0.908	0.940	0.944	0.958	0.081	0.958
Three-factor model	175.425	80	2.193	.00	0.939	0.962	0.968	0.979	0.061	0.979

Note: GFI = Goodness-of-Fit Index; NFI = Normed Fit Index; TLI = Tucker–Lewis Index; CFI = Comparative Fit Index; RMSEA = Root Mean Square Error of

Approximation; IFI=Incremental Fit Index.