

Article

Inclusive Tourism: Assessing the Accessibility of Lisbon as a Tourist Destination

Sandra Rebelo¹, Mafalda Patuleia² and Álvaro Dias^{2,3,*} ¹ Department of Tourism, University of Lusófona, 1749-024 Lisbon, Portugal; sandra-rebelo1@hotmail.com² The Transdisciplinary Research Center of Innovation & Entrepreneurship Ecosystems (TRIE), Universidade Lusófona, 1749-024 Lisbon, Portugal; mafaldapatuleia@ulusofona.pt³ ISCTE-IUL, 1649-026 Lisboa, Portugal

* Correspondence: alvaro.dias1@gmail.com

Abstract: Full accessibility to people with reduced mobility, applied to tourism, is difficult to achieve and should not be seen in an absolute way, but as a concern to make tourism services more accessible and focused on the specific and individual needs of people as tourists. National and regional entities should adopt good practices to build a tourism of all, for all. The Delphi method was used in order to verify the accessibility and attractiveness of the city of Lisbon as a tourist destination by addressing the following objectives: to analyse the competitiveness of a destination for people with reduced mobility, to analyse if Lisbon is attractive and inclusive, considering its infrastructures, services, hospitality, tourist attractions and accessibility. The results obtained in the study show that Lisbon's factors and resources are increasingly accessible to people with reduced mobility. Our findings reveal that entertainment, general and tourism infrastructures, accommodation, the various activities and cultural resources and the quality of services present greater accessibility for people with reduced mobility. The factors with less importance were: marketing of a destination, accessibilities, and natural resources.

**Citation:** Rebelo, S.; Patuleia, M.;

Dias, Á. Inclusive Tourism: Assessing the Accessibility of Lisbon as a

Tourist Destination. *Tour. Hosp.* **2022**, *3*, 466–495. <https://doi.org/10.3390/tourhosp3020030>

Academic Editor: Brian Garrod

Received: 18 April 2022

Accepted: 18 May 2022

Published: 23 May 2022

Publisher's Note: MDPI stays neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.



Copyright: © 2022 by the authors. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Keywords: competitiveness; accessibility; reduced mobility; accessibilities; niche tourism; sustainability

1. Introduction

Discussion around aspects that contribute to the construction and promotion of a more inclusive world has had several reflections on tourism. There is a growing consensus that tourism is a social good of first necessity, constituting an essential aspect in quality of life, and should, therefore, be available to all people, regardless of their physical, economic and/or social conditions [1]. Thus, awareness of the tourism sector and tourist destinations for inclusion of those with reduced mobility is of utmost importance, because all citizens, regardless of their characteristics, should have the right to be autonomous and have no barriers to their movement. The concept of accessibility in tourism has been a subject of discussion in the literature, since it is not a consensual topic. In this vein, Gillovic et al. [2] conducted a literature review highlighting that the concept was being “employed loosely, inconsistently and interchangeably, euphemistically with erroneous understandings and nuances” (p. 615). On the other hand, due to the complexity of the needs of agents to be involved in promoting a more inclusive city as a tourism destination [3], it is recognized that empirical research on stakeholder involvement in accessible tourism practice is still scarce [4].

By addressing the challenges proposed by Scheyvens and Biddulph [5], related to the need for identifying the degree of inclusiveness of tourism development, and how a tourism enterprise can be more inclusive, this study aims to verify the accessibility and attractiveness of the city of Lisbon as a tourist destination. In a more specific scope, the objectives proposed for the study are: (i) to analyse how competitive Lisbon is seen to be as a destination for people with reduced mobility; (ii) to analyse whether Lisbon is attractive and

inclusive in terms of infrastructure, services, hospitality, tourist attractions, and accessibility. To fulfil the study's aims, interviews were carried out with experts/researchers and with tourism, and inclusive tourism, associations, to analyse and evaluate their opinions about the problems associated with the study. The qualitative Delphi method, which functions as a methodological tool widely used in research in various areas of knowledge, was applied. This method is a powerful research technique that seeks to gather a set of expert opinions on a given theme. To collect a set of opinions, interviews were applied that considered various studies and scientific models.

In this regard, and according to the literature review, there is empirical research on three major themes presented as central to the realisation and treatment of information based on the analysis of inclusive tourism: Inclusive Tourism, Competitiveness and Tourist Destinations. The city of Lisbon's accessibility for people with reduced mobility, and whether this is an important factor in measuring its competitiveness against other tourist destinations, were assessed.

Thus, this study contributes to existing knowledge by detailing the specific factors that a city must invest in so as to be more inclusive. By doing so, our study contributes to the growing discussion around inclusive tourism by adding empirical evidence of an old city, with ancient neighbourhoods, not prepared for this kind of tourism. Furthermore, this study shows that Lisbon has made, over the years, several efforts to make the city more inclusive and accessible to all. However, a lot of work is still required, mainly concerning marketing and natural resources. Two points that are indispensable are that, on the one hand, increase in tourism marketing has had a great contribution to the growth of the tourism industry [6] and, on the other hand, the natural resources related to tourism are attractions that most influence the movement of people to other regions [7].

2. Theoretical Framework

2.1. *Inclusive Tourism*

The term inclusive tourism, according to Darcy [8], is defined as a set of services and infrastructure that allow people with reduced mobility to enjoy their holidays and leisure time without barriers or hindrances to their movement. A later study corroborates this and adds that it is a complex process, having as a general objective that tourism is for all, regardless of situation and possibilities, and should allow access to all tourism services in all tourist destinations [9]. Turismo de Portugal [10] also adds that inclusive tourism is not only aimed at people with disabilities. Everyone needs to be included and enjoy good access which ensures equality, autonomy, safety, and comfort. "Inclusive tourism presupposes a transversal offer of infrastructures, equipment and services that allow everyone to enjoy travel, stay and leisure without barriers. A destination that can ensure in a systemic way these conditions of accessibility will be called an accessible destination" ([11], p. 115).

The provision of tourism services depends, for the most part, on respect for difference, and diversity of supply is essential. In this way, inclusive tourism has a competitive advantage and is more sustainable, embracing the potentiality of more customers. All customers, regardless of age or disability, should have the right to different tourism experiences [12]. Thus, "inclusive tourism does not concern only people with motor, visual, hearing or cognitive disabilities, but rather a diversity of situations, cultural and social that require special attention" ([13], p. 15). Furthermore, although it is for everyone, it is intended for people with disabilities, specifically individuals with physical, sensory and intellectual disabilities, or others in medical circumstances that require special care (the elderly and other temporary assistance needs), so that they can enjoy tourism in a simple, safe and comfortable way [1].

Inclusive tourism is not intended to be a subcategory of tourism, with its own sites and attractions. It is intended that all tourist destinations are for all, transversely, so that cultural, leisure and sports venues, and commercial and other tourist activities, are accessible to all visitors [10].

2.1.1. Accessibility

To talk about inclusive tourism, it is essential to explain what it is, for whom it is and what the importance of accessibility is in general terms. For SNRIPD [14], accessibility is internally linked to mobility, communication and understanding, i.e., it is a concept that covers aspects from the physical, communicational, and cognitive points of view. For Eichhorn and Buhalis [15], accessibility is a very complex concept, as it has different meanings for different people in different contexts. Therefore, according to the European Commission [16], accessibility is a set of services and facilities (such as physical environment, transport, and information, among others), which allow people with special needs and reduced mobility to enjoy holidays and leisure time permanently, or temporarily, without any barriers.

Accessibility is defined as the ability of the surrounding environment to provide an equal opportunity of use to all people, directly, immediately, permanently and as autonomously as possible, demonstrating greater safety, comfort and functionality for all [12]. According to Gouveia et al. ([17], p. 13), “accessibility is the ability of the built environment to provide all people with an equal opportunity of use, in a direct, immediate, permanent and as autonomous as possible”. Turismo de Portugal [13] corroborates this and states that the more accessible the space, equipment, product or service, the more likely it is to be used by everyone. This requires the direct involvement of customers being at the centre and responsible for their own decisions [18]. “Accessibility is not just a tool or a technical approach, it is more than that, it is a cultural and altitudinal attribute that encompasses and enriches all the valences of customer service, enhancing each visitor and contributing additional advantages for all tourism businesses” ([10], p. 31).

For a destination to be accessible, in the broad sense of the term, it must allow all visitors to use and enjoy its facilities and services in an equitable, non-discriminatory manner [19]. In short, accessibility should be considered a requirement for all public procurement of buildings, infrastructure works, equipment and services, in order to promote social inclusion, contribute to employability, save public money and foster economic growth [10].

Technological Accessibility

With technological evolution and the need for access by people with visual impairment, there is a need to adopt guidelines that oblige those responsible for web pages, those of public and private domains, to facilitate their use by all. Thus, guidelines on accessibility of web content were developed by the World Wide Web Consortium (W3C) and became part of Portugal’s policy through the resolution of the Council of Ministers No. 155/2007.

According to DL No. 83/2018, of 19 October, from 23 September 2019, all “new” public websites, i.e., those built after the date of 23 September 2018, need to have an Accessibility Statement, with a hyperlink on the first page of the site and in the /accessibility/ directory, access unit.

2.1.2. Inclusive Tourism from an Economic Perspective

“Besides building an ethical and socially relevant concern, the promotion of accessible tourism products also has an important economic dimension” ([1], p. 42). Turismo de Portugal [13] corroborates this by stating that inclusive tourism, with a focus on people with disabilities and older people, can have great economic potential, since these people bring with them their family and friends and pass the word on regarding their good experiences. It adds that the promotion of inclusive tourism should be seen as a collective responsibility, a business opportunity, and a competitive advantage [20].

Another study carried out in Germany on the specific economic incentives of implementing “Accessible Tourism for All” reveals that most disabled tourists would not mind paying a higher price if they could use services that are more accessible and affordable for everyone. In addition, they also stated that they would travel more often if there

was greater accessibility [21]. For example, Devile [1] reported that tourists with reduced mobility contributed 80 billion Euros to the economy in terms of gross demand.

In short, inclusive tourism has been assuming a role of extreme economic and social importance, and is capable of generating wealth, promoting the socio-economic development of regions, being an important source of revenue for destinations and businesses, as well as contributing significantly to employability in Europe. However, due to lack of infrastructure and services, and negative attitudes towards travellers with special needs, derived either from age or disabilities, European tourism is losing 142 billion euros per year [10].

2.1.3. Inclusive Tourism from a Social and Ethical Perspective

The aim of making the environment accessible was decreed internationally by governments, in 1993, in the United Nations Standard Rules on the Equalisation of Opportunities for Persons with Disabilities (EN/EN). However, despite most of the world's countries having subscribed to the normative concept, the issue of accessibility remains a technical issue and social problem.

A key principle of equity is social inclusion; thus, access to services for people with disabilities is one of the components of sustainable tourism (Miller & Kirk, 2002). Accessibility is not just a tool or a technical approach, it is more than that. It is a cultural and attitudinal attribute that encompasses and enriches all valences of customer service, enhancing each visitor's touristic experiences and contributing additional benefits to all tourism businesses [19]. It is further added that "The United Nations (UN) Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities recognises disability as a human rights issue and identifies it as a social construct rather than an inherent quality of the individual. Emphasis is placed on eliminating social barriers-legal, organisational, or architectural prejudice" ([22] p. 2013).

In conclusion, according to Turismo de Portugal [20], tourism is a social good that should be available to all, not excluding any part of the population. To reinforce this idea, the World Code of Ethics for Tourism [23] states that tourism is the "possibility of direct and personal access to discover the riches of the planet is a right open to all inhabitants of the world. Increased participation in national and international tourism should be regarded as one of the best possible expressions of the continuing growth of leisure time and should not be hindered". In this way, respecting the tourism code of ethics implies that tourism activity should be equitable, responsible, and sustainable, and should be available to all individuals [23,24].

2.1.4. Policies for Inclusive Tourism in Europe and Portugal

In 1982, the first decree-law was published on the importance of a country's accessibility to all. However, it was only in 1997 that a deadline of seven years was set for the adaptation of public roads, buildings, and public establishments. However, in 2004 Portugal still did not guarantee accessibility for all. Therefore, in 2006 a new deadline for adaptations was established. The deadline ended on 8 February 2017, and little is known about the existence of systematised data that allow us to rigorously analyse the results obtained in the implementation of accessibility at national level.

Tourism in the European Union is truly versatile and one of its most developed segments is inclusive tourism. Inclusive Tourism not only serves people with special needs, but also provides solutions for the elderly, families with small children and for tourists who have safety as a priority [25].

Currently, according to the World Tourism Organization [26], at least 15% of the world's population has some form of physical or mental disability, which corresponds to at least one billion people. Furthermore, according to the same source, the ratio of elderly people is increasing throughout the European Union, with individuals aged over 65 years accounting for over 88 million people, i.e., one in five people belong to this demographic group.

Senior citizens, or citizens with disabilities, represent a demographic group with a high economic importance within the European Union, as they are consumers of the same economic sectors as all other citizens, and, in some specific circumstances, have stronger purchasing power [25]. Thus “in the last thirty years, the issue of accessibility and integration of people with disabilities in society has been gaining importance in public policy-making and legal practice” ([10], p. 28). Therefore, according to the same source, nowadays, all European Union Member States have their own legislation regarding accessibility, with specific requirements, such as: access to building spaces, access to information and communication technologies, access to education, employment, and transport. However, the EU does not contain a single set of agreed standards for accessibility, or common criteria which are specifically targeted at tourist sites and services.

In more and more countries, the promotion of accessibility in places of tourist interest is a legal imperative. Portugal has taken a decisive step with the introduction of anti-discrimination legislation and new forms of accessibility. Thus, accessibility must be ensured in physical spaces and provision of services, to provide full access and enjoyment of spaces, goods and services [10].

It is further added that the main tourism consumers—United Kingdom, France, Germany, Italy, and Spain—of the products offered by Portugal have about ten million people with reduced mobility and, therefore, with special accessibility needs. Thus, taking into account external demand, as well as internal demand, and accessibility needs, the All for All Portuguese Tourism programme was implemented in 2016, by Turismo de Portugal. This programme is aimed at tourism sector companies and public entities, and involves a concerted effort to make the national tourism offer accessible, with the intention of making Portugal a tourist destination for all [19]. The programme, according to the same authors, aims to prepare managers of Portuguese tourist destinations to introduce accessibility and inclusion in their management methods, thus adding a more competitive dimension. The focus on accessibility is directly linked to the intrinsic values of the destination of Portugal, i.e., “welcoming” all tourists. By building a tourist destination accessible for all in response to the individual needs of each visitor, a higher quality service is offered, reinforcing the attractiveness and sustainability of Portugal’s tourism industry [19]. Furthermore, Konstantakopoulou [27] also argued that health quality is an important predictor of international tourism receipts, being positively influenced by life expectancy. He found that the lifetime risk of the maternal death rate has a negative effect.

Compliance with the technical standards of accessibility and correction of current obstacles to mobility of people in Portugal subsists in the Decree Law No.125/2017 that proceeds to the second amendment to Decree Law No. 163/2006, of 8 August, amended by Decree Law No. 136/2014, of 9 September, which approves the regime of accessibility to buildings and establishments that receive the public, public roads and residential buildings. As far as the city of Lisbon is concerned, the City Council has defined the pedestrian accessibility plan as a strategy for the promotion of Lisbon’s accessibility. This plan aims to develop a global diagnosis of a given situation and defines the guidelines and actions considered most appropriate, depending on their strategic impact and feasibility.

2.2. Competitiveness

2.2.1. Competitiveness at the Micro and Macro Level

Micro-Environment

Competitiveness at the micro-level includes all the components that shape the industrial environment with which companies in the tourism sector must adapt to develop more effective competitiveness [28]. According to Ritchie and Crouch [29] competitiveness at the micro-level is part of the tourism system, as it concerns the actions and activities of the various entities of the tourism system that directly affect the objectives of each member of the system, whether individual company or organisation, that constitute the destination.

Macro-Environment

Kotler, Bowen and Makens [30] indicate that there are six environmental factors that shape the (destination) market: demographic, economic, natural, technological, political and cultural. These forces are claimed to be constraints and factors that influence the experiences of visitors to a tourist destination [31]. Tourism is influenced by several global forces, including laws and regulations, growing environmental concerns, restructuring of the economy, changing market demographics, innovation, and complexity of technology, which present themselves as challenges and opportunities for the tourism sector [28,32]. Ritchie and Crouch [29] add that “the tourism system is an open system. That is, it is subject to many influences and pressures arising outside the system itself. This is the global system or macro environment” (p. 1052).

2.2.2. Competitiveness of Cities as Tourist Destinations

The world, and consequently the economy and society, are constantly changing, which in recent years has been quite intense and at a rather high speed [33]. “In the century we live in, the effects of globalisation and of making the world a global village, have coincided with the boom of the tourism industry, also with many challenges and obstacles” ([34], p. 76).

The current global forces influencing the world have never been more complex and challenging and are causing changes in society. Thus, it is essential that destinations adapt to these global forces and use them to gain competitive advantages [35]. Therefore, according to Townsend [36], one of the strategies to meet these challenges is the use of cutting-edge technology. Dwyer, Forsyth and Rao [37] state that tourism competitiveness is a general concept that encompasses price differentials associated with exchange rate movements, productivity levels of the various components of the tourism industry and qualitative factors that affect the attractiveness, or otherwise, of a destination. According to Huggins and Thompson [38], the level of competitiveness of a destination is a determinant of its economic, social, and technological development. According to the authors, to create value and differentiation in the market, a destination must focus on knowledge, technology, innovation, creativity, and a unique identity.

In line with the authors cited above, the World Economic Forum (WEF) report, developed by Schwab [39], mentions that Portugal reached twelfth place in the competitiveness ranking at world level for the first time. It currently remains in the highest position ever, having risen eight positions since 2013 (twentieth place), three positions since 2015 (fifteenth place) and two positions since 2017 (fourteenth place). According to Omerzel [40], the competitive advantage of tourism seems to be much more important for the economy when compared to comparative advantage. Comparative advantage includes climate, landscape, forests, and wildlife, relating to the tourism offer. However, competitive advantage means infrastructure, management quality, labour skills and knowledge, and government policies, amongst others, thus paving a way for the competitiveness of a particular destination.

2.2.3. Competitiveness Strategies for Tourist Destinations

According to Hong [41], competitive advantages provide deeper insight into the reallocation of different types of tourism. In this way, the destination then has a viable approach (strategy) to modify its comparative advantages. Thus, the competitive advantages of a tourism destination consider the following dimensions: Infrastructure investments; Strategic planning for market ties; Resource maintenance; Resource allocation control; Growth and development; Effectiveness of operational performance and Facilitation of resources created.

2.2.4. Tourism Destinations' Competitiveness Indicators

After developing a framework for destination competitiveness, the next step is to develop competitiveness indicators [28]. According to the same authors mentioned above, the indicators of competitiveness of a destination can be categorized according to “Hard”

(objectively or quantitatively measurable measures) or “Soft” (measures that relate to the perceptions of visitors and, therefore, tend to be more subjective or qualitative).

According to Porter’s [42] view, government has the role of creating an environment that encourages industries or firms to acquire competitive advantages, such as the provision of quality education and training, public goods, support services, and reduced transactions and costs. In addition, Porter [42] indicated that governments can also influence strategy, structure and rivalry through approaches such as market regulation and tax policy. In the context of tourism, the management component focuses on such management of activities that enhance comparative advantages and competitive advantages [41].

2.2.5. Tourism Competitiveness Models

Diamond Model

According to Porter [42], this model represents the way in which an economy, company and/or organisation can generate competitive advantage through four factors: Firm Strategy; Factor Conditions; Demand Conditions; and Supporting Industries. *Firm Strategy* reflects attitudes towards competition, market institutions, degree of competition in the domestic market and other factors.

Factor Conditions reflect human resources, specialised infrastructure (physical and administrative), natural and capital resources.

Demand conditions reflect sophisticated and demanding local resources, customers who drive companies to innovate, unusual local demand in specialised segments that can globally serve customer needs.

Supporting Industries reflect the presence of local suppliers and competition-related industries, as well as stimulation, cooperation, and rivalry.

Calgary Model

This conceptual model determines that a more competitive tourist destination is one that is built on a sustainable basis and produces the best level of well-being and prosperity for its residents [43]. According to the same authors, this model is influenced by a first set of factors, at the macro-environmental level, that affect all human and economic activities of tourism. These factors are then related to economics, technologies, ecology, politics and socio-cultural and/or environmental issues. The Calgary model also relies on a second set of factors at the micro-environmental level, i.e., actions taken by each of the tourism sectors.

Integrated Model—New Conceptual Model by Kim and Dwyer

This conceptual model [44] brings an integrated approach to measuring competitiveness, both in comparative terms and advantages, related to climate, landscape, and wildlife, among others, and in tourism-related competitive advantages, involving the infrastructure (restaurants, hotels, events and attractions, transportation, etc.), management quality, workers’ skills, and government policies. Therefore, this model discusses the main elements regarding government skills and policies at national and corporate levels, and considers tourism competitiveness to be an intermediate goal within a broader process of maximising the contribution of the tourism sector and achieving socio-economic prosperity [44]. This model is divided into five factors:

The *1st Factor* of the model indicates the vital role of the resource base in tourism competitiveness and is divided into Inherited Resources (natural and cultural resources) and Created Resources (tourism infrastructure, special events, shopping, and entertainment).

The *2nd Factor* of the model highlights that supporting factors and resources include attributes such as general infrastructure, service quality, site accessibility and hospitality to tourists. Thus, these resources constitute the basic foundations for a sustainable tourism industry, as well as for competitiveness of the destination.

The *3rd Factor* of the model relates to destination management and how it can increase the attractiveness of key resources and enhance the effectiveness and quality of supporting factor resources. This model combines two sectors of activity, the public and private sectors.

Activities concerning the tourism industry and hospitality associations, destination marketing programme funding, training programmes, and private sector adoption of “green” tourism operations should be combined with national tourism development, destination marketing and image promotion strategies, workforce and workforce development and environmental and cultural protection undertaken by government.

The *4th Factor* of the model is related to demand conditions and comprises three main attributes that shape tourism demand: awareness, perception, and preference (as seen in Diamond’s model).

The *5th Factor* of the model focuses on innovation within the specific destination or in an aggregate. This is best suited to two attributes: product/service differentiation and tourism innovation and experience.

Heath’s Model

Heath [45] did not consider that the Calgary model and the integrated model were relevant for the study he was developing and so he devised his own model. Heath’s Model [45] was developed considering the analogous model of a house, where the foundations correspond to the supporting elements of competitiveness, the cement connects the different components of competitiveness, the building corresponds to the essential block for tourism to “happen” in the destination and the roof relates to the people of a destination’s competitiveness.

Hong’s Model

Building on the structure of the Calgary model, Hong’s [41] model is an explanatory model of the competitiveness of tourist destinations that is based on three internal dimensions (comparative and competitive advantages and tourism management) and two external dimensions (macro- and micro-environment).

2.3. Tourist Destinations

2.3.1. Factors and Resources of a Tourist Destination

The environment, product, service, or information elements should be reachable and/or usable by all, regardless of the ability of users. In this regard, architectural structures should consider the field of disability/impaired mobility, to become accessible [16]. Thus, *Universal Design* is one of the concepts of accessibility [46].

Universal Design

Worldwide, there are one billion people with disabilities [15]. The concept of *Universal Design* is partly the basis of the accessible sustainable model, emphasising a triple bottom line approach. *Universal Design* aims at developing and recommending equitable spaces and products that are flexible, simple, and intuitive to use, as well as promoting understandable information [46].

According to Darcy and Dickson [9], *universal Design* will make life easier for people with disabilities, seniors, and families with small children, as this concept implies a general solution for all less sustainable living conditions.

Linear Approach

The linear approach and corporate sustainability efforts are based on the need for society at large to follow an approach to economic, environmental, and social development that is sustainable over time, as underlined by the Commission on Environment and Development and the Brundtland Report (World Commission on Environment and Development [47]). Furthermore, sustainable development has to be implemented in a way that ensures and meets the needs of the present, without compromising future generations from meeting their own needs [47].

Infrastructures

The general infrastructure of a destination includes road networks, airports, train network, bus network, water supply, telecommunications, sewage, health care facilities, sanitation, electricity production system, financial services, and computer services [28]. Hong [41] corroborates this and adds that investment in infrastructure, including accessibility projects, accommodation, and transportation, among others, are the most important functional bases of a destination, and are referred to as physical resources. Winters [48] further adds that infrastructure is one of the policy responses that most readily stimulate and diffuse the benefits of economic growth.

It is, therefore, of the utmost importance that infrastructure of all types, to achieve a wide range of development outcomes, considers the needs of all people. If these needs are not considered in the design and delivery of different types of infrastructure, there is a risk that segments of society will be excluded [49].

However, due to lack of infrastructure, services, and poor attitude towards travellers with special needs, derived either from age or disability, European tourism is losing 142 billion Euros every year. Accessibility should be considered a requirement of all public procurement for buildings, infrastructure works, equipment, and services in order to promote social inclusion, contribute to employability, save public money and foster economic growth [10]. As such, we hypothesise:

H1. *Destination competitiveness is seen as favourable to people with reduced mobility.*

H2. *The city of Lisbon is attractive and inclusive considering its infrastructures.*

Services

The service dimension in the tourist experience is of utmost importance and, therefore, efforts should be made to ensure quality of service. Ensuring the quality of a service is a necessity to meet the satisfaction of tourists/visitors [50].

According to Hong [41], the services of a destination include two types of resources: hard resources (infrastructure, natural resources, and cultural resources) and soft resources (all accompanying services, waiters, stewards and porters). These services aim to provide as much satisfaction as possible to tourists through all components of tourism packages (experiences). The same author adds that destination managers should ensure that hard services are available, accessible and barrier-free to tourists. Thus:

H3. *The city of Lisbon is attractive and inclusive considering its services.*

Accessibility of Destinations

According to Ritchie and Crouch [29], the accessibility of tourism destinations is also a supporting factor, governed by a wide variety of influences, and dependent on various economic, social and/or political concerns and measures. Furthermore, the accessibility of tourist destinations and their various sectors and resources is also a competitive issue. Tourism resources, such as beaches, mountains, and national parks, among others, are influenced by economic, social, and political needs (which govern the location of roads and railway lines). Reiter [51] also adds that the quality of a city is measured by its diversity translating into the relevance of the four A's: attractions, amenities, accessibility, and authenticity. Accordingly, we hypothesise:

H4. *The city of Lisbon is attractive and inclusive considering the accessibility of the destination.*

Hospitality

The whole process of welcoming the customer (hospitality) and, consequently, the profitability of the company, depends mostly on the human element. Demand is human and supply depends fundamentally on the human element [52].

In this way, human resources become the key to quality hospitality “there is no quality without well-trained, motivated and well-led human resources” ([53], p. 121). Each visitor should feel good in the tourist destination and not feel like simply a source of money and revenue. In this way it becomes essential that the destination provides experiences that allow the visitor to feel welcome [29]. Dalpiaz, et al. [54] also add that hospitality currently relates to the feelings of all those involved in the tourism environment, considering that it seeks and aims at the total satisfaction of the visitor. Based on these assumptions, the following hypothesis is raised:

H5. *The city of Lisbon is attractive and inclusive considering its hospitality.*

Tourist Attractions

According to MacCannell [55], a tourist attraction comprises three essential elements: a tourist or human element, a central or core element, and a marker or informational element. In this way, a tourist attraction arises when these three elements are interconnected. Thus, without tourist attractions there would be no tourism, without tourism there would be no tourist attractions [56]. This tautology points to the fundamental importance of tourist attractions and the attractiveness of places for tourism [57].

The attractions and essential resources of a destination are the primary elements and constitute the main motivations for visiting a tourist destination, although all the components of a destination are key to success and profitability. Therefore, factors fall into seven categories: climate, culture and history, market links, mix of activities, special events, entertainment, and the superstructure of tourism [43]. Thus:

H6. *The city of Lisbon is attractive and inclusive considering its tourist attractions.*

2.3.2. Accessibility in Tourist Destinations

For a tourist destination to be accessible to people with reduced mobility, it is essential that all people have access to the whole tourist offer, thus managing to overcome architectural, attitudinal, communicational, methodological, instrumental, and programmatic barriers (as can be seen in the Table 1) existing in the leisure, recreation and tourism environments of a destination [58].

Table 1. Barriers that hinder accessibility for people with reduced mobility. Source: Adapted from Sasaki [58].

Barrier Type	Presented Difficulty	Possible Solutions
Architectural	Physical Spaces e.g., lack of low kerbs or structures for easy access for people with reduced mobility.	Wide doors, adapted toilets, easy access, accessible means of transport
Attitudinal	Attitude people show when relating to/serving tourists with disabilities e.g., discrimination.	Training courses for sector workers, service providers and decision-makers
Communicational	Difficulty in communication with the disabled person e.g., lack of adequate signage and interpreters.	Use of raised or Braille signs and the hiring of staff with expertise in such areas.
Methodological	Practices that do not take into account the needs of disabled people.	Innovation by managers, with the implementation of differentiated policies for different audiences.
Instrumental	Tourist attractions that ignore the limitations of people with disabilities.	Suitability of appliances, equipment, tools and other devices that are part of the recreational facilities

Table 1. Cont.

Barrier Type	Presented Difficulty	Possible Solutions
Programme	Prevent, or make it difficult, in practice for certain people to use leisure services.	Review of existing programmes, regulations, ordinances and standards, in order to ensure the exclusion of invisible barriers contained therein that may prevent or hinder the full participation of all persons, with or without disabilities, in leisure spaces and services

3. Methodology

3.1. Research Design

This study used the Delphi method, a qualitative method that was nevertheless enhanced with a quantitative analysis [59]. The qualitative method was applied in interviews with experts and, afterwards, to analyse the obtained answers. The data obtained was statistically analysed. A good starting question should not seek to judge, but to understand, should effectively facilitate the work, provide knowledge and not be demonstrative, i.e., it should aim at better knowledge of the phenomena studied and not only their description. Thus, considering the mentioned author, the present study is based on the following starting question: Are the factors and resources of Lisbon, as a tourist destination, accessible and inclusive to people with reduced mobility?

This study focuses on the inclusion and accessibility of Lisbon as a tourist destination. It is increasingly necessary that tourist destinations and all tourism sectors are aware that everyone, regardless of their characteristics, has the right to be free, autonomous and without barriers to movement. Currently there are many measures and actions for inclusion in the tourism sector, but are they enough? Can a tourist with reduced mobility access, and circulate freely in, Lisbon? Is Lisbon a competitive city in terms of accessibility for people with reduced mobility? There are many issues involved in this theme, which, in the twenty first century, should not be debated but solved. However, when circulating in Lisbon it is possible to observe numerous barriers, either due to lack of maintenance of the different places and resources of the city or lack of civic behaviour of the population.

3.2. Research Approach

Taking into account the problematic nature of the present study, the integrated model (new conceptual model of Kim and Dwyer [44]) was used as a reference framework of approach to the present research project, because this model, as already mentioned in the literature review, discusses the main elements regarding government competencies and policies, at national and corporate levels, that consider tourism competitiveness as an intermediate objective within a broader process to maximise the contribution of the tourism sector, and to achieve socio-economic prosperity for the destination [44]. Therefore, the purpose of this model is to analyse the five factors of the integrated model adapted to the attractiveness and inclusion of the city of Lisbon as a tourist destination: Hereditary and Created Resources; Supporting Factors and Resources (general infrastructure, service quality, accessibility to the site and hospitality to tourists); Tourism Destination Management; Demand Conditions; Innovations in the Tourism Destination.

Bearing in mind the nature of the research, it was decided to use a qualitative methodology, specifically the Delphi method, in phases, to validate the competitiveness indicators. Thus, exploratory interviews were carried out with researchers and experts in the field of tourism, to identify different perspectives and enrich this research. In the first phase, the participants were asked to answer the questions presented in a questionnaire and to give their opinions on the various indicators presented. After the first round, and considering the answers presented, a second phase was developed to obtain a greater degree of agreement.

The Delphi method is a qualitative research method based on the analysis of the experts' assessment of a given problem [60]. This exploratory qualitative method uses *standard* questionnaires with experts, allowing for a broad and in-depth gathering of knowledge on a complex topic [61]. The method achieves its objectives by promoting consensus among the different members of the selected experts, without having to do it in a face-to-face or anonymous manner [62].

There is no consensus as to the number of experts required for a research study. For Landeta [63], the number of experts should vary between seven and thirty elements. However, and to analyse the data obtained in the Delphi method, a quantitative method was subsequently developed with views to analysing the responses obtained in the two rounds conducted, using statistical analysis techniques. As far as research methods are concerned, studies distinguish and acknowledge the contribution of the quantitative and qualitative method to research in tourism [64]. Considering the method used in the present research, there follows a discussion of the methodological procedures taken. Thus, in addition to the bibliographical research and the various studies and scientific papers presented throughout the study, exploratory interviews were conducted with a panel of researchers in the field of tourism.

The panel of researchers was contacted in person, by telephone and via email, thus forming a group of twelve experts. The contacts were made between January and October of 2021, and the confidentiality of personal information was guaranteed.

The first round of interviews was conducted between January and May. During these five months several entities and researchers were contacted to obtain a strong and cohesive group. However, due to lack of responses in May, we proceeded to the second round, until the second day of October. All members who participated in the first round also did so in the second round, and thus both have the same participants. After this procedure, a data treatment of the two Delphi rounds was carried out, to analyse the results and subsequently carry out a conclusion and discussion.

3.3. Participants

Bearing in mind that the present study uses the Delphi method, exploratory interviews were conducted with various entities, experts, researchers, and teachers in tourism, as represented in the table below (Table 2).

Table 2. Participants of the exploratory interviews. Source: Own realisation.

Type of Entity	No. of Interviews
Public authorities (national, regional and local)	2
Private entities	3
Tourism Technical Consultant	1
Professors and researchers specialised in tourism	6
Total	12

It should be noted that considering the pandemic situation, it was a great challenge to achieve the total of this sample. Twenty-five experts were contacted and, of these, only twelve participated in this study, as represented in Table 2. The thirteen experts contacted who did not respond are in Table 3.

The participants shown in Table 3 were carefully selected to contribute to deepening the study in question, considering the participants' knowledge and different perspectives. This aspect is in line with the fact that the Delphi method does not use a random sample, but rather a researcher and expert in the area, i.e., a specialist or someone with in-depth knowledge on a given topic [62]. For reasons of feasibility, and considering the topic in question, these interviews were only conducted in Portugal and ensured the participants

their anonymity throughout the study. However, some data were collected, such as gender, age, and academic qualifications, as it is possible to observe in the charts.

Table 3. Contacts made but no response. Source: Own realisation.

Type of Entities	No Reply
Public authorities (national, regional and local)	2
Private entities	4
Tourism Technical Consultant	2
Professors and researchers specialised in tourism	5
Total	13

The participants' anonymity and confidentiality were chosen to enable panel members to express their opinions and perceptions truthfully [63]. Most of the study participants were female (N = 9) and only 25% were male (N = 3), aged between 25 and 60 years, with the majority (N = 5) aged between 31 and 40 years and then between 25 and 30 years (N = 4). It is also possible to verify that 50% of the respondents (N = 6) hold a master's degree.

3.4. Structure of Interviews

It is first important to mention that the interview questions were developed considering the ideologies and studies of various authors (as can be seen in the Table 4).

Table 4. Structure of the interview questions considering the ideologies of the authors. Source: Elaborated by the author.

Dimension	Author	Author's Issues	Adaptation to the Author's Problematic Integrated in the Interview
Analyse the Tourist Competitiveness of a Tourist Destination	Hong's model [41]	Investment in infrastructure, including accessibility projects, accommodation, transport, among others, are the most important functional bases of a destination, and are referred to as physical resources.	What factors and features influence tourists' decision making towards a tourist destination?
	Wares and Hadley [65]	Competitiveness reflects a country's ability to use resources in a way that enhances socio-economic competitiveness and people's development.	In your opinion, what are Lisbon's main competitors as a tourist destination?
	Porter [42]	The model of competitiveness in tourism is the Diamond model, which represents how an economy, company and/or organisation can generate competitive advantage through four factors: Firm Strategy; Factor Conditions; Demand Conditions and Supporting Industries.	In your opinion the biggest competitors to the Portuguese Capital, are related to the local proximity in geographical terms, or to the similar dimensions to Lisbon? Why?

Table 4. Cont.

Dimension	Author	Author's Issues	Adaptation to the Author's Problematic Integrated in the Interview
Lisbon's competitiveness as a tourist destination	Schwas [39]	The analysis of the competitiveness of a tourist destination is presented by the tourism industry competitiveness index. The tourism industry competitiveness index is understood as the measurement of factors and policies that contribute to increasing the competitiveness of the tourism sector.	What are the fundamental elements to consider when analysing the tourist competitiveness of the city of Lisbon?
	Dwyer and Kim [28]	The competitiveness indicators of a destination can be categorised according to "Hard" (objectively or quantitatively measurable measures) or "Soft" (measures that relate to visitors' perceptions and, therefore, tend to be more subjective or qualitative).	Taking into account the tourism destination competitiveness indicators of Dwyer and Kim (2003), how would you classify the following elements for the competitiveness of Lisbon (Likert Scale from 1-Strongly Disagree to 5-Strongly Agree)
Analyse the tourism competitiveness of a tourist destination taking into account the factors of inclusion	Manguele, and Roque, [11]	Inclusive tourism presupposes a transversal offer of infrastructures, facilities and services which allow everyone to enjoy travel, stay and leisure without barriers. A destination that is able to systematically ensure these conditions of accessibility will be called an accessible destination.	In your opinion, have the national and international entities made sufficient efforts to make infrastructures and services accessible to people with reduced mobility?
	Dweyer and Kim [28]	The competitiveness indicators of a destination can be categorised according to "Hard" (objectively or quantitatively measurable measures) or "Soft" (measures that relate to visitors' perceptions and therefore tend to be more subjective or qualitative).	Taking into account the tourism destination competitiveness indicators of Dwyer and Kim (2003), how would you rate the following elements in terms of accessibility for people with reduced mobility? (Likert Scale from 1 to 5)
	Turismo de Portugal [13]	The promotion of accessibility is an opportunity to innovate and to promote quality, sustainability and competitiveness, as well as a key point to achieve the four objectives referred to in the Lisbon European Council strategy: Increasing competitiveness; Achieving full employment; Strengthening social cohesion; Promoting sustainable development.	In your opinion, would Lisbon's accessibility for people with reduced mobility influence its competitiveness as a tourist destination?

After preparation of the interviews, considering the mentioned authors and their ideologies, we proceeded to the next phase. Two rounds of interviews and questionnaires were conducted with the panel members, and specific instruments were prepared for each round applied. Considering that there was no significant degree of consensus among the panel, it was necessary to apply a second round.

The degree of consensus as to the relevance of the indicator was at least 95%, giving a margin of error of only 5%. In the first round, and bearing in mind that the questions required a mixture of open and closed answers, a categorisation of the answers was carried out and subsequently an average and percentage of the answers was obtained. However, after analysing the data from the first round, and considering the degree of consensus, it was necessary to conduct a second round of the Delphi method, and the questions were developed according to a Likert scale. Thus, the indicator would be pertinent and would have consensus if the average of the answers from the various panel members was equal to, or greater than, 4 corresponding to one of the highest scores on a scale of 1 to 5. In addition, and still on the criteria for defining consensus, the standard deviation should also be mentioned as a criterion measure. Thus, a standard deviation of less than 1 (one) was considered as a reference for considering the existence of consensus.

3.4.1. First Round of Interviews

The first round of interviews was applied in person, through email and through Google Meet. In all these formats the interview template was sent beforehand and contained a restricted set of six open-ended questions and only two closed-ended questions, which aimed to assess the participants' perspective, considering three domains: The tourism competitiveness of a tourist destination; The competitiveness of Lisbon as a tourist destination; The tourism competitiveness of a tourist destination considering the inclusion factors. In this first round the researchers had the opportunity to give their opinion on the indicators and domains presented.

3.4.2. Second Round of Interviews

In the second round, only closed-ended questions were asked, more specifically considering the Likert scale. The participants and the domains present in the interviews were the same, the only difference was the categorisation of the questions considering the answers given in the first round of interviews. Therefore, the results of the first round served as the basis for generating a new questionnaire/interview that included the suggestions provided from the group of experts. These interviews were sent via email and were developed with the support of the Google Forms platform. The purpose of the application of the second round of interviews was to seek greater agreement and, given that it was found in this round, it was not necessary to conduct a third one.

4. Results

In the first pre-analysis phase, a content analysis and organisation of the study material was performed, i.e., all interviews developed were analysed, thus formulating hypotheses and/or guiding questions. Subsequently, and still in the first phase, an organisation of the material was made with visual highlights. In the next phase, material exploration was performed on what was decided in the previous phase; this was the longest and most exhaustive stage, because it was necessary to group and organise the collected data according to the classification criteria. After this second phase, it was possible to move on to the third and last phase, the treatment of the results. In short, the first analysis of the results, as can be seen in the previous paragraphs, was an extremely careful and judicious process to move on to an effective statistical analysis. The results obtained in both rounds of the Delphi method were analysed with the support of Excel software.

4.1. First Round of Delphi Panel

In the first round of the Delphi method, and as previously mentioned, the panel had the opportunity to give their opinions on the questions posed, and had the opportunity to develop and justify their answers. As such, and to deal with the data acquired statistically, the first phase aimed to organise the answers transmitted by the panel and subsequently categorise them into different questions. This phase of organisation was supported by the Excel platform. In this analysis, the answers given by the panel members were collected and then an average, standard deviation and percentage of answers were calculated to then perform a concordance analysis of the answers given by the experts and understand if it was necessary to apply a second round. In other words, the statements were compared, and a search was conducted for a concept that would unify them.

The following criteria were defined for the analysis of this first round:

Relevance of the indicator: an indicator was considered relevant if the average responses of the panel members, in the closed-ended questions, according to the Likert scale (from 1 to 5), were higher than 4.

Consensus on the relevance of the indicator: it was considered that if 75% of the panel members agreed there would be consensus.

Therefore, if in the first round there is compliance with the criteria indicated above, the answers are considered valid for research purposes. On the other hand, if these criteria are not met, a second round will be carried out. It is important to point out that in the first Delphi round a categorisation of the answers given by the panel members was carried out, thus grouping the answers.

4.1.1. First Interview Domain—Analysis of the Tourism Competitiveness of a Tourist Destination

In Table 5 it is possible to observe the statistical data concerning the analysis of the three questions of the first domain: analysis of the tourism competitiveness of a tourist destination. In this table it is possible to conclude that the concordance rate of the answers given by the experts is extremely low.

In the first question (What factors and resources influence the tourist's decision making in relation to a tourist destination), of the twelve researchers that made up the sample, 66.7% (N = 8) agreed that the factor that most influences the tourist's decision making is the tourist and cultural offer, as well as safety, and still 50% (N = 6) corroborated that climate is also a factor of influence. On the other hand, the answers that presented a lower agreement among the panel were advertising and marketing of the tourist destination, and hygiene and health with only one answer.

In the second question (Competitiveness reflects the ability of a country to use resources in a way that enhances socio-economic competitiveness and people's development), only Barcelona obtained a higher percentage 50% (N = 6), while the balance between hospitality and standard of living, as well as the city of Rome, presented the lowest percentage 8.3% (N = 1).

In the last question of this domain (Which are the fundamental elements to consider in the analysis of tourism competitiveness?), of the seven options given by the panel members, four showed an extremely low percentage of 8.3%; these being costs, cultural offer, accessibility and segments that the tourist disputes. The option that showed the highest percentage was geographic terms 66.7% (N = 8).

As can be seen in Table 6, question/dimension number one showed the highest rate of agreement, 66.7%, while question number two showed the lowest percentages of the three questions.

Table 5. Results of the first round of interviews—domain, analysis of tourism competitiveness of a tourist destination. Source: Elaborated by the author.

Domain	Factors and Resources Influencing Tourists' Decision-Making	N	Average	Standard Deviation	%	
Analysis of the tourism competitiveness of a tourist destination	Costs and budgets available from the Tourist	2	0.17	0.9	16.7%	
	Country price–quality ratio (prices charged)	7	0.6	3.2	58%	
	Tourist Experience/Living	2	0.2	0.9	16.7%	
	Motivations	2	0.2	0.9	16.7%	
	Tourist and Cultural Offer	8	0.7	3.7	66.7%	
	Security	8	0.7	3.7	66.7%	
	Health and Hygiene	1	0.8	0.5	8.3%	
	Quality of services and transport	4	0.3	1.8	33%	
	Climate	6	0.5	2.75	50%	
	Advertising and Marketing of the tourist destination	1	0.08	0.5	8.3%	
		Competitiveness reflects the ability of a country to use resources in a way that enhances socio-economic competitiveness and the development of people	N	Average	Standard Deviation	%
		Southern European Cities	2	0.2	0.9	16.7%
		Balance between hospitality and standard of living	1	0.08	0.5	8.3%
		Cities with the same tourist offer	2	0.2	0.9	16.7%
	Barcelona	6	0.5	2.75	50%	
	London	4	0.3	1.8	33.3%	
	Paris	4	0.3	1.8	33.3%	
	Porto	3	0.25	1.38	25%	
	Rome	1	0.08	0.5	8.3%	
	Madrid	2	0.2	0.9	16.7%	
	Are the biggest competitors to the Portuguese Capital, related to the local proximity in geographical terms, or to the similar dimensions to Lisbon?	N	Average	Standard Deviation	%	
	Both	2	0.2	0.9	16.7%	
	Time	2	0.2	0.9	16.7%	
	Costs	1	0.08	0.5	8.3%	
	Geographical Terms	8	0.7	3.7	66.7%	
	Cultural Offer	1	0.08	0.5	8.3%	
	Accessibility	1	0.08	0.5	8.3%	
	Segments that the tourist dispute	1	0.08	0.5	8.3%	

Table 6. Maximum and minimum agreement of the first domain of the interviews. Source: Elaborated by the author.

	Dimension	Minimum Agreement (%)	Maximum Agreement (%)
Analyse the Tourist Competitiveness of a Tourist Destination	Factors and resources influencing tourists' decision-making	8.3%	66.7%
	Competitiveness reflects the ability of a country to use resources in a way that enhances socio-economic competitiveness and the development of people.	8.3%	50%
	Are the biggest competitors to the Portuguese Capital related to the local proximity in geographical terms, or to the similar dimensions to Lisbon?	8.3%	66.7%

4.1.2. Second Interview Field-Lisbon's Competitiveness as a Tourism Destination

This domain was composed of two questions, one with an explanatory and argumentative character and the other considering the Likert scale (1-I totally disagree to 5-I totally agree). As it is possible to observe in Table 7, in the first question many were the elements with agreement, such as: affordable prices, safety and tourism, cultural and natural infrastructures, as well as activities to be developed; all of which presented a rate of 58.3% (N = 7). However, there were also many elements with a low percentage, such as environmental policy, hygiene and health, positioning, competition and target and climate, all with a percentage of 8.3% (N = 1).

Table 7. Results of the first round of interviews—Domain, Key elements to consider in tourism competitiveness analysis. Source: Elaborated by the author.

Domain	Key Elements to Consider in Tourism Competitiveness Analysis	N	Average	Standard Deviation	%
Lisbon's competitiveness as a tourist destination	Hospitality and reception conditions	6	0.5	2.75	50%
	Affordable prices	7	0.58	3.2	58.3%
	Environmental sustainability	1	0.08	0.45	8.3%
	Security	7	0.58	3.2	58.3%
	Tourist, cultural and natural infrastructures and activities to be developed	7	0.58	3.2	58.3%
	Hygiene and Health	1	0.08	0.45	8.3%
	Accessibility	2	0.2	0.9	16.7%
	Positioning, competition and target	1	0.08	0.45	8.3%
	Gastronomic Offer	2	0.2	0.9	16.7%
Climate	1	0.08	0.45	8.3%	

Table 7. Cont.

Domain	Key Elements to Consider in Tourism Competitiveness Analysis	N	Average	Standard Deviation	%
Lisbon's competitiveness as a tourist destination	Elements for Lisbon's competitiveness	N	Average	Standard Deviation	%
	Natural Resources	12	3.1	0.8	61.7%
	Cultural Resources	12	4.7	0.5	93.3%
	Tourism Infrastructure	12	3.7	0.6	73.3%
	Range of Activities	12	4.3	0.6	85%
	General infrastructure	12	3.7	0.8	73.3%
	Quality of services	12	4.1	0.7	81.7%
	Accessibility	12	3.4	1.1	68.3%
	Hospitality	12	4.8	0.4	95%
	Entertainment	12	3.9	0.8	78.4%
	Market Links	12	3.5	0.7	70%
	Demand Factors	12	3.5	0.8	70%
	Tourism organisation and management	12	3.6	0.6	71.7%
	Marketing Management	12	4	0.9	80%
	Prices	12	4.4	0.7	88.3%
Environment	12	4.1	0.9	81.7%	
Security	12	4.3	0.7	85%	

In the second question many were the elements with a percentage greater than 75%, such as hospitality with the highest percentage observed, 95%, which from 1 to 5 obtained an average of 4.8, cultural resources, range of activities, quality of services, entertainment, marketing management, prices, environment, and safety. Therefore, and considering the concordance values presented, it is considered that these indicators are validated in the first round of the Delphi method and are not repeated in the second round.

In summary, Table 8, and chart 5, show the maximum and minimum levels of agreement in the two questions of the second domain. In the first question, it is possible to observe that no question presents a rate of agreement higher than 75%. On the other hand, the second question presents a rate of agreement higher than 75%, since it is a closed-ended question; influencing all panel members to answer the various elements presented.

Table 8. Maximum and minimum agreement of the second domain of the interviews. Source: Elaborated by the author.

Domain	Dimension	Minimum Agreement (%)	Maximum Agreement (%)
Lisbon's competitiveness as a tourist destination	Key elements to consider in tourism competitiveness analysis	8.33%	58.33%
	Elements for Lisbon's competitiveness	68.30%	95%

4.1.3. Third Interview Domain—Analysing the Tourism Competitiveness of a Tourist Destination Considering the Factors of Inclusion

This last domain was made up of three questions, two open answer questions and one closed answer (Likert scale). As can be seen in Table 9, regarding the first question, related to whether companies are making enough effort, 75% (N = 9), answered no and only 25% (N = 3) had a positive opinion.

Table 9. Results of the third round of interviews—Domain, Analysing tourism competitiveness of a tourist destination taking into account the factors of inclusion. Source: Elaborated by the author.

Domain	National and International Bodies Have Made Sufficient Efforts to Make Infrastructure and Services Accessible to People with Mobility	N	Average	Standard Deviation	%
	Analyse the tourism competitiveness of a tourist destination taking into account the factors of inclusion	Yes	3	0.25	1.4
No		9	0.75	4.1	75%
How do the following elements rate in terms of accessibility for people with reduced mobility?		N	Average	Standard Deviation	%
Natural Resources		12	2.75	0.98	55%
Cultural Resources		12	3.33	0.99	66.7%
Tourism Infrastructure		12	2.9	1.07	58.3%
Range of Activities		12	2.4	0.82	48.3%
General infrastructure		12	2.75	1.25	55%
Quality of services		12	2.75	1.12	55%
Accessibility		12	2.75	1.12	45%
Hospitality		12	3.7	0.84	74.2%
Entertainment		12	2.5	1.07	50%
Market Links		12	2.75	0.42	55%
Demand Factors		12	2.6	0.73	51.7%
Tourism organisation and management		12	2.9	0.92	58.3%
Marketing Management		12	2.1	0.99	41.7%
Prices		12	3.2	0.95	63.3%
Environment		12	3.25	1.47	65%
Security		12	3.2	1.46	63.3%
Would Lisbon's accessibility for people with reduced mobility influence its competitiveness as a tourist destination?	N	Average	Standard Deviation	%	
Yes	12	1	5.5	100	
No	0	0	0	0	

In the second question a Likert scale was applied (from 1—totally disagree to 5—totally agree), where it was perceptible that the panel members showed a higher level of agreement regarding hospitality being accessible to people with reduced mobility, 74.2%, with an average response of 3.7. On the other hand, the experts had a low level of agreement about marketing management. It was possible to observe that, although the elements were the same as those presented in the field of competitiveness, these elements, as they are related and adapted to people with reduced mobility, present significantly lower averages and percentages.

Regarding the last question of the interview, this was the only one that presented a 100% percentage of agreement among the panel, all agreeing that the accessibility of a tourist destination for people with reduced mobility is essential for the competitiveness of a tourist destination. This information is summarised in Table 10 and Graph 6, where the minimum and maximum levels of agreement can be seen.

Table 10. Minimum and maximum agreement of the third domain of the interviews. Source: Elaborated by the author.

Domain	Dimension	Minimum Agreement (%)	Maximum Agreement (%)
Analyse the tourism competitiveness of a tourist destination taking into account the factors of inclusion	National and international bodies have made sufficient efforts to make infrastructure and services accessible to people with mobility	25%	75%
	How do the following elements rate in terms of accessibility for people with reduced mobility?	41.67%	74.17%
	Would Lisbon's accessibility for people with reduced mobility influence its competitiveness as a tourist destination?	0%	100%

4.1.4. Conclusions of the First Round of the Delphi Method

In summary, and after the verification and validation of all domains and dimensions/questions presented in the interview, it was time to draw conclusions. Concluding that most of the questions presented an agreement below 75%, there was a need to conduct a second round of the Delphi method.

It is essential to mention that the following dimensions presented in the Table 11 were considered validated because they showed a level of agreement equal to, or greater than, 75% and were not applied in the second round of the Delphi method. This analysis will be discussed in the following section.

Table 11. Summary of the dimensions considered validated in the first round of Delphi. Source: Elaborated by the author.

Elements Considered Fundamental for Lisbon's Competitiveness:	Maximum Agreement (%)
-Cultural Resources; -Range of Activities; -Quality of services; -Hospitality; -Entertainment; -Marketing Management; -Prices; -Environment; -Safety.	95%
National and international entities have made sufficient efforts to make infrastructure and services accessible to persons with reduced mobility.	75%
The accessibility of the city of Lisbon for people with reduced mobility influences the competitiveness of a destination.	100%

However, considering that the second dimension presented a level of agreement at the 75% limit, this question was adapted in the second round of interviews. The questions that were presented in this second phase considered the answers and opinions given by the experts and were formatted according to the Likert scale.

4.2. Second Round of the Delphi Panel

After the first round of Delphi, and considering the lack of agreement in different domains, a second round of the Delphi method was carried out. In this round, and after analysing the results obtained in the first round of interviews, the answers of the panel were considered, resulting in a grouping of answers into categories.

In this round only questions following a Likert scale (from 1 to 5) were applied. Thus, an indicator was considered relevant if the average of the answers was equal to or higher than 4, corresponding to one of the highest scores according to the scale. However, some relevance was considered to exist when the scores were higher than 3, the average score on the scale. In addition, as in the first round, consensus was reached if at least 75% of the panel members responded that it was important (4) or extremely important (5).

The dimensions of this new questionnaire were redone and categorised and then sent to the panel members. After all the answers were sent, a new organisation and analysis of the data was carried out and it was concluded that there was no need to carry out a third round, as all the dimensions of the questionnaire obtained a maximum agreement of over 75%. The following conclusions were reached.

4.2.1. First domain—Analysis of the Tourism Competitiveness of a Tourist Destination

In Table 12 and, subsequently summarized in Table 13, it is possible to observe that in relation to the factors and resources that most influence the decision making of tourists in relation to a tourist destination, all presented an average equal to, or greater than, 4 and a percentage greater than 75%, meeting both criteria defined as agreement. It is also observed that there was a total agreement that what concerns the terrain conditions for the realization of activities (tourism offer) is considered by the panel as the factor that most influences decision making, presenting 100% agreement ($M = 5$).

Table 12. Results of the second round of interviews-domain Analysis of the tourism competitiveness of a tourist destination. Source: Elaborated by the author.

Domain	Classification of Factors and Resources That Influence Decision Making in Relation to a Tourist Destination	N	Average	Standard Deviation	%
Analysis of the tourism competitiveness of a tourist destination	Available costs/budgets	12	4.1	0.3	81.7%
	Quality/price ratio	12	4.6	0.5	91.7%
	Experience living in the destination	12	4.9	0.3	98.3%
	Motivations	12	4.8	0.4	95%
	Terrain conditions to carry out activities (tourist and cultural offer)	12	5	0	100%
	Climatic conditions	12	4	0.8	80%
	Promotion and marketing of a tourist destination	12	4.4	0.5	88.3%
	Safety, Hygiene and Health	12	4.8	0.4	96.7%

Table 12. Cont.

Domain	Classification of Factors and Resources That Influence Decision Making in Relation to a Tourist Destination	N	Average	Standard Deviation	%
Analysis of the tourism competitiveness of a tourist destination	Importance of the elements to be considered in the analysis of tourism competitiveness	N	Average	Standard Deviation	%
	Hospitality	12	4.7	0.5	93.3%
	Environmental Sustainability	12	2.75	0.7	55%
	Affordability/lower standard of living	12	4.75	0.4	95%
	Safety, hygiene and security	12	4.75	0.4	95%
	Tourist, cultural and natural infrastructures, activities to be developed	12	4.5	0.5	90%
	Accessibility and transport	12	4.6	0.5	91.7%
	Positioning	12	5	0	100%
	Gastronomic offer	12	4	0	80%
	Meteorological conditions	12	4	0.4	80%

Table 13. Minimum and maximum agreement of the first domain of the interviews. Source: Elaborated by the author.

Dimension	Minimum Agreement (%)	Maximum Agreement (%)	Average Responses
What are the factors and resources that most influence tourists' decision making in relation to a tourist destination?	80.00%	98.30%	4.6
The importance of the elements to be considered in analysing tourism competitiveness	55.00%	100.00%	4.3

Regarding the second question, the averages and percentages are significantly lower. However, there was agreement among the panel that the elements that should be taken into more consideration so as to analyse tourism competitiveness are its positioning with a percentage of 100% ($M = 5$), as well as safety, health and hygiene and affordable prices/lower standard of living, with a 95% correlation rate ($M = 4.75$).

4.2.2. Second Interview Field-Lisbon's Competitiveness as a Tourism Destination

Regarding this domain two questions were applied, and it was concluded that in the first question applied, the rate of agreement in all answers obtained a maximum percentage of 96.7% ($M = 4.8$) and the panel agreed and corroborated that the main cities competing with the Portuguese capital are other cities/capitals with the same tourist offer, with an average of 4.4 out of 5.

In the second question the percentages and concordances are slightly lower only in one question which is related to the dimensions of the city. According to the specialists, this characteristic is not important for the competitiveness of the city of Lisbon, unlike geographical terms and proximity to the capital, which presented an agreement rate of 96.7% ($M = 4.8$), as can be seen in Tables 14 and 15.

Table 14. Results of the second round of interviews—Domain, Key elements to consider in tourism competitiveness analysis. Source: Elaborated by the author.

Domain	Which Cities Do You Consider Lisbon's Biggest Competitors as a Tourist Destination	N	Average	Standard Deviation	%
Lisbon's competitiveness as a tourist destination	European Cities/Capitals with the same tourism offer	12	4.8	0.35	96.7%
	Southern European Cities	12	4.25	0.4	85%
	Cities in Spain due to geographical proximity	12	4	0.56	80%
	Other Portuguese cities	12	4.4	0.47	88.3
	What are the characteristics of these cities that are most important for competition with the Portuguese capital?	N	Average	Standard Deviation	%
	Geographical terms (proximity)	12	4.8	0.35	96.7%
	Socio-economic characteristics	12	4.75	0.42	95%
	Similar dimensions	12	2.75	0.42	55%
	Segment of tourist demand	12	4	0	80%

Table 15. Maximum and minimum agreement of the second domain of the interviews. Source: Elaborated by the author.

Dimension	Minimum Agreement (%)	Maximum Agreement (%)	Average Responses
Major cities competing with Lisbon as a tourist destination.	80.00%	96.70%	4.4
Characteristics of these cities are more important for the competition of the Portuguese capital.	55.00%	96.70%	4.1

4.2.3. Third Interview Domain—Analysing the Tourism Competitiveness of a Tourist Destination Considering the Factors of Inclusion

In the third domain of the interviews, four questions were analysed, as can be seen in the Table 16. Thus, in the first question it is possible to observe that 93.3% ($M = 4.7$) agreed that Portuguese entities have made efforts to be more accessible to all. However, they need to make more efforts and give greater importance to this issue.

Regarding the elements that were considered to be the most accessible to people with mobility, the generality showed an agreement equal to, or higher than, 75%, that these were cultural resources, tourism infrastructures, range of activities, general infrastructures, quality of services, accommodation, entertainment, and the marketing management of a country.

On the other hand, natural resources presented an average of only 2.6 (51.7%), being considered to have low accessibility to people with reduced mobility. As can be seen in Table 17, it was agreed by 91.7% and 86.7% that there is still a lot to do and to be improved for Lisbon to be competitive in the market.

Table 16. Results of the second round of interviews—Domain, Analysing tourism competitiveness of a tourist destination taking into account the factors of inclusion. Source: Elaborated by the author.

Domain	Although National Entities Are Making Efforts to Make Tourism Infrastructures and Services Accessible, They Are Still Not Enough and It Should Be a Matter of Greater Importance	N	Average	Standard Deviation	%
Analyse the tourism competitiveness of a tourist destination taking into account the inclusion factors		12	4.7	0.45	93.3%
	Most accessible elements for people with reduced mobility	N	Average	Standard Deviation	%
	Natural resources	12	2.6	0.47	51.7%
	Cultural resources	12	3.75	0.69	75%
	Tourism infrastructures	12	4.2	0.36	83.3%
	Range of activities	12	3.8	0.36	76.7%
	General Infrastructure	12	4.3	0.45	86.7%
	Quality of Services	12	3.75	0.4	75%
	Accessibility	12	3.2	0.36	63%
	Accommodation	12	4.1	0.27	81.7%
	Entertainment	12	4.5	0.48	90%
	Marketing Management	12	3.25	0.41	65%
	The city of Lisbon could do more to be accessible for people with reduced mobility	N	Average	Standard Deviation	%
		12	4.59	0.47	91.7%
If the city of Lisbon does more in terms of accessibility for people with reduced mobility it will be more competitive in relation to other European cities/capitals	N	Average	Standard Deviation	%	
	12	4.3	0.45	86.7%	

Table 17. Maximum and minimum agreement of the third domain of the interviews. Source: Elaborated by the author.

Dimension	Minimum Agreement (%)	Maximum Agreement (%)
Although national entities are making efforts to make tourism infrastructures and services accessible, they are still not enough and it should be a matter of greater importance.	-----	93%
Elements that most present accessibility for people with reduced mobility?	51.70%	90%
The city of Lisbon could do more to be accessible for people with reduced mobility.	-----	92%
If the city of Lisbon does more in terms of accessibility for people with reduced mobility it will be more competitive in relation to other European cities/capitals.	-----	86.70%

4.2.4. Conclusions of the Second Round of the Delphi Method

As it was possible to observe in the analysis carried out of the second round of the Delphi method, all the domains presented showed agreement among the panel members and consequently it was not necessary to apply a third round of interviews to the panel members.

It should be noted that in relation to the second dimension of the study—elements that are accessible to people with reduced mobility—natural resources, accessibility/transport, and marketing management, obtained percentages below 75%, with averages below 4. However, the standard deviation presented was extremely low, not exceeding the value of one (1), i.e., there was a consensus among the panel in attributing low classifications, considering that there is consensus among members.

All the hypotheses were validated in this study. In relation to the first round of interviews, the three domains showed agreement among the panel, i.e., the panel, regarding the dimension of the elements considered fundamental for the competitiveness of the city of Lisbon, highlighted cultural resources, range of activities, quality of services, hospitality, entertainment, marketing management, prices, destination environment, and safety. Still, in the first round, the panel members agreed with a 75% rate that national and international infrastructures have made sufficient efforts for people with reduced mobility. However, considering that the rate of agreement was at the threshold of the defined percentage, this question was adapted in the second round of the Delphi method, namely at national level.

Finally, and still in relation to the first round, the panel members obtained a total of 100% agreement that the accessibility of the city of Lisbon influences its competitiveness as a tourist destination, in line with the study by Devile [1], who stated that making a destination accessible allows an extension of valences that may improve the competitiveness of the destination and exponentially increase its tourist demand.

In conclusion, it was observed in the first round that the panel agreed that national and international entities have been making efforts to increase accessibility and that the elements considered most important for this competitiveness are cultural resources, range of activities, quality of services, hospitality, entertainment, marketing management, prices, destination environment, as well as safety. The resources and efforts that the entities adopt are presented as being fundamental for a city, in this case Lisbon, to compete with other European cities/capitals.

After this analysis, a second round of interviews was conducted. In this second round, agreement was obtained in all the domains presented, thus consolidating that, according to the experts, the factors that most influence the decision making of a tourist in relation to a destination are the terrain conditions for the realisation of activities, i.e., its tourism offer. However, costs, the price-quality relationship, tourist experience at the destination, intrinsic motivations, climatic conditions, safety, hygiene and health and the promotion and marketing of a destination, obtained a lower agreement, although higher than the defined value of 75%.

Also in the competitiveness aspect, positioning is considered as an important element, with 100% agreement, followed by affordable prices and the lowest were standard of living and safety and hygiene, followed by hospitality, tourist, cultural and natural infrastructures, as well as activities to be developed. Also mentioned were accessibility, and transport and then gastronomic offers and climatic conditions. In this area, environmental sustainability, with a percentage of less than 75%, was not considered as an element to consider yet, although several studies indicate that tourists are increasingly concerned with this issue.

It is also important to mention that the experts consider the biggest competitors of the city of Lisbon to be European cities/capitals with the same tourism offer. However, the southern European cities, Spanish cities and other Portuguese cities also presented quite a high concordance. European cities/capitals must present as main characteristics geographical proximity and socio-economic characteristics and positioning.

More specifically in the case of accessibility for people with reduced mobility, the panel agreed that entities have made efforts so that infrastructures and services are accessible,

but still with many weaknesses and work to be done. At this level, the elements that they considered to be most accessible are firstly, entertainment, followed by general infrastructures, tourism infrastructures, accommodation, ranges of activities, cultural resources, and quality of services.

Marketing management, accessibility and natural resources had a rate below 75%. However, there was no disparity of answers, since answers varied between 2 and 3, on a scale of 1 to 5, showing agreement, but of a negative nature. Furthermore, there was mutual agreement that the city of Lisbon could make more effort to be accessible to all and that management of this is extremely important for the capital to be competitive with other European cities/capitals.

5. Discussion and Conclusions

In conclusion, and taking into account the starting question of this study (Are the factors and resources of Lisbon, as a tourist destination, accessible and inclusive to people with reduced mobility?), we can see that the factors and resources of Lisbon are more and more accessible to people with reduced mobility, where entertainment, general and tourism infrastructures, accommodation, range of activities and cultural resources and quality of services, present a greater accessibility for people with reduced mobility, unlike marketing of a destination, accessibilities and natural resources.

As can be seen in the previous sections, the starting question was answered, and it was possible to achieve the proposed objectives. However, there were some obstacles and difficulties, but, fortunately, they were successfully overcome. Firstly, one of the obstacles was undoubtedly to obtain the answers from the panel of members. Several national and regional entities were contacted but did not respond to the email. The Covid-19 pandemic did not help, considering that contact with experts was made only via email and telephone, as there was no possibility to directly contact the companies.

Applying the Delphi method was also a challenge, and many hours of study were needed to understand how the method works and apply it. Following the Delphi method, the choice of questions to be asked in the interviews was also a challenge, since there are not many scientific studies on inclusive tourism, which, thus, presented an obstacle.

Therefore, and taking into account the limitations and obstacles presented, it is suggested that, for future research, and regarding the definition and study of a jury panel, it is vital to understand the profile and competences of the companies and to try to adapt the interview method to different situations; always looking for a more viable way of applying the interviews. Another suggestion, focusing on analysis of accessibility at a national, versus regional, level, is to conduct a survey of areas of the country which are more accessible and of which practices are best practices, so that all Portuguese cities follow these examples. It is suggested that there are more studies and development of the subject of inclusive tourism, of giving everyone the opportunity to be free, responsible and autonomous, regardless of their physical and/or psychological characteristics. More responsibility and concern are needed for more inclusive, more accessible, tourism, a Tourism for All. Safety, functionality and comfort in the use of spaces, goods and services are of interest to all users, not just people with disabilities or mobility impairments [12].

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, S.R. and M.P.; methodology, S.R. and M.P.; software, S.R.; validation, Á.D. and M.P. investigation, S.R.; resources, Á.D.; data curation, S.R.; writing—original draft preparation, S.R. writing—review and editing, Á.D.; funding acquisition, Á.D. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Institutional Review Board Statement: Ethical review and approval were waived for this study, since written informed consent was obtained for the in-depth interviews before each session. In the survey, a link to the online survey platform was sent by social media and partners' social media, and at no times was contact established between researchers and participants. Moreover, the interview script and the personal questionnaire did not include any information and on histories. As such, all

data accessible to the researchers were stripped of respondents' names, addresses, or birth dates and cannot be linked back to them.

Informed Consent Statement: Informed consent was obtained from all subjects involved in the study.

Data Availability Statement: Not applicable.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

1. Devile, E. O Desenvolvimento do Turismo Acessível: Dos Argumentos Sociais aos Argumentos de Mercado. *Rev. Tur. E Desenvol.* **2009**, *11*, 39–46.
2. Gillovic, B.; McIntosh, A.; Darcy, S.; Cockburn-Wooten, C. Enabling the language of accessible tourism. *J. Sustain. Tour.* **2018**, *26*, 615–630. [CrossRef]
3. Michopoulou, E.; Buhalis, D. Stakeholder analysis of accessible tourism. In *Accessible Tourism-Concepts and Issues*; Darcy, S., Buhalis, D., Eds.; Channel View Publications: Bristol, UK, 2011; pp. 260–273.
4. Nyanjom, J.; Boxall, K.; Slaven, J. Towards inclusive tourism? Stakeholder collaboration in the development of accessible tourism. *Tour. Geogr.* **2018**, *20*, 675–697. [CrossRef]
5. Scheyvens, R.; Biddulph, R. Inclusive tourism development. *Tour. Geogr.* **2018**, *20*, 589–609. [CrossRef]
6. Morais de Brito, M.; Dias, A.; Patuleia, M. *Managing, Marketing, and Maintaining Maritime and Coastal Tourism*; IGI Global: Hershey, PA, USA, 2019.
7. WEF. *Aqueduct, Measuring and Mapping Water Risk-Water Risk Atlas*; WEF: Washington, DC, USA, 2016.
8. Darcy, S. *Tourism Patterns and Experiences of New South Wales People with a Physical Disability*; Tourism New South Wales: Sydney, Australia, 1998.
9. Darcy, S.; Dickson, T. A Whole-of-Life Approach to Tourism: The Case for Accessible Tourism Experiences. *J. Hosp. Tour. Manag.* **2009**, *16*, 32–44. [CrossRef]
10. Turismo de Portugal. Manual de Gestão de Destinos Turísticos. Available online: <http://business.turismodeportugal.pt/SiteCollectionDocuments/all-for-all/apresentacao-manual-destinos-turisticos-acessiveis-enat-mar-2017.pdf> (accessed on 18 April 2022).
11. Manguele, E.; Roque, V. Turismo Acessível: O caso de estudo da acessibilidade em hotéis portugueses. In *Inovação, Gestão e Educação em Turismo e Hotelaria: Investigação Aplicada*; Fernandes, G., Sardo, A., Martins, J.A., Melo, A., Eds.; Instituto Politécnico da Guarda: Guarda, Portugal, 2015.
12. Gouveia, P.H.; Mendes, D.; Simões, J. Turismo Acessível em Portugal-lei, oportunidades económicas, informação. *Inst. Nac. Para A Reabilitação IP Incl. Coleção Inf.* **2010**, *7*, 1–23.
13. Turismo de Portugal. *Guia de Boas Práticas de Acessibilidade-Turismo Ativo*; Federação Portuguesa de Desportos para Pessoas com Deficiência: Lisboa, Portugal, 2014.
14. SNRIPD. *Acessibilidade para a Igualdade de Oportunidades-Guia de Boas Práticas*; SNRIPD: Lisboa, Portugal, 2000.
15. Eichhorn, V.; Buhalis, D. A key objective for the tourism industry. In *Accessible Tourism. Concept and Issues*; Buhalis, D., Darcy, S., Eds.; Aspects of Tourism Series; Channel View Publications: Bristol, UK, 2011; pp. 46–61.
16. European Commission. European Accessibility Act. 2022. Available online: <https://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=1202> (accessed on 22 January 2022).
17. Gouveia, P.H.; Nave, P.; Simões, J.; Lopes, V.; Moço, S.; Rosado, S.; Cristóvão, H.; Marques, J.; Rodrigues, S. Plano de Acessibilidade Pedonal de Lisboa Fiscalização de Particulares Desafios Transversais. Available online: https://issuu.com/camara_municipal_lisboa/docs/plano_acessibilidade_vol_5_fiscaliz (accessed on 23 February 2022).
18. Dias, Á.L.; Silva, R.; Patuleia, M.; Estêvão, J.; González-Rodríguez, M.R. Selecting lifestyle entrepreneurship recovery strategies: A response to the COVID-19 pandemic. *Tour. Hosp. Res.* **2022**, *22*, 115–121. [CrossRef]
19. Ambrose, I.; Garcia, A.; Papamichail, K.; Veitch, C. Manual de Gestão de Destinos Turísticos Acessíveis. Available online: <https://www.chaves.pt/uploads/document/file/1460/manual-de-gestao-de-destinos-turisticos-acessiveis-pt.pdf> (accessed on 23 February 2022).
20. Turismo de Portugal. *Guia de Boas Práticas de Acessibilidade na Hotelaria*; Turismo de Portugal: Lisboa, Portugal, 2012.
21. BMWA. *Estímulos Económicos do Turismo Acessível para Todos. (Versão Portuguesa, Disponibilizada pelo Secretariado Nacional de Reabilitação e Integração da Pessoa com Deficiência)*; Federal Ministry of Economics and Labour: Berlin, Germany, 2004; não publicada.
22. Turismo de Portugal. Turismo Acessível para Todos Recomendações da OMT. 20ª Assem Geral. Available online: <https://business.turismodeportugal.pt/SiteCollectionDocuments/all-for-all/recomendacoes-omt-turismo-acessivel-para-todos.pdf> (accessed on 23 February 2022).
23. UNTWO. Manual on Accessible Tourism for All–Public-Private Partnerships and Good Practices. 2015. Available online: <https://www.e-unwto.org/doi/pdf/10.18111/9789284416585> (accessed on 23 February 2022).
24. Pereira, L.; Pinto, M.; Costa, R.L.D.; Dias, Á.; Gonçalves, R. The new SWOT for a sustainable world. *J. Open Innov. Technol. Mark. Complex.* **2021**, *7*, 18. [CrossRef]

25. Zsarnoczky, M. Accessible tourism in the European Union. In *Proceedings of the 6th Central European Conference in Regional Science Conference Proceedings: "Engines of Urban and Regional Development"*, Banská Bystrica, Slovak Republic, 20–22 September 2017; Faculty of Economics, Matej Bel University in Banská Bystrica: Banská Bystrica, Slovakia, 2017; pp. 30–39.
26. UNWTO. *Recommendations on Accessible Tourism for All*; UNWTO: Madrid, Spain, 2013; p. 3.
27. Konstantakopoulou, I. Does health quality affect tourism? Evidence from system GMM estimates. *Econ. Anal. Policy* **2022**, *73*, 425–440. [[CrossRef](#)]
28. Dwyer, L.; Kim, C. Destination competitiveness: Determinants and indicators. *Curr. Issues Tour.* **2003**, *6*, 369–413. [[CrossRef](#)]
29. Ritchie, J.R.; Crouch, G.I. A model of destination competitiveness/sustainability: Brazilian perspectives. *Rev. De Adm. Pública* **2010**, *44*, 1049–1066. [[CrossRef](#)]
30. Kotler, P.; Bowen, J.; Makens, J. *Marketing for Hospitality and Tourism*; Prentice Hall: Hoboken, NJ, USA, 1996.
31. Pereira, V.; Silva, G.M.; Dias, Á. Sustainability practices in hospitality: Case study of a luxury hotel in Arrábida Natural Park. *Sustainability* **2021**, *13*, 3164. [[CrossRef](#)]
32. Dias, Á.; Silva, G.M. Lifestyle Entrepreneurship and Innovation in Rural Areas: The Case of Tourism Entrepreneurs. *J. Small Bus. Strategy* **2021**, *31*, 40–49. [[CrossRef](#)]
33. Porter, M.E.; Heppelmann, J.E. How smart, connected products are transforming competition. *Harv. Bus. Rev.* **2014**, *92*, 64–88.
34. Fernando, I.N.; Long, W. New conceptual model on cluster competitiveness: A new paradigm for tourism? *Int. J. Bus. Manag.* **2012**, *7*, 75. [[CrossRef](#)]
35. Boes, K.; Buhalis, D.; Inversini, A. Smart tourism destinations: Ecosystems for tourism destination competitiveness. *Int. J. Tour. Cities* **2016**, *2*, 108–124. [[CrossRef](#)]
36. Townsend, A.M. *Smart Cities: Big Data, Civic Hackers, And the Quest for a New Utopia*; W. W. Norton Company: New York, NY, USA, 2013.
37. Dwyer, L.; Forsyth, P.; Rao, P. The price competitiveness of travel and tourism: A comparison of 19 destinations. *Tour. Manag.* **2000**, *21*, 9–22. [[CrossRef](#)]
38. Huggins, R.; Thompson, P. *Handbook of Regions and Competitiveness—Contemporary Theories and Perspectives on Economic Development*; Edward Elgar Publishing: Cheltenham, UK, 2017.
39. Schwab, R. *The Global Competitiveness Report. Committed to Improving the State of The World*; World Economic Forum: Cologny, Switzerland, 2019.
40. Omerzel, D.G. Competitiveness of Slovenia as a Tourist Destination. *Manag. Glob. Transit.* **2006**, *4*, 167–189.
41. Hong, W.C. Global competitiveness measurement for the tourism sector. *Curr. Issues Tour.* **2009**, *12*, 105–132. [[CrossRef](#)]
42. Porter, M.E. The competitive advantage of nations. *Harv. Bus. Rev.* **1990**, *73*, 91.
43. Ritchie, J.; Crouch, G. *The Competitive Destination: A Sustainable Tourism Perspective*; CABI: Wallingford, UK, 2003.
44. Kim, C.; Dwyer, L. Destination Competitiveness and Bilateral Tourism flows between Australia and Korea. *J. Tour. Stud.* **2003**, *14*, 55–67.
45. Heath, E. Towards a model to enhance destination competitiveness: A Southern African perspective. *J. Hosp. Tour. Res.* **2003**, *10*, 124–141.
46. Polat, N.; Hermans, E. A model proposed for sustainable accessible tourism (SAT). *Tékhné* **2016**, *14*, 125–133. [[CrossRef](#)]
47. World Commission on Environment and Development (WECD). *Our Common Future*; Oxford University Press: New York, NY, USA, 1987.
48. Winters, L.A. Globalization, Infrastructure, and Inclusive Growth. ADBI Working Paper Series. Tokyo: Asian Development Bank Institute. 2014. Available online: <http://www.adbi.org/workingpaper/2014/02/24/6176.globalization.infrastructure.inclusive.growth/> (accessed on 23 February 2022).
49. Agarwal, S.; Shaw, G. Heritage, screen and literary tourism. In *Heritage, Screen and Literary Tourism*; Channel View Publications: Bristol, UK, 2017.
50. Go, F.M.; Govers, R. Integrated quality management for tourist destinations: A European perspective on achieving competitiveness. *Tour. Manag.* **2000**, *21*, 79–88. [[CrossRef](#)]
51. Reiter, A. Liveable city—Sustainable quality of life as success driver for urban branding. In *Trends and Issues in Tourism*; Conrady, E.R., Buck, M., Eds.; Springer: Berlin/Heidelberg, Germany, 2012; pp. 69–77.
52. Castelli, G. *Administração Hoteleira*, 9th ed.; Coleção Hotelaria; EDUCS: Caxias do Sul, Brazil, 2001.
53. Balanzá, I.M. *Organización Y Control del Alojamiento*; Internacional Thomas Editores Spain: Madrid, Spain, 2000.
54. Dalpiaz, R.C.C.; Dagostini, A.; Giacomini, D.M.; Giustina, M.G.S.D. A Hospitalidade no Turismo: O bem Receber. Available online: <https://docplayer.com.br/185370-A-hospitalidade-no-turismo-o-bem-receber.html> (accessed on 23 February 2022).
55. MacCannell, D. *The Tourist: A New Theory of the Leisure Class*; Schocken Books: New York, NY, USA, 1976.
56. Gunn, G.A. *Vacationscape: Designing Tourist Regions*; Bureau of Business Research, University of Texas: Austin, TX, USA, 1972.
57. Lew, A.A. A framework of tourist attraction research. *Ann. Tour. Res.* **1987**, *14*, 553–575. [[CrossRef](#)]
58. Sasaki, R.K. *Inclusão No Lazer e No Turismo: Em Busca da Qualidade de Vida*; Áurea Editora: São Paulo, Brazil, 2003.
59. Dias, Á.; Aldana, I.; Pereira, L.; Lopes da Costa, R.; António, N. A measure of tourist responsibility. *Sustainability* **2021**, *13*, 3351. [[CrossRef](#)]
60. Garrod, B.; Fyall, A. Revisiting delphi: The delphi technique in tourism research. In *Tourism Research Methods: Integrating Theory with Practice*; Ritchie, B., Burns, P., Palmer, C., Eds.; CABI International: Wallingford, UK, 2005; pp. 85–98.

61. Von Bergner, N.; Lohmann, M. Future Challenges for Global Tourism: A Delphi Survey. *J. Travel Res.* **2014**, *53*, 420–432. [[CrossRef](#)]
62. Green, B.; Jones, M.; Hughes, D.; Williams, A. Applying the Delphi technique in a study of GPs information requirement. *Health Soc. Care Community* **1999**, *7*, 198–205. [[CrossRef](#)]
63. Landeta, J. Current validity of the Delphi method in social sciences. *Technol. Forecast. Soc. Chang.* **2006**, *73*, 467–482. [[CrossRef](#)]
64. Hara, T. *Quantitative Tourism Industry Analysis. Introduction to Input-Output, Social Accounting Matrix Modeling and Tourism Satellite Accounts*; Butterworth-Heinemann: Oxford, UK, 2008.
65. Wares, A.C.; Hadley, S.J. The Cluster Approach to Economic Development. *Tech. Brief* **2008**, *7*, 1–2.