LGBT+ TOURISTS' DESTINATION CHOICE: RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PSYCHOLOGICAL MOTIVATIONS AND DESTINATION IMAGE

ESCOLHA DO DESTINO TURÍSTICO DO SEGMENTO LGBT+: RELAÇÃO ENTRE AS MOTIVAÇÕES PSICOLÓGICAS E A IMAGEM DO DESTINO

Ivanete Schneider Hahn[1]
Julia Bianchi[1]
Juciele Marta Baldissarelli[1]
Anderson Antônio Mattos Martins[1]

1 UNIARP, Caçador, Santa Catarina, Brazil.

ABSTRACT

Purpose: this study aimed to identify the relationship between psychological motivations and destination image of self-defined LGBT+ tourists' destination choice.

Design/ methodology/ approach: The study was operationalized through a survey with 239 respondents. Which 89 were self-defined as LGBT+. Statistical univariate and bivariate analyses were used for data analysis.

Findings: (1) both targets value leisure as the primary psychological motivation for choosing the travel destination; (2) infrastructures and socio-economic environment and affective image are the most critical dimensions of destination image; (3) the psychological motivations increase the destination image of self-defined LGBT+ tourists'; (4) there was no significant difference between the choice of tourist destination between heterosexuals and the LGBT +.

Originality/value: Previous studies have focused on analyzes of consumption of LGBT + tourist destinations, but not understanding the main psychological motivations and their association with the image of the destination, either check whether there are in fact differences between the LGBT + and heterosexual audiences. This study answered to this gap.

Keywords: Tourism. Diversity. Travel motivation. Emerging Markets.

RESUMO

Objetivo: o estudo se debruçou na identificação da relação entre as motivações psicológicas e da imagem do destino na escolha do destino turístico do segmento LGBT+.

Design/ Metodologia/ Abordagem: A pesquisa foi operacionalizada por meio de uma survey com um total de 239 respondentes. sendo destes. 89 autodefinidos LGBT+. Para a análise de dados foram utilizadas análises estatísticas univariadas e bivariadas.

Resultados: (1) ambos os públicos valorizam o lazer como principal motivação psicológica para a escolha do destino turístico; (2) as infraestruturas e o ambiente socioeconômico e a imagem afetiva são as dimensões mais importantes da imagem do destino; (3) as motivações psicológicas aumentam a avaliação da imagem de destino de turistas autodefinidos LGBT +; (4) não houve diferença significativa entre a escolha do destino turístico entre heterossexuais e o público LGBT +.

Originalidade: estudos anteriores focam em análises de consumo de destinos turísticos de LGBT+, mas não a compreensão das principais motivações psicológicas e sua associação com a imagem do destino, tampouco, verificam se de fato há diferenças entre o público LGBT+ e heterossexuais. Este estudo respondeu esta lacuna.

Palavras-chave: Turismo. Diversidade. Motivações para viagem. Países emergentes.

1 INTRODUCTION

Understanding tourists' destination choice is essential (Pan, Rasouli & Timmermans, 2021). The literature about tourist destination choice is consolidated and sees this phenomenon as a complex process influenced by many factors, such as motivation (Battour et al., 2012; Scherer et al., 2015; Zhang & Walsh, 2021) tourism experience (Larsen, 2007; Wu et al., 2011; Masiero & Qiu, 2018; Qiu, Masiero & Li, 2018) and destination image (e.g., Hong et al., 2006; Lin et al., 2007; Phau et al., 2010; Stylos et al., 2016; Scherer et al., 2015; Zhang et al., 2018).

Although destination image and psychological motivation have been recognized as significant factors influencing tourist destination choice, few studies focused on the LGBT+ (Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender/Transsexual and plus - inclusive of other groups, such as asexual, intersex, queer, questioning, etc.) segment, even though Guerra, Wiesinieski, and Brasileiro (2018) showed that LGBT+ audiences are wishful for entertainment and culture.

Brazilian LGBT+ tourists, even without high incomes, constitute themselves as frequent tourists, both domestic and international trips (Neves & Brambatti, 2019). Hughes e Deutsch (2010) makes clear that LGBT+ tourists occupy a significant space in the tourist phenomenon, through the unique way of consuming, their travel motivations, those who accompany them, the choice of services, the chosen destinations, the peculiarities that these travelers have, based on their reality. Azevedo et al. (2012) analyzing São Paulo (Brazil) LGBT+ tourists, confirmed that LGBT+ public presents behavioral particularities as buyers of tourist products, providing during their stay and higher investments than others tourism segments.

As postulated by Monterrubio, Rodríguez-Madera, and Pérez (2020), much of what is known about this market segment is undifferentiated internally. It has been extracted from empirical studies of gay and lesbian travelers (Clift & Forrest, 1999; Hughes, 2002; Monterrubio & Barrios-Ayala, 2015; Pritchard et al., 2000). The conclusions on LGBT+ tourism have been based on analyzes of sexuality and not on gender issues, and, unlike sexuality, gender manifestations and intensely exposed to social views (Monterrubio, Rodríguez-Madera & Pérez, 2020).

In Brazil, the LGBT + segment generated U$ 218.7 billion in terms of tourism and entertainment in 2018, according to data from the LGBT + Travel Market survey, promoted by Consultancy Out Now / WTM. It is possible to infer that tourism is based on an experience and is motivated by people's desire to travel and by what they hope to receive in return at the chosen destination. "These

expectations can lead the individual to satisfaction or dissatisfaction," and knowing the motivational factors related to consumer satisfaction enables the planned expansion of tourist campaigns and travel packages, given that the motivations can induce the individual to travel acting in an intrinsic psychological context (Martins & Guagliardi, 2010).

In this sense, Avena and Rossetti (2004) explain that it is essential that the place is previously structured to be part of the destination interests of the LGBT + public. The tourist destination must be built in the social and economic sense, from its image to the tourist infrastructure, passing through the local inhabitants' attitudes concerning tourism and tourism (Avena & Rossetti, 2004).

The LGBT+ tourism segment needs to be studied and understood once practitioners, to the best of our knowledge, doesn't know how psychological motivations and destination image of self-defined LGBT+ tourists' impacts destination choice – especially in the current context of worsening economic crisis in the country and in the world, due to the COVID-19 pandemic, which has forced tourism companies to rethink alternatives for the readjustment of their business models and performance in the market (Hudecheck et al., 2020; Brandão, Alves & Sarcinelli, 2021).

Therefore, this study aimed to identify the relationship between psychological motivations and destination image of self-defined LGBT+ tourists. Still, we will understand if there are differences between LGBT+ or heterosexual tourists' destination choices. To this end, the present study is structured in six sections. First, it brings a brief contextualization of the study. Then, the theoretical construction on the theme is presented, followed by methodological procedures and instruments used in collecting and treating data and the study results. Finally, the theoretical and practical implications and the limitations of the research and directions for future research were woven.

2 DESTINATION IMAGE AND PSYCHOLOGICAL MOTIVATIONS IN TOURISM RESEARCH

Research has addressed tourism as a socio-economic alternative (Martins & Guagliardi, 2010). Tourism has become a critical economic force that can generate income, job opportunities, stimulate consumption, and regional income distribution (Haddad, Porsee & Rabahy, 2013; Rabahy, 2020; Pan, Rasouli & Timmermans, 2021).

Segmenting this sector is an alternative to reducing tourist seasonality and maintaining high places' economic collections even in low season. "One of the characteristics of the tourism market is the heterogeneity about the demand that consumes tourism products and services, which justifies the diversification of the offer through the creation of homogeneous segments" (Medaglia, Maynart & Silveira, 2013).

In tourism, the individual travels for pleasure and relaxation and personal fulfillment. However, there is evidence that the reasons that lead an individual to travel are broader (Martins & Guagliardi, 2010). For Martin and Del Bosque (2008), the representation of a tourist destination in an individual's mind is influenced by the processing of individual psychological stimuli. When dealing with a psychological approach, Martins and Guagliardi (2010) explain that tourist motivations are intrinsic forces resulting from extrinsic forces coming from the environment in which the individual is inserted.

Psychological motivations have been addressed in the literature by several authors. Wang and Mei (2006) defined tourist motivation as the intrinsic power that directly promotes people's tourism behavior. In literature, tourists 'motivations can be classified into two main categories - based on Dann (1981) - namely, push forces and pull forces. Push forces are related to the inner desires that lead people to travel (e.g., escaping reality, relaxation, exercising, adventure, and ex-

ploration). On the other hand, pull forces refer to the tourism destination attributes that attract the tourists (e.g., natural scenery, leisure facilities, cultural atmosphere, events, and catering (Crompton, 1979; Zhang & Walsh, 2021).

Destination image in literature is frequently described as impressions and perceptions of a place, and tourists' previous experiences, marketing efforts, or word of mouth, and often used as a universal concept, sometimes broken down by several dimensions or a list of attributes (Pan, Rasouli & Timmermans, 2021). Destination image plays a crucial role in tourists' perception of a destination (Remoaldo et al., 2014) and contributions to understanding tourists' destination choice and satisfaction with destination experiences (Su et al., 2020).

San Martin and Del Bosque (2008) indicate that destination image should be considered a multi-dimensional phenomenon integrated by several cognitive (individuals' beliefs about the place) and affective dimensions (their feelings toward it). The destination image's cognitive component is related to the tourist destination's attributes, functional/ tangible (e.g., landscape, cultural attractions) and psychological (e.g., hospitality, atmosphere). On the other hand, the affective component is related to the emotions that a tourist destination can evoke (e.g., pleasure, excitement). It is noteworthy that tourists will use these image dimensions to establish their impressions and evaluate the considered destinations in their choice processes.

2.1 LGBT+ Tourism

Tourism aimed at the LGBT + public is considered a relevant segment, accounting for more than 6% of all global tourism (Out Now, 2020). This segment generated US $ 218.7 billion in the Brazilian scenario in 2018 (Out Now / WTM, 2020). "Gay-friendly spaces and gay tourism practices, in a way, represent not only the use of a consumer market but also a form of resistance, sociability among peers and social empowerment" (Lanzarini & Rial, 2013). The segment's social empowerment has taken relevant proportions year after year to search for homosexuality as a sexual identity. In 1990, the World Health Organization (WHO) removed homosexuality from the International Statistical Classification of Diseases and Related Health Problems (ICD). Recognition did not end prejudice and discrimination (DW, 2020), and this audience still has limits on the experiences of / LGBT + tourists, in cases, for example, when same-sex couples request a double bed; seek a honeymoon visa; hiring travel insurance, among others (Neves, 2021).

Literature shows that most of LGBT+ tourists prefer destinations celebrated as gay-friendly with spatial concentrations of places, attractions, accommodation, and events targeted activities to LGBT people (Hughes & Deutsch, 2010; Ram et al., 2019). The authors also explain that socializing with predominantly or exclusively other LGBTs is easy and safe, and where the host culture, city, and state are not threatening - are the targeted places for this segment (Hughes & Deutsch, 2010; Ram et al., 2019).

Few studies have studied the psychological motivations and destination image of self-defined LGBT+ tourists' destination choice or differences between LGBT+ or heterosexual tourists' destination choice to the best of our knowledge. The available scientific studies concerning LGBT+ tourism motivations are focused on LGBT+ tourist activity from the perspective of the destinations of their trips, expenditures, etc. (Lubowiecki-Vikuk & Borzyszkowski, 2016). LGBT+ hotel experiences of gays and lesbians (Poria, 2006); diversification according to age (Hughes, Deutsch, 2010) or segmentation of gay and lesbian travelers' motivations for travel based on their stage of sexual identity formation (Khan, 2013); the way tourism products are promoted to LGBT people (Moreira & Campos, 2019); trans women's tourism motivations and experiences (Monterrubio, Madera & Pérez, 2020).

Previous studies have focused on broader analyzes such as the relationship between ho-

mosexuality, consumption, and hospitality (Avena & Rossetti, 2006); holiday travel consumption by gays (Clift & Forrest, 1999; Hughes, 2002; Hughes & Deutsch, 2010; Pritchard et al., 2000; Monterrubio & Barrios-Ayala, 2015). Studies seek to understand the behavior of choosing destinations (Hoffmann et al., 2018; Lanzarini, 2013; Neves & Brambatti, 2019); benefits of an LGBT-inclusive tourist destination (Ram et al., 2019).

3 METHODOLOGICAL PROCEDURES

The present research, descriptive to the objectives, was operationalized through a survey. The instrument proposed by San Martin and Del Bosque (2008) was used as a reference. The questionary analyzes the choice of tourist destination based on the analysis of the image of the destination (subdivided into (1) infrastructure and socio-economic environment; (2) atmosphere; (3) environment; (4) affective image; and (5) cultural environment), and psychological motivations (being (1) leisure; (2) physical motivations; and (3) social interaction). Besides, issues of identification of the LGBT + public have been included. Thus, in total, the instrument was composed of 25 observable variables, which were verified using a Likert-type scale (1- Nothing important to 5- Very important). Data collection took place on-line (via Google forms tool) between August and November 2019.

The sampling method used in the development of the research was non-probabilistic. For Dencker (2000), sampling is non-probabilistic when the possibility of choosing an element from the research universe is unknown. The person should have taken a leisure trip in the last three years to participate in the research. Thus, the research sample consisted of 223 valid questionnaires, of which 78 were LGBT +. The choice of participants was simply random, non-probabilistic, being the respondents from the south and southeast of Brazil, accessed through the researchers' networks. Initially, Table 1 presents the respondents' profile.

Table 1 - Sample profile

		LGBT+ (n=78)	Heterossexual (n=145)
Age	Until 21 anos	27.3%	20.7%
	Between 22 e 37 anos	71.4%	57.9%
	Between 38 e 53 anos	1.3%	16.6%
	Between 54 e 72 anos	-	4.8%
Sex	Male	22.1%	40.7%
	Female	77.9%	57.9%
Marital Status	Single	79.2%	54.5%
	Married / Stable union	19.5%	40.7%
	Divorced	1.3%	4.8%
Education	Elementary School	6.5%	4.8%
	High school	19.5%	9.7%
	Incomplete Higher Education	33.8%	34.5%
	Complete Higher Education	33.8%	24.8%
	Complete Graduate	6.5%	26.2%
Family Income	Up to 2 minimum wages	16.9%	11%
	From 2 to 6 minimum wages	54.5%	53.8%
	From 6 to 10 minimum wages	18.2%	15.9%
	From 10 to 14 minimum wages	2.6%	3.4%
	More than 14 minimum wages	1.3%	6.9%

Source: Research Data

Firstly, it appears that the two groups (heterosexual and LGBT +) had more female representatives as respondents, with the most frequent age of participation being between 22 and 37 years old, and both groups with a high level of education and different family income ranges.

The data collected were analyzed using SPSS Statistics 22. Initially, the data entry matrix's preparation was conducted, where missing values, outliers, and data distribution normality were analyzed. After, we performed a descriptive and univariate analysis of the variables to identify the mean standard deviation (SD). Finally, the data's bivariate analysis was performed to test the correlations between the variables and linear regression to understand the association between the constructs.

4 RESULTS

Initially, consumption preferences related to travel for each group were presented. The frequency with which groups travel minor changes to the detriment of sexual orientation. The method of purchasing the groups is also similar, as both prefer setting up their itinerary. There is a considerable difference between accommodation choices, where 64.9% of the LGBT + group opt for accommodation through the Airbnb application or hostels. In comparison, only 31% of the heterosexual group opts for these means of accommodation. The heterosexual group prefers hotels or resorts.

Table 2 – Consumer preferences in destination choice

		LGBTQIA	Heterossexual
Frequency of trips	Rarely	5.2%	6.2%
	About every two years	10.4%	14.5%
	Once a year	57.1%	49.0%
	Two to four times a year	26%	24.8%
	More than four times a year	1.3%	5.5%
Purchase method	Specialized agency	14.3%	16.6%
	Travel sites	6.5%	8.9%
	Assemble your own itinerary	79.2%	74.5%
	Other	-	-
Accommodation	Hotels / Resorts	26%	44.8%
	Friends' house / relatives	5.2%	23.5%
	AirBNB / *Hostels and the like*	64.9%	31.0%
	Rented house or apartment	3.9%	0.7%

Source: Research Data.

Table 3 presents the univariate analysis, which is also presented in the appendix). Good cost-benefit and safety are relevant in the choice in both groups. The LGBT + group valued the atmosphere dimension. Both groups claim to enjoy beautiful landscapes, a variable found in the environment construct. The cultural environment dimension obtained the lowest averages of motivations based on both groups' tourist destination image.

In psychological motivations, both groups value leisure, and they seek fun and entertainment and interest in having exciting experiences in travel. The social interaction dimension was the one that obtained the lowest averages for both groups. As for physical motivations, it appears that both groups are looking for a place to relieve stress. The sample is also interested in safe places where they can live exciting experiences while rest and relax.

Table 3: Analysis of dimensions

	Latent variable	LGBT+		Heterossexual		Reliability *
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Destination image	Infrastructure and socioeconomic environment	4.18	.541	4.19	.526	.793
	Atmosphere	4.07	.833	3.94	.932	
	Environment	3.85	.835	3.83	.811	
	Affective image	4.17	.597	4.05	.687	
	Cultural environment	3.56	.916	3.69	.923	
Psychological motivations	Recreation	4.49	.479	4.48	.625	.734
	Physical motivations	3.87	.676	3.90	.651	
	Social interaction	3.22	1.080	3.31	1.108	

Source: Research data/ reliability measured by Cronbach's Alpha
** Differences between groups are not statistically significant

Table 4 shows the linear correlation between the observable variables of the LGBT + group in order to assess, in this case, the dimensions of the compelling image and the psychological motivations of only the LGBT + public.

Table 4: Correlation of the dimensions of the affective image and psychological motivations (LGBT+)

		IAS	ATM	MAM	IA	AC	LAZ	MF	ISO	MP	IAF
Destination image	IAS	1									
	ATM	.026	1								
	MAM	-.042	.199	1							
	IA	.122	.087	.506**	1						
	AC	-.026	-.010	.447**	.374**	1					
Psychological motivations	LAZ	.006	.012	.190	.356**	.274*	1				
	MF	.015	.222	.286*	.233*	.377**	.145	1			
	ISO	.088	.017	.197	.282*	.371**	.112	.391**	1		
	Psychological motivations	.067	.110	.304**	.380**	.481**	.390**	.728**	.872**	1	
	Destination image	.262*	.481*	.766**	.680**	.674**	.287**	.415**	.333**	.475**	1

Source: Research Data.
** The correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2 ends).
* The correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2 ends).
Note: IAS (infrastructure and socioeconomic environment); ATM (atmosphere); MAM (environment); AI (affective image); AC (cultural environment); LAZ (leisure); MF (physical motivations); ISO (social interaction); MP (Psychological motivations (total)); IAF (Affective image (total))

Observing the results of the correlation analysis, the dimensions of infrastructure and socioeconomic environment and atmosphere do not correlate with the dimension of psychological motivations, and these variables will not compose the linear regression model. Furthermore, it is possible to verify that the other correlations are high between the sub-constructs and their constructs, as well as between both constructs analyzed.

In the final analysis (see Table 5), the relationship between psychological motivations and destination image of self-defined LGBT + tourists 'destination choice was assessed through linear regression.

Table 5 – Linear regression between the dimensions (just self-defined LGBT + tourists')

	R²	R²-adjus	SD Residual	F Statistic	t	Sig
Psychological motivations → Destination image	.243	.233	.542	24.053	3.553	.001

Source: Research Data.

The linear regression showed that the psychological motivations predict the destination image of self-defined LGBT + tourists |F (1.45) = 24.053. p <0.001; R² 0.243) |. So, the 1,627 points in psychological motivations increase 0.576 points the destination image of self-defined LGBT + tourists 'destination choice.

5 DISCUSSION AND FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

Previous studies have focused on analyzes of consumption of LGBT+ tourism destination choice, but these studies were not able to understand the LGBT+ main psychological motivations and their association with the destination image, either check if there are in fact differences between the LGBT+ and heterosexual audiences in tourism destination choice. This in this study we responded to this gap. Therefore, our results contribute with the literature in least three ways.

First, there was no significant difference between the choice of tourist destination between heterosexuals and the LGBT + public. We can observe in the literature that even most LGBT+ differ in their private lives, their friend's circle, their new families, the homoaffective relations, a style, and consumption model that makes them different from others (as before raised by Pereira & Ayrosa (2012)), it is impossible to conclude that LGBT+ the group we observed here have different tourism destination choice that heterosexual sample. Pereira and Ayrosa (2012) has found before that gay world is not culturally apart from the heterosexual world, in some way corroborating with our results.

Second: both (Hetero and LGBT+) rank leisure as the main psychological motivation for choosing the travel destination and infrastructures and socioeconomic environment and affective image are the most important dimensions of destination image. This result support Scherer et al. (2015) results, that found the same dimensions as the most important in psychological motivation and destination image, analyzing a general Brazilian sample.

And the last contribution is related to the analysis of self-defined LGBT+ tourists' destination choice, which we can conclude that psychological motivations increase the destination image. So, it is inferred that the LGBT's main motivation to travel is intrinsic. This result raised some new questions, which we are not able to answer in literature. The first question is that the advancement in LGBT activities is seen by some as an opportunity to segregate between homosexual and heterosexual travel destinations by their nature of inclusiveness (as supposed by Coon, 2012). But, if the main reason to travel destination choose is intrinsic, so, does it make sense to segregate the travel destinations? Further research should look at this point.

Also, if there is not a difference in tourism destination choice behavior, so why gay-friendly destinations receive more attention from gay (as presented in Hoffmann et al., 2018 and Lanzarini, 2013)? Is the main problem-related in their selection of the destinations on or than how LGBT are accepted in the destination? Future research can investigate this point, analyzing the difference between tourist destinations with a strong religious and moral norms appeal (or not recognized as receptive to LGBT) versus gay-friendly destinations.

6 LIMITATIONS AND FURTHER RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

Even having achieved the proposed research objectives, this study had some limitations. These limitations can be resolved in future research, completing the list of further research directions raised in the previous topic. First, our sample: (1) self-defined LGBT+ tourists' is limited to 78 cases; (2) the sample was simple random; (3) respondents' average income can interfere with the ability to travel and consequently their perception; (4) the age average may also bring some bias to the results. Moreover, we cannot identify how many respondents are from each of the definitions of LGBT+. Therefore, larger-scale studies focusing on a diversity of respondents segmented between each definition of LGBT+ are future research directions.

Another critical limitation could be inherent in our study. We operationalized both (psychological motivations and destination image) using the perception and memories about the LGBT+ tourists' destination choice. Using survey design and not an experimental approach, we can bias our study but be aware of this limitation. Future studies should extend this analysis by a practical or natural buy experience approach.

Finally, for future studies, we suggest that the same relationships that were the focus of this study be investigated with LGBTs groups with different characteristics from those of our informants. Older men, lower social class respondents, or transgender (once we believe they have other questions related) would be interesting study targets. Also, there are different groups of heterosexuals and LGBTs with different lifestyles and characteristics who probably differ from our sample.

REFERENCES

AVENA, D.T. & ROSSETTI, F. (2006). Homossexualidade, consumo, cidadania e hospitalidade. *Caderno Virtual de Turismo*, 4, 9-16

AZEVEDO, M., MARTINS, C., PIZZINATTO, N., & FARAH, O. (2012). Segmentation in touristic sector: LGBT tourists of Sao Paulo. *Revista de Administração da UFSM*, 5(3), 493-506. https://doi.org/10.5902/198346593852

BALOGLU, S. & MCCLEARY, K. (1999) A model of destination image formation. *Annals of Tourism Research* 26(4): 808–889, https://doi,org/10,1016/S0160-7383(99)00030-4

BATTOUR, M. M., BATTOR, M.M., & ISMAIL, M. (2012), The mediating role of tourist satisfaction: A study of Muslim tourists in Malaysia. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 29(3), 279–297, https://doi,org/10,1080/10548408,2012,666174

BRANDÃO, M.M., ALVES, L.A., & SARCINELLI, A.F. (2021) A percepção de valor do ambiente eletrônico de agências de turismo e seu impacto na decisão de compra. *Revista Brasileira de Pesquisa em Turismo*, 15(2), https://doi.org/10.7784/rbtur.v15i2.1977

MONTERRUBIO, C. & BARRIOS-AYALA, M. (2015) Holiday motivations: conversations with lesbians in Mexico. *International Journal of Tourism Sciences,* 15:1-2, 22-29, https://doi,org/10,1080/15980634,2015,1118873

CHI, C.G.-Q., & QU, H. (2008). Examining the structural relationships of destination image, tourist

satisfaction and destination loyalty: An integrated approach. *Tourism Management*, 29(4), 624–636, https://doi,org/10,1016/j,tourman,2007,06,007

CLIFT, S. & FORREST, S. (1999). Gay men and tourism: destinations and holiday motivations. *Tourism Management,* 20 (5), 615-625, https://doi,org/10,1016/S0261-5177(99)00032-1

COHEN, S. A., PRAYAG, G., & MOITAL, M. (2014). Consumer behaviour in tourism: Concepts, influences and opportunities. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 17(10), 872-909 https://doi,org/10,1080/13683500,2013,850064

COON, D.R. (2012). Sun, sand, and citizenship: The marketing of gay tourism. *Journal of Homosexuality,* 59,4, 511-534. https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2012.648883

CROMPTON, J. L. (1979). Motivations for pleasure vacation. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 6(4), 408-424. https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383(79)90004-5

DANN, G. M. (1981). Tourist motivation an appraisal. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 8(2), 187-219. https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383(81)90082-7

DENCKER, A.F.M. (2000). *Métodos e técnicas de pesquisa em turismo*. São Paulo: Futura,

DW (2020). *Há 30 anos, OMS retirava homossexualidade da lista de doenças,* Available on: https://www,dw,com/pt-br/h%C3%A1-30-anos-oms-retirava-homossexualidade-da-lista-de-doen%C3%A7as/a-53447329

GONZÁLEZ, L., LEON, C.J., GONZALEZ HERNANDEZ, M.M., & DE LEON, J. (2021). The structural relationships of destination image, satisfaction, expenditure and loyalty in the context of fishing tourism. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism* https://doi,org/10,1080/15022250,2021,1884596

GUERRA, A. R. D. T., WIESINIESKI, L. C. B. DA S., & BRASILEIRO, I. L. G. (2018). Lazer e turismo LGBT em Brasília/DF sob a perspectiva da hospitalidade. *Cenário: Revista Interdisciplinar em Turismo e Território*, 6(11), 85-91. https://doi.org/10.26512/revistacenario.v6i11.18268

HADDAD, E. A., PORSSE, A. A., & RABAHY, W. (2013). Domestic Tourism and Regional Inequality in Brazil. *Tourism Economics*, 19(1), 173–186 https://doi,org/10,5367/te,2013,0185

HOFFMANN, C.; DUARTE, R.; TRAVERSO, L.D. & BOBSIN. D, (2018). Turismo gay-friendly: segmento de demanda latente. *Rosa dos Ventos Turismo e Hospitalidade,* 10(4), 798-813, http://dx,doi,org/10,18226/21789061,v10i4p798

HONG, S., KIM, J., JANG, H., & LEE, S. (2006). The roles of categorization, affective image and constraints on destination choice: An application of the NMNL model. *Tourism Management*, 27(5), 750–761.

HUDECHECK, M., SIRÉN, C., GRICHNIK, D., & WINCEN, J. (2020). How Companies Can Respond to the Coronavirus. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 1–13.

HUGHES, H.L. (2002). *Gay men's holidays: Identity and inhibitors.* London: Continuum,

HUGHES, H. L., & DEUTSCH, R. (2010). Holidays of older gay men: Age or sexual orientation as decisive factors? *Tourism Management,* 31(4), 454–463, https://doi,org/10,1016/

j,tourman,2009,04,012

KHAN, R.M. (2013). *Travel motivations of gay and lesbian tourists: a qualitative inquiry.* Thesis, Master of Science in Hospitality Information Management, University of Delaware. Available on: https://udspace.udel.edu/bitstream/handle/19716/12794/Reshma_Khan_thesis.pdf?isAllowed=y&sequence=1

LANZARINI, R. (2013). A viagem liberadora: para além das fronteiras sociais da sexualidade, *Revista Rosa dos Ventos: Turismo e Hospitalidade*, 5(4), 548-558

LARSEN, S. (2007). Aspects of a psychology of the tourist experience. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 7(1), 7-18, https://doi,org/10,1080/15022250701226014

LIN, C.-H., MORAIS, D. B., KERSTETTER, D. L., & HOU, J.-S. (2007). Examining the role of cognitive and affective image in predicting choice across natural, developed, and theme-park destinations. *Journal of Travel Research,* 46(2), 183–194.

LUBOWIECKI-VIKUK, A. P., BORZYSZKOWSKI, J. (2016), Tourist Activity of LGBT in European Post-Communist States: the Case of Poland, *Economics and Sociology,* 9 (1), 192-208, DOI: 10.14254/2071-789X.2016/9-1/13

MADDEN, K., RASHID, B., & ZAINOL, N. A. (2016). Beyond the motivation theory of destination image. *Tourism and Hospitality Management,* 22(2), 247-264, https//doi,org/10,20867/thm,22,2,1

MARQUES, C., VINHAS DA SILVA, R., & ANTOVA, S. (2021). Image, satisfaction, destination, and product post-visit behaviours: How do they relate in emerging destinations? *Tourism Management*, 85 https://doi,org/10,1016/j,tourman,2021,104293

MARTÍN, H.S., & BOSQUE, I. (2008). Exploring the cognitive–affective nature of destination image and the role of psychological factors in its formation. *Tourism Management*, 29, 263-277, https://doi,org/10,1016/j,tourman,2007,03,012

MARTINS, A. A. C.; GUAGLIARI, J. A. (2010). *Motivadores de uma Viagem de Lazer/Turismo.* In: Seminário da Associação Brasileira de Pesquisa e Pós-Graduação em Turismo, VII, São Paulo/SP, Anais...São Paulo/SP.

MASIERO, L., & QIU, R.T. (2018). Modeling reference experience in destination choice. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 72, 58-74, https://doi,org/10,1016/j,annals,2018,06,004

MEDAGLIA, J., MAYNART, K., & SILVEIRA, C. E. (2013). A segmentação de mercado e a demanda turística real em Diamantina/MG e Região. *Revista Acadêmica do Observatório de Inovação do Turismo*, 7(4), 54-75, https://doi,org/10,12660/oit,v7n4,11412

MONTERRUBIO, C., MADERA, S.R., & PÉREZ, J. (2020). Trans women in tourism: Motivations, constraints and experiences. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 43, 169-178, https://doi,org/10,1016/j,jhtm,2020,04,009

MOREIRA, M. G.; CAMPOS, L. J. (2019). The ritual of ideological interpellation in LGBT Tourism and the impossibility of the desire that moves. *Revista Brasileira de Pesquisa em Turismo*, 13 (2), 54 - 68, http://dx.doi.org/10.7784/rbtur.v13i2.1542

NEVES, C.S.B. (2021). Turismo LGBT: Aplicação Bibliométrica na Pesquisa Científica dos Programas de Pós-Graduação em Turismo no Brasil (1997-2019), *Cenário Revista Interdisciplinar em Turismo e Território*, 9(1), 84-103, https://doi,org/10,26512/revistacenario,v9i1,33650

NEVES, C.S.B. & BRAMBATTI, L.E. (2019). O comportamento do turista LGBT com relação ao consumo em viagens de lazer. *Rosa dos Ventos – Turismo e Hospitalidade,* 11(4), 832-846, http://dx,doi,org/10,18226/21789061,v11i4p832

OUT NOW (2020). *Better LGBT*. Available on: https://www,outnowbusinessclass,com/learn/

PAN, X., RASOULI, S., & TIMMERMANS, H. (2021). Investigating tourist destination choice: Effect of destination image from social network members. *Tourism Management,* 83, 104217, https://doi,org/10,1016/j,tourman,2020,104217

PEREIRA, V., GUPTA, J. J., & HUSSAIN, S. (2019). Impact of Travel Motivation on Tourist's Attitude Toward Destination: Evidence of Mediating Effect of Destination Image. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, https://doi,org/10,1177/1096348019887528

PEREIRA, SEVERINO JOAQUIM NUNES, & AYROSA, EDUARDO ANDRÉ TEIXEIRA. (2012). Between two worlds: an ethnographic study of gay consumer culture in Rio de Janeiro. *BAR - Brazilian Administration Review*, 9(2), 211-228. https://doi.org/10.1590/S1807-76922012000200006

PHAU, I., SHANKA, T., & DHAYAN, N. (2010). Destination image and choice intention of university student travellers to Mauritius. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management,* 22(5), 758–764

PORIA, Y. (2008). Pink Tourism: Holidays of Gay Men and Lesbians. *Tourism and Hospitality Research,* 8(1), 71–73, https://doi,org/10,1057/palgrave,thr,2007,18

PORIA, Y. (2006). Assessing Gay Men and Lesbian Women's Hotel Experiences: An Exploratory Study of Sexual Orientation in the Travel Industry, *Journal of Travel Research,* v. 44, 327-334. https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287505279110

PRITCHARD, A., MORGAN, N.J., SEDGLEY, D., KHAN, E. & JENKINS, A. (2000). Sexuality and holiday choices: conversations with gay and lesbian tourists. *Leisure Studies*, 19:4, 267-282, https://doi,org/10,1080/02614360050118832

QIU, R.T.R., MASIERO, L. & LI, G. (2018). The psychological process of travel destination choice. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 35:6, 691-705, https://doi,org/10,1080/10548408,2018,1435332

RABAHY, W.A. (2020). Análise e perspectivas do turismo no Brasil. *Revista Brasileira de Pesquisa em Turismo*, 14(1), 1-13, https://doi,org/10,7784/rbtur,v14i1,1903

RAM, Y., KAMA, A., MIZRACHI, I., & C. M. HALL (2019) The benefits of an LGBT-inclusive tourist destination, *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*, 14, 100374, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdmm.2019.100374

REMOALDO, P. C., RIBEIRO, J. C., VAREIRO, L., & SANTOS, J. F. (2014). Tourists' perceptions of world heritage destinations: The case of Guimarães (Portugal). *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 14(4), 206–218, https://doi.org/10.1177/1467358414541457

SAN MARTIN, H., & DEL BOSQUE, I.A. (2008). Exploring the cognitive–affective nature of destination

image and the role of psychological factors in its formation, *Tourism Management*, 29, 263–277 https://doi,org/10,1016/j,tourman,2007,03,012

SCHERER, F.L., HAHN, I.S., STEIN, L. C., & BARPP, D. B. (2015). Motivações, dimensões da imagem e qualidades afetivas dos lugares: a escolha do destino e as fotos em viagens de turismo e lazer. *Revista Brasileira de Pesquisa em Turismo*, 9(3), 442-458, http://dx,doi,org/10,7784/rbtur,v9i3,865

STYLOS, N., VASSILIADIS, C. A., BELLOU, V., & ANDRONIKIDIS, A. (2016). Destination images, holistic images and personal normative beliefs: Predictors of intention to revisit a destination. *Tourism Management*, 53, 40–60.

SU, D.N., NGUYEN, N.A.N., NGUYEN, Q.N.T., & TRAN, T.P. (2020). The link between travel motivation and satisfaction towards a heritage destination: The role of visitor engagement, visitor experience and heritage destination image. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 34, 100634, https://doi,org/10,1016/j,tmp,2020,100634

UM, S. & CROMPTON, J.L. (1990). Attitude Determinants in Tourism Destination Choice. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 17, 432-448, https://doi,org/10,1016/0160-7383(90)90008-F

WANG, X., & MEI, H. (2006). Tourist satisfaction of tourism destination: model and empirical study. *Journal of Beijing International Studies University*, (137), 58-62

WU, L., ZHANG, J., & FUJIWARA, A. (2011). Representing tourists' heterogeneous choices of destination and travel party with an integrated latent class and nested logit model, *Tourism Management*, 32(6), 1407–1413, https://doi,org/10,1016/j,tourman,2011,01,017

ZHANG, J., & WALSH, J. (2021). Tourist experience, tourist motivation and destination loyalty for historic and cultural tourists. *Pertanika Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 28(4), 3277-3296, doi:10,47836/PJSSH,28,4,43

ZHANG, H., WU, Y., & BUHALIS, D. (2018). A model of perceived image, memorable tourism experiences and revisit intention. *Journal of Destination Marketing and Management*, 8, 326–336.

ATTACHMENT

Table 6: Univariate analysis of observable variables

		LGBTQIA+		Heterossexual	
		Mean	**SD**	**Mean**	**SD**
DESTINATION IMAGE	**Infrastructures and socioeconomic environment**				
	Shopping facilities	3.70	1.007	3.70	1.106
	Quality accommodation	4.28	.820	4.28	.636
	Good value for money	4.57	.674	4.57	.549
	Safe place	4.46	.935	4.59	.583
	Atmosphere				
	Peaceful place	4.00	.967	3.91	.968
	Place to rest	4.16	.812	3.99	.996
	Relaxing place	4.51	.992	3.93	1.025
	Natural environment				
	Variety of fauna and flora	3.44	1.100	3.44	1.111
	Beautiful landscapes	4.20	.795	4.28	.723
	Beautiful natural parks	3.91	.982	3.77	.960
	Affective image				
	Arousing destination	3.93	.873	3.87	.904
	Exciting destination	3.96	.889	3.86	.954
	Pleasant destination	4.62	.486	4.42	.663
	Cultural environment				
	A lot of cultural attractions	3.39	1.010	3.62	1.000
	Interesting cultural activities	3.67	1.012	3.71	.999
	Nice to learn about local customs	3.61	1.022	3.75	.988
PSYCHOLOGICAL MOTIVATIONS	**Leisure**				
	To seek adventures	4.29	.720	4.04	1.112
	To seek diversion and entertainment	4.49	.503	4.48	.627
	To live exciting experiences	4.51	.585	4.55	.671
	Physical motivations				
	To take a rest/to relax	4.24	.870	4.19	.907
	To alleviate stress	4.44	.749	4.28	.788
	To explore historical and cultural heritage	3.25	1.121	3.49	1.0661
	To learn about cultures and ways of life	3.56	1.146	3.64	1.097
	Social interaction				
	To meet new people	3.35	1.127	3.35	1.193
	To integrate myself into the life and activities of local people	3.09	1.208	3.27	1.227

Source: Research Data.
** Differences between groups are not statistically significant

AUTHORS

1. Ivanete Schneider Hahn

Professor and Researcher at Uniarp.
Ph.D. in Business Administration (UFSM/Brazil)
E-mail: ivischneider@hotmail.com
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0552-7496

2. Julia Bianchi

Undergraduate Student in Business Management (UNIARP/Brazil)
E-mail: juliambianchi@hotmail.com
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1089-9067

3. Juciele Marta Baldissarelli

Ph.D. Candidate in Business and Accountability (FURB/Brazil)
E-mail: juciele.marta@uniarp.edu.br
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2021-9547

4. Anderson Antônio Mattos Martins

Professor and Researcher at Uniarp, Brazil
Ph.D. in Manufacturing Engineering (UFSC/ Brazil)
E-mail: andersonmartins@uniarp.edu.br
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6812-4219

Contribution of authors.

Contribution	[Author 1]	[Author 2]	[Author 3]	[Author 4]
1. Definition of research problem	√	√		
2. Development of hypotheses or research questions (empirical studies)	√	√		
3. Development of theoretical propositions (theoretical work)	√	√	√	
4. Theoretical foundation / Literature review	√	√	√	√
5. Definition of methodological procedures	√	√	√	√
6. Data collection	√	√	√	
7. Statistical analysis	√			
8. Analysis and interpretation of data	√	√		
9. Critical revision of the manuscript	√	√	√	√
10. Manuscript writing	√	√	√	√