

SOLO TRAVEL - EXPLORATIVE INSIGHTS FROM A MATURE MARKET (SWITZERLAND)

Christian Laesser

Institute for Public Services and Tourism, Universtiy of St. Gallen (Switzerland)

Pietro Beritelli

Institute for Public Services and Tourism, Universtiy of St. Gallen (Switzerland)

Thomas Riklin

Institute for Public Services and Tourism, Universtiy of St. Gallen (Switzerland)

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.umass.edu/ttra>

Laesser, Christian; Beritelli, Pietro; and Riklin, Thomas, "SOLO TRAVEL - EXPLORATIVE INSIGHTS FROM A MATURE MARKET (SWITZERLAND)" (2016). *Travel and Tourism Research Association: Advancing Tourism Research Globally*. 57.
https://scholarworks.umass.edu/ttra/2007/Presented_Papers/57

This is brought to you for free and open access by ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. It has been accepted for inclusion in Travel and Tourism Research Association: Advancing Tourism Research Globally by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. For more information, please contact scholarworks@library.umass.edu.

Solo travel — Explorative insights from a mature market (Switzerland)

Christian Laesser, Pietro Beritelli, and Thomas Riklin,
Institute for Public Services and Tourism
University of St. Gallen (Switzerland)

ABSTRACT

This study examines solo travel, and offers a conceptual framework of solo travelers, a profile of these types of travelers (by socio-demographic characteristics), and a profile of travels (by specific descriptors). The data for this study emerged from a comprehensive survey of Swiss travel behavior conducted 2004 by the University of St. Gallen (Switzerland).

The conceptual model proposes an a priori segmentation of four types of solo travel, delineated on the combination of the departure status (a single, one-person household, compared to a collective, multi-persons household) and arrival status (solo travel, compared to group travel), thus creating a two-by-two matrix with four segments overall.

The results of the profiling reveal significant differences between the solo travel groups, as well as towards a control group incorporating all other travel. They include income, profession, and age, as well as familiarity with the destination, choice of type of accommodation, expenditures and various types of trips. However, no significant differences can be reported with regard to the choice of destination.

INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE OF PAPER

The study presents profiles of solo travel (the test group) compared to all other travel (the control group), using the Swiss population as an example. Recent census and literature indicate that solo travel is among the fastest growing segments (Opaschowski, 2006; Jordan and Gibson, 2005; Mehmetoglu, Graham, and Larsen, 2001), driven by shifts in social structures as well as lifestyles. An active, aging population, the phenomena of childless couples and later marriage, and especially a rising population of singles have combined to produce a substantial change in travel and leisure demands.

Solo travel is partly driven by the fact that an increasing share of the population in developed countries (and also in Switzerland) lives in single-person households (BfS, 2005). By 2005, 35 per cent of all households consisted of only one person, and 16 per cent of the Swiss population lived by themselves in single-person households (GfK, 2006). Single living does not necessarily equate to a lonesome life (Danielsson and Lohmann, 2004). When it comes to traveling, one-third of all trips taken by persons from single households can be characterized as solo (that is, without travel companions; see, for instance, Bieger and Laesser, 2005). In contrast, a study in the 1970s revealed that almost 50 per cent of persons living singly always spend their holiday with another person (Getas, 1978). However, this study also revealed that only every tenth person travels alone.

In the case of the Swiss traveler, 6.4 per cent of all trips are taken alone; that is, without close travel companions (either from the person's own household or from relatives' and/or friends' households). This share translates to approximately 1.1 million trips (from a country with a population of 7.4 million, indicating a high gross travel propensity). Furthermore, 50

per cent of all solo travelers (compared to 21 per cent of non-solo travelers) indicate that their reason for traveling is primarily to visit friends and relatives (Bieger and Laesser, 2005). That number indicates a strong influence from the structure and expansion of social networks on solitary travel (an issue also brought forward by Axhausen, 2006).

Several authors (Poon, 1997; Gross, 1994; Opaschowski, 2006) point out that this development is a result of a society that has myriad options, characterized by an increase in individualism, lack in connectedness, and higher rates of consumerism. Identified trends (Popcorn, 1996) such as *cocooning*, *adventure*, *hedonic*, *pressed for time* or *health* have an increasing influence on the travel decision. The multi-optioned society provides the basis for a further division of labor: individualism, which is inversely associated with (financial and social) obligations, and results in flexibility, which in turn is conversely associated with increased labor mobility (Bieger, 2004).

An analysis of the extant literature reveals little research on solo travel. Most studies reveal differences with regard to the delimitation of solo travel. A widespread (but misleading) implicit connotation of solo travel is found in the term *independent traveler*, which includes persons who would have only booked air travel, and thus have flexibility in their itinerary and some degree of freedom in where they choose to travel (Hyde and Lawson, 2003). *Solo traveler* would be a part of the independent travelers group, referring to a person who arrives in a country alone (Foo, 1999), thus the term only refers to one's arrival status.

However, the solo traveler may not be a fully independent traveler. Solo travelers often prefer freedom and flexibility, but in a more structured type of packaged, organized holiday (Wilson, 2004). We first need to conceptualize the framework of the solo traveler and hence the framework of this study. Also, most of the body of knowledge on that type of travel was generated from the perspectives of gender-related studies (Wilson, 2004; Yiang and Jongaratnam, 2006; Yonemaru, 2004) or age-related studies (Chlaidze, 2000), as well as from a tourism-type specific approach, mainly adventure or backpacker tourism (Loker, 1993; Buchanan and Rosetoo, 1997). Those studies revealed that solo travelers are mostly either young or female, and/or have a comparably high affinity towards adventure and backpacking tourism.

There is also some evidence that the expenditures of solitary travelers tend to be rather high. However, the majority of these studies took an arrival-status perspective, or were based on student samples, and offer little indication about the delimiting factors of solo travel compared to non-solo travel. Hence research into that type of travel is quite limited. Therefore this paper aims to bridge that gap by profiling Swiss solo travelers, taking several issues into special consideration, such as: socio-demographic characteristics, travel-specific descriptors, such as travel motivation, choice of destination, type of trip, travel planning and booking behavior, activities pursued, and expenditure issues.

CONCEPTUAL MODEL AND METHODOLOGY

Conceptual model

For conceptualization reasons, the researchers pursued an *a priori* segmentation of the solo travel market. This approach is congruent with the procedure for *a priori* (or commonsense) segmentation studies, as discussed in Dolnicar (2004), where "a subgroup of the total tourist population" is "determined by an *a priori* or commonsense criterion." This procedure necessitated a two-by-two perspective, differentiating between the framework whence a traveler comes (that is, an outbound or trip-start perspective; a single, compared to a collective or multi-person household), compared to the framework one goes to (that is, a

inbound or trip-end perspective). This approach means that the social networks in which a traveler is embedded (household at home and group while traveling) are not identical (see Figure 1).

Figure 1: Conceptualization model of solo travelers and their market shares

Type of network person travels in	Solo (one person only)	Group (more than six persons)
Type of household traveler comes from		
Single (one person only)	<i>SINGLE-SOLO (1.2%)</i>	<i>SINGLE-GROUP (1.9%)</i>
Collective (more than one person)	<i>COLLECTIVE-SOLO (1.1%)</i>	<i>COLLECTIVE-GROUP (2.2%)</i>

Source: author's own model; numbers based on Bieger and Laesser (2005).

This approach allows differentiation between four groups of travelers:

1. SINGLE-SOLO (travel by persons who come from single households)
2. SINGLE-GROUP (travel by persons who come from one-person households, traveling with a group of other people)
3. COLLECTIVE-SOLO (travel by persons who do not live alone, but travel solo)
4. COLLECTIVE-GROUP (travel by persons who come from collective households, but take off by themselves to travel as part of a group).

This categorization, when compared to a (fifth) control group that consists of all other travel not assigned to one of the above four groups, allows behavioral homogeneity as well as heterogeneity to be tested.

Data collection and treatment

The data collection (executed by GfK, one of the leading market research companies in Europe, on behalf of the authors of this paper) took place during the entire year 2004. The survey instrument consisted of self-administrated and structured written interviews (one per trip), which were conducted with a representatively sampled number of 3,050 households and all their members. It surveyed all of their private trips during one year. All interviews came from a sample of households located in the German- and French-speaking part of Switzerland, and the data is representative in terms of size of household, age, gender, income, education, and profession.

Respondents were contacted four times during 2004, reminding them to return the completed questionnaires. The final sample contained respondents who acted in all four quarters of 2004, either by providing completed surveys or by stating that they had not traveled in that particular quarter. The sample includes 4,081 respondents from 1,540 households who in total undertook 11,245 trips in 2004.

The sample was split according to the above conceptualization model. We thus generated overall five groups, of which four emerged from the *a priori* segmentation approach, and the fifth incorporated all other travel and served as a control group.

Data analysis

Only cases with persons over 18 ("adults," according to Swiss law) were included in the analysis. Among the remaining, the size of household of the respondents was recorded. If the result of that survey was 1, we assumed that a given respondent lived in a single household. Respondents were also asked which other members of their household they traveled with, and

if they traveled with a group of non-household members. If the first number was 0, we assumed that this case was a solo travel case.

Next, t-tests and chi-square test on item levels were performed to assess whether potential differences between the four *a priori* segments as well as the control group were significant or merely due to chance variations. Since the intention of this study was to understand differences at the item level, rather than at the level of abstract constructs, we refrained from factor analyzing the variables, thus accepting the potential for a large number of significant results. However, given that multiple tests were computed based on the same data sets and therefore potential interaction effects would not be reflected in the p-values of the respective tests, p-values were Bonferroni corrected. This correction increases the p-value, taking into consideration the number of independent tests computed, and provides a conservative estimate of the significance of tested hypotheses.

The following trip-specific socio-demographic variables were included in the analysis (scale in parentheses):

1. gender (dichotomous)
2. age (nominal)
3. highest completed education (nominal)
4. profession (nominal)
5. income (nominal)
6. personality (based on a cluster analysis of the respondents, based on an item battery by Gountas and Gountas, 2001; Gountas, 2003).

The following trip profiling variables were also included in the analysis (scale in parentheses):

1. destination (nominal)
2. number of previous trips (nominal)
3. duration (nominal)
4. type of accommodation (nominal)
5. motivation (based on clusters derived from a cluster analysis of the respondents on the basis of motivation items; Bieger and Laesser, 2002; Bieger and Laesser, 2005)
6. expenditure (metric)
7. eighteen types of trip (interval; application scale)
8. nineteen sources of information (interval; importance scale).

FINDINGS

With regard to the socio-demographic variables (refer to Table 1), the results revealed several significant differences. While SINGLE-SOLO and SINGLE-GROUP tend to be older females, COLLECTIVE-SOLO and COLLECTIVE-GROUP tend to be younger males. All solo travelers, regardless of whether they came from single or collective households, tend to be less educated than all others. Consequently (and shown by the results), their professional positions are modest. In contrast, group travelers are either students (COLLECTIVE-GROUP) or well educated and hold professional positions (SINGLE-GROUP).

There is also a split in terms of income: travelers from single households tend to have a low income, whereas travelers from collective household tend to have higher income (regardless of whether they travel solo or within a group). Finally, significant differences are also identified with regard to the personality of the travelers. Persons traveling solo tend to be more empathic, emotional, and imaginative, whereas group travelers can be described as *doers and lovers of material comfort*.

With regard to trip descriptors (refer to Table 2), the results reveal no significant differences about the choice of destination. However, solo travelers' familiarity with the destination, combined with the fact that they are more likely to come from single households, is significantly lower than for the control group. Solo travel also tends to be shorter for all groups except COLLECTIVE-SOLO. The preferred accommodation is either with friends and relatives (SINGLE-SOLO), at holiday residences (COLLECTIVE-SOLO — most of which are their own) or hotels (the other two segments).

Travel motivation for three groups except SINGLE-SOLO can be described as *curious hedonism* and *social matters*; whereas for the SINGLE-SOLO group and all other travel, *rest and relaxation* as well as *family holidays* predominate. In terms of types of trip, there are several significant occurrences: SINGLE-SOLO predominantly visit friends and relatives, COLLECTIVE-SOLO undertake primarily city and shopping trips as well as cruises and breaks in warm areas; whereas members of the SINGLE-GROUP are more often found on sightseeing trips/tours. Finally, COLLECTIVE-GROUP members are likely to be found at events and sports holidays.

Regarding the sourcing of information, all four segments draw significantly less on any sources of information. However, in contrast, both the GROUP members rely significantly more on information provided by their friends and relatives as well as printed information material from tour operators.

Significant differences exist between all groups with regard to their travel expenses. Members of SINGLE-SOLO are significantly low spenders (€60 per day and person, €292 per trip overall), whereas members of both the GROUP segments tend to be high spenders, for example, €148 per day per person, and due to the longer duration of trips by the SINGLE-GROUP, their overall expenses are the highest.

DISCUSSION AND APPLICATION OF THE RESULTS

The results of the study reveal several interesting insights which deserve further discussion.

All four segments analyzed tend to travel to destinations they are not familiar with. In terms of personality, the results reveal a systematic overrepresentation of the type *emotional empathic*. Finally, and with regard to travel motivation, a large majority within the four groups is either driven by *curious hedonism* (that is, a desire to experience something new without really abstaining from comfort and convenience; refer to expenditures per day) or *social matters*. In general we can conclude that persons traveling alone or who come from single households, more than any other traveler, tend to look for something new and desire (close) social interaction.

Closer examination of the groups reveals additional issues for discussion. People who come from a single household are most likely to travel (1) to visit friends and relatives (family and social motivation) or (2) to expand their horizon through a sightseeing trip (curious hedonism motivation) with a group (social interaction motivation). Later trips are mostly organized by a tour operator. In terms of personality type, both groups tend to be *emotional*

empathic, that is, ready to absorb social/emotional or new cultural experiences. Consequently, solo travelers stay with their friends and relatives; whereas with regard to the group travelers, and due to the type of trip, they mostly stay in hotels or hotel-type accommodation. The spread of spending within this group is significant: expenditures can range from the cheapest (visiting friends and relatives) to the priciest. While most of the low spending is related to domestic tourism (SINGLE-SOLO), the high spending with SINGLE-GROUP is based on long-haul, long-lasting travel.

In contrast, examination of people who come from a collective household and take off by themselves reveals significantly different behaviors. People from such households traveling by themselves tend to embody the personality type *imaginative dreamer* and *emotional empathic*; whereas people from such households traveling in groups have a wide range of personalities. Leaving (or breaking out from) a collective household on a solo trip often results in a city and/or shopping trip, a cruise or just a warm break during the winter months. In contrast, group travel comprising single travelers from collective households consists mostly of people going on a sports holiday or visiting an event — both of which are often linked to some sort of special interest. To a certain extent the type of accommodation chosen supports this proposition: the high share (24 per cent) for “other accommodation” includes, for example huts, camps, houseboats, and other special types of accommodation.

CONCLUSIONS

Solo travelers either tend to foster an existing social network or try to nurse their curiosity and at the same time look for new social contacts. As shown in a recent study (Dolničar and Laesser, 2007), while travel retailers should focus on destination competence, tour operators should prioritize customer type (that is, the solo traveler), as well as their needs, more or less neglecting the destination. The non-significant differences with regard to destination choice should be no surprise, because destinations in terms of shopping trips and cruises are rendered interchangeable, due to the high commoditization of such trips.

With regard to group travel, this non-significance also indicates that the social benefit of a group trip might be prioritized from the choice of destination. Driven by the choice of accommodation, the market for solo travelers who end up in groups is also significant, in terms of their travel expenses as well as the fact that they are less familiar with a destination, and this makes them prone to choose professional trip organization.

REFERENCES

- Axhausen, K.W. (2006). "Social networks and travel: some hypotheses." In: *Social Aspects of Sustainable Transport: Transatlantic Perspectives*, edited by K. Donaghy. Ashgate: Aldershot.
- BfS (2005). *Bundesamt für Statistik — 01 Bevölkerung*. Available at <http://www.bfs.admin.ch/bfs/portal/de/index/themen/01.html> retrieved on 25 September 2006.
- Bieger, Th. (2004). *Dienstleistungsmanagement*. Bern/Stuttgart/Wien: Haupt.
- Bieger, Th. and Ch. Laesser (2002). "Market Segmentation by Motivation — The Case of Switzerland." *Journal of Travel Research*, 41(1): 68-76.
- Bieger, Th. and Ch. Laesser (2005). *Travel Market Switzerland — Basic Report and Variables Overview*. St. Gallen: IDT.
- Buchanan, I, and A. Rosetto (1997). "With my swag upon my shoulder: A comprehensive study of international backpackers to Australia." *Occasional Paper No. 24*. Canberra: Bureau of Tourism Research.
- Chlaidze, R. (2000). "Research of the Recreational Needs and Socio-Psychological Characteristics of the Users on the Tourism Services Market of Latvia." Proceedings from the International Conference Integration of practice, education and research in tourism: experience and analysis, Riga, 75-79.
- Danielsson, J. and M. Lohmann (2004). "Nachfrageseitige Urlaubstrend." In *Erlebniswelten und Tourismus*, edited by Institut für Mobilitätsforschung (ifmo). Berlin: Springer.
- Dolničar, S. (2004). "Beyond 'Commonsense Segmentation' – a Systematics of Segmentation Approaches in Tourism." *Journal of Travel Research*, 42(3): 244-250.
- Foo, L.M. (1999). "International solo travellers to Australia." *Research Report*, 1(2), 1-5. Bureau of Tourism Research Report.
- Gates, B.T. (2002). "Solitary Travelers: Nineteenth-Century Women's Travel Narratives and the Scientific Vocation (review)." *Victorian Studies*, 44(4): pp. 716-717.
- Getas (1978). "Motivation, Lebensgefühl, Lebensgestaltung von Alleinlebenden." In *Singles*, edited by H. Schreiber. München.
- GfK (2006). *Vademecum 2006*. Hergiswil and Lausanne: IhA. GfK.
- Gountas, J. (2003). *Personality types and tourism holiday preferences*. PhD Thesis, University of Reading, UK.
- Gountas, J. and S. Gountas, S. (2001). "A new psychographic segmentation method using Jungian MBTI variables in the tourism industry." In *Consumer Psychology of Tourism, Hospitality and Leisure*, edited by Mazanec, J., Crouch, G., Brent Ritchie, J., and Woodside A. Oxford, UK, CABI. 2, 215-230.
- Gross, P. (1994). *Die Multioptionsgesellschaft*. Frankfurt a/M.: Suhrkamp.
- Hymers, S. (1993). "An alternative to the 'traumatizing' vacation: the enriching, expansive vacation." *American Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 53(2): 143-57.
- Jordan, F. and H. Gibson (2005). "We're not stupid... but we do not stay home either: Experiences of solo women travelers." *Tourism Review International*, 9(2): 195-211.

- Lawson, R. and K.F. Hyde (2003). "The Nature of Independent Travel." *Journal of Travel Research*, Vol. 42, August 2003: 13–23.
- Loker, L. (1993). *The backpacker phenomenon II: More answers to further questions*. Townsville: Department of Tourism, James Cook University of North Queensland.
- Mehmetoglu, M., M.S. Graham, and S. Larsen (2001). "Solitary Travellers in the Norwegian Lofoten Islands: Why do People Travel on Their Own?" *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 1(1).
- Opaschowski, H.W. (2006). *Einführung in die Freizeitwissenschaft*. Wiesbaden: Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Poon, A. (1997). *Tourism, technology, and competitive strategies*. Wallingford UK: CABI.
- Popcorn, F. and L. Marigold (1996). *Clicking: der neue Popcorn-Report: Trends für unsere Zukunft*. München: Heyne.
- Siung, H.H. (2004). "Classification of Adventure Travelers: Behavior, Decision Making, and Target Markets." *Journal of Travel Research*, 42(4): 343-356.
- Walter, C.K. (1974). "The Single pay more." *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 8(2): 211-217.
- Wilson, E.C. (2004). A "Journey of her own"?: *The Impact of Constraints on Women's Solo Travel*. Department of Tourism, Leisure, Hotel and Sports Management.
- Yiang, Ch.-Y. and G. Jongaratnam (2006). "Why do women travel solo for purposes of leisure?" *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 12(1): 59-70.
- Yonemaru, M. (2004). *The empowerment of Japanese women aged 50 and over through leisure travel*. Masters Thesis at the University of Florida.

Table 1: Socio-demographic profiles

Group/ Market Share	CONTROL GROUP 93.6%	SINGLE- SOLO 1.2%	COLLECTIVE- SOLO 1.1%	SINGLE- GROUP 1.9%	COLLECTIVE- GROUP 2.2%
Gender** ($X^2=46.501$; $p<.001$)					
Male	47.7%	13.0%	58.3%	21.8%	48.8%
Female	52.3%	87.0%	41.7%	78.2%	51.2%
Age** ($X^2=198.816$; $p<.001$)					
13–24 years	3.5%		8.3%	.7%	12.1%
25–34 years	10.7%		16.7%	4.5%	7.5%
35–44 years	24.8%	4.5%	25.0%	15.7%	24.3%
45–54 years	22.6%	4.5%		11.2%	18.5%
55–64 years	20.4%	22.7%	8.3%	13.4%	19.7%
older than 64 years	17.9%	68.2%	41.7%	54.5%	17.9%
Highest Completed Education** ($X^2=86.138$; $P<.001$)					
Compulsory Schooling	8.5%	25.0%	33.3%	5.3%	7.0%
Apprenticeship	37.9%	37.5%	8.3%	42.9%	45.0%
Vocational Graduation	1.0%	12.5%		.8%	1.2%
Commercial/High School	9.8%	12.5%	8.3%	15.0%	10.5%
Vocational Master Diploma	6.6%		16.7%	5.3%	7.0%
Technical School	7.1%			2.3%	8.2%
Higher Technical School	8.1%		8.3%	10.5%	5.8%
University of Applied Sciences	8.9%		8.3%	6.8%	5.3%
University	10.0%	12.5%	16.7%	10.5%	6.4%
Other	2.1%			.8%	3.5%
Profession** ($X^2=191.980$; $P<.001$)					
CEO/Top Management	3.9%			4.5%	3.5%
SME Director/Owner	3.8%			.8%	1.2%
Farmer	.4%		8.3%		4.0%
Free Profession	2.2%	4.3%	25.0%		1.7%
Middle Management	15.4%	21.7%		12.1%	11.0%
Commercial/Technical Employment	26.2%	4.3%	33.3%	20.5%	24.3%
Worker	4.9%	56.5%	25.0%	2.3%	12.1%
Pensioner	17.7%	13.0%	8.3%	42.4%	14.5%
Housework	19.2%			12.1%	18.5%
Unemployed	1.3%			2.3%	1.2%
In Training: Apprenticeship	.6%				1.2%
In Training: Middle School	.3%				1.2%
In Training: University Student	2.1%			2.3%	2.9%
None of the Above	.2%				
In Military Service	.3%				1.7%
Other	1.3%			.8%	1.2%

Group/ Market Share	CONTROL GROUP 93.6%	SINGLE- SOLO 1.2%	COLLECTIVE- SOLO 1.1%	SINGLE- GROUP 1.9%	COLLECTIVE- GROUP 2.2%
Income of household head** <i>($X^2=437.043$; $p<.001$)</i>					
Not Known	18.8%	12.5%	16.7%	21.8%	13.4%
0–2449 CHF	1.4%	33.3%		9.0%	.6%
2450–3249 CHF	2.1%	25.0%	16.7%	10.5%	4.1%
3250–4049 CHF	3.4%	12.5%	8.3%	16.5%	6.4%
4050–4849 CHF	5.4%			16.5%	6.4%
4850–5649 CHF	7.7%	16.7%		9.0%	6.4%
5650–6449 CHF	9.5%			6.0%	13.4%
6450–7249 CHF	10.7%		16.7%	2.3%	16.3%
7250–8049 CHF	10.2%		8.3%	3.0%	10.5%
8050–9649 CHF	11.4%			2.3%	8.7%
more than 9650 CHF	17.5%		33.3%	3.0%	12.2%
not recorded	2.0%				1.7%
Personality** <i>($X^2=63.812$; $p<.001$)</i>					
The Imaginative Dreamer	15.9%	15.8%	18.2%	9.0%	8.9%
The Emotional Empathic	30.2%	52.6%	45.5%	62.2%	33.6%
The Practical Doer	27.5%	15.8%	27.3%	12.6%	29.5%
The Material Comfort Lover	26.4%	15.8%	9.1%	16.2%	28.1%

Bold denotes when solo travel group is significantly higher than control group.

Table 2a: Travel profiles (1)

Group/ Market Share	CONTROL GROUP 93.6%	SINGLE- SOLO 1.2%	COLLECTIVE- SOLO 1.1%	SINGLE- GROUP 1.9%	COLLECTIVE- GROUP 2.2%
Destination <i>($X^2=36.902$; $p=.427$)</i>					
Switzerland	41.4%	52.6%	30.3%	31.5%	37.6%
Austria	7.0%	15.8%	9.7%	8.5%	6.9%
Germany	8.7%	5.3%		12.3%	9.8%
France	10.5%		10.6%	7.7%	14.5%
Italy	9.1%	5.3%		10.8%	10.4%
Other Europe	14.4%	15.8%	29.4%	19.2%	13.3%
Americas	2.6%				1.2%
Africa	2.7%		10.5%	3.8%	3.5%
Asia	3.2%	5.3%	9.5%	6.2%	2.9%
Oceania	.4%				
Number of previous trips** <i>($X^2=198.189$; $p<.001$)</i>					
none	22.5%	47.8%	45.1%	45.1%	34.1%
1–2	18.5%	4.3%	39.8%	39.8%	37.6%
3–5	14.8%	17.4%	6.8%	6.8%	16.2%
5–10	15.0%	13.0%	6.0%	6.0%	7.5%
> 10	29.2%	17.4%	2.3%	2.3%	4.6%
Duration (overnights)** <i>($X^2=85.189$; $p<.001$)</i>					
1 night	9.3%	15.0%		12.0%	23.8%
2–3 nights	21.5%	5.0%	16.7%	23.3%	27.3%
4–7 nights	33.5%	40.0%	58.3%	44.4%	32.0%
8–14 nights	23.4%	40.0%	16.7%	15.0%	9.3%
15–21 nights	6.5%			4.5%	4.7%
more than 21 nights	5.8%		8.3%	.8%	2.9%
Type of Accommodation** <i>($X^2=511.702$; $p<.001$)</i>					
Hotel	48.12%	26.09%	25.00%	76.03%	59.33%
Friends and relatives	16.50%	69.57%	16.67%	5.79%	4.31%
B&B, Residential Stay	3.87%	0.00%	0.00%	0.83%	1.91%
Holiday Residence	19.93%	0.00%	25.00%	5.79%	4.31%
Camping/RV	5.67%	0.00%	8.33%	3.31%	1.91%
Hostel/Backpacker	1.04%	0.00%	0.00%	0.83%	2.87%
Cruise	1.06%	0.00%	8.33%	2.48%	1.44%
Other	3.81%	4.35%	16.67%	4.96%	23.92%
Cluster of Motivation** <i>($X^2=155.208$; $p<.001$)</i>					
Rest and Relaxation	34.4%	30.4%	16.7%	12.9%	9.8%
Family Holiday	31.1%	34.8%	25.0%	18.2%	29.5%
Curious Hedonism	25.1%	17.4%	33.3%	56.8%	36.4%
Social Matters	9.4%	17.4%	25.0%	12.1%	24.3%

Group/ Market Share	CONTROL GROUP 93.6%	SINGLE- SOLO 1.2%	COLLECTIVE- SOLO 1.1%	SINGLE- GROUP 1.9%	COLLECTIVE- GROUP 2.2%
Cluster of Activities** <i>($X^2=55.982$; $p<.001$)</i>					
Multi-options	63.4%	87.0%	58.3%	53.7%	42.2%
Learning, Sightseeing	19.9%	13.0%	33.3%	29.1%	37.6%
Cold Weather Physical	10.2%			9.0%	11.0%
Warm Weather Physical	6.4%		8.3%	8.2%	9.2%
Exp. Per Person Per Day <i>($F=9.248$; $p<.001$)</i>	€06	€6	€08	€48	€46
Exp. Per Person Per Trip <i>($F=9.543$; $p<.001$)</i>	€691	€92	€18	€69	€51

Bold denotes when solo travel group is significantly higher than control group.

Table 2b: Travel profile (continued): Type of trip results

Type of trip (1=not applicable to 4=applicable)	CONTROL GROUP	SINGLE-SOLO	COLLECTIVE-SOLO	SINGLE-GROUP	COLLECTIVE-GROUP	df	F	Sig.
Beach vacation	1.58	1.08	1.07	1.18	1.27	4	13.34	0.000
City trip	1.66	1.09	1.71	1.59	1.62	4	2.73	0.027
Sightseeing tour with car, bus or train	1.50	1.13	1.28	1.76	1.41	4	4.45	0.001
Cruise (with cruise ship or houseboat)	1.21	1.13	1.47	1.10	1.12	4	3.43	0.008
Vacation in the countryside	1.42	1.13	1.22	1.08	1.18	4	10.35	0.000
Vacation in the mountains (not winter vacation in the snow)	1.60	1.00	1.52	1.36	1.33	4	8.15	0.000
Health-oriented vacation (fitness/wellness)	1.43	1.00	1.26	1.23	1.19	4	8.30	0.000
Regimen break	1.18	1.24	1.20	1.07	1.07	4	4.40	0.001
Winter vacation in the snow	1.63	1.00	1.38	1.34	1.40	4	7.62	0.000
Winter vacation in warm areas with warm weather	1.26	1.00	1.34	1.07	1.07	4	8.66	0.000
Sports vacation	1.53	1.09	1.52	1.31	1.62	4	3.78	0.004
Events trip (cultural, sports, and so on)	1.31	1.13	1.28	1.35	1.47	4	3.31	0.010
Theme park vacation/trip	1.31	1.00	1.07	1.13	1.11	4	7.78	0.000
Study tour (predominantly private)	1.22	1.00	1.20	1.22	1.26	4	1.36	0.245
Language trip (predominantly private)	1.17	1.00	1.20	1.02	1.07	4	7.17	0.000
Shopping trip	1.30	1.12	1.41	1.07	1.13	4	7.98	0.000
Visit friends and relatives	1.72	2.59	1.62	1.19	1.12	4	27.77	0.000
Family event/reason (for example, wedding)	1.36	1.33	1.29	1.21	1.10	4	6.66	0.000
Other	1.55	1.12	1.46	1.44	1.89	4	7.49	0.000

Bold denotes when solo travel group is significantly higher than control group.

Table 2c: Travel profile (cont'd): Sources of information

Sources of information (1=completely unimportant to 4= very important)	CONTROL GROUP	SINGLE- SOLO	COLLECTIVE- SOLO	SINGLE- GROUP	COLLECTIVE- GROUP	df	F	Sig.
Brochures of destination (communal level)	1.76	1.04	1.20	1.67	1.59	4	5.62	0.000
Brochures of destination (region to country)	1.64	1.09	1.07	1.40	1.41	4	7.62	0.000
Accommodation guide of destination	1.49	1.04	1.32	1.32	1.31	4	4.80	0.001
Accommodation guide of national or international chain	1.17	1.00	1.00	1.17	1.12	4	1.58	0.175
Guide on homogenous group of offers (for example, ski, diving, etc.)	1.17	1.00	1.18	1.13	1.13	4	1.22	0.300
Brochures of tour operators	1.49	1.17	1.54	1.81	1.35	4	5.57	0.000
Travel agencies	1.37	1.09	1.00	1.35	1.34	4	1.52	0.194
Rail service/train stations	1.18	1.00	1.00	1.13	1.16	4	1.26	0.284
Tourist information at destination	1.34	1.00	1.00	1.15	1.22	4	4.83	0.001
NTO in Switzerland	1.13	1.00	1.00	1.20	1.12	4	1.60	0.172
Ads in newspapers and magazines	1.23	1.04	1.00	1.21	1.18	4	1.35	0.247
Travel guides, books, journals	1.47	1.13	1.00	1.38	1.30	4	3.87	0.004
Video, DVD, CD-ROM	1.08	1.00	1.00	1.06	1.04	4	1.47	0.210
Travel fairs and exhibitions	1.10	1.00	1.38	1.08	1.07	4	2.50	0.041
Broadcasts in TV and radio	1.13	1.00	1.13	1.16	1.06	4	2.01	0.090
Teletext	1.09	1.00	1.13	1.04	1.06	4	1.47	0.207
Internet/WWW	2.02	1.00	1.53	1.41	1.58	4	19.33	0.000
Friends and relatives	2.09	1.29	1.87	2.48	2.41	4	9.63	0.000
Other sources of information	1.38	1.34	1.38	1.56	1.66	4	6.43	0.000

Bold denotes when solo travel group is significantly higher than control group.