Sustainable practices in daily life and in the context of tourism

Práticas de sustentabilidade no quotidiano e no âmbito do turismo

FERNANDA A. FERREIRA * [faf@esht.ipp.pt]

DÁLIA LIBERATO ** [dalialib@esht.ipp.pt]

ANA SOFIA LIMA *** [ana98lima@gmail.com]

PAULA ODETE FERNANDES **** [pof@ipb.pt]

Abstract | The concern and desire to follow sustainable practices is increasing, which makes tourists take this into account when choosing a tourism destination. The general objective of this paper is to analyze the difference between tourists' sustainable behavior in their daily lives and in the context of tourism. To answer the objectives of this study, we opted for a quantitative methodological approach since this research aims to study population behavior, opinions, and values. The results suggest that although in their daily lives' individuals adopt sustainable practices, sometimes it doesn't happen in the context of tourism. It was verified that if individuals felt they had the resources to adopt sustainable practices in the context of tourism, they would more often do so. Also, word of mouth, the perceived image of the destination, and guest reviews positively influence the intention to visit a destination that adopts sustainable practices. This study helps to recognize the sustainable practices most frequently adopted, those that do not present differences in the two contexts, and finally, the tools considered most important in the decision to visit a sustainable tourism destination.

Keywords | Slow travel, slow tourism, sustainable practices, sustainable tourism, wellness

Resumo | A preocupação e interesse em seguir práticas sustentáveis é cada vez maior, e os turistas vão tendo isso em atenção no momento da escolha por um determinado destino turístico. Este artigo tem como objetivo geral analisar a diferença entre o comportamento sustentável dos turistas no seu quotidiano e no contexto do Turismo. Para atingir os objetivos deste estudo, optámos por uma abordagem metodológica quantitativa, uma vez que esta investigação visa o estudo do comportamento da

* School of Hospitality and Tourism, Polytechnic Institute of Porto, Portugal. UNIAG, Applied Management Research Unit. CiTUR, Centre of Tourism Research, Development and Innovation. ORCID: 0000-0002-1335-7821
** School of Hospitality and Tourism, Polytechnic Institute of Porto, Portugal. CiTUR, Centre of Tourism Research, Development and Innovation. UNIAG, Applied Management Research Unit. ORCID: 0000-0003-0513-6444
*** School of Hospitality and Tourism, Polytechnic Institute of Porto, Portugal
**** School of Technology and Management, Polytechnic Institute of Bragança, Portugal. UNIAG, Applied Management Research Unit. ORCID: 0000-0001-8714-4901

população, das suas opiniões e valores. Os resultados sugerem que, embora os indivíduos possam adotar práticas sustentáveis no seu quotidiano, tal nem sempre acontece no contexto do Turismo. Verificou-se que, em contexto do Turismo, se os indivíduos constatassem a existência de recursos adequados para adotar práticas sustentáveis, fá-lo-iam com mais frequência. Também se verificou que ferramentas como o "boca a boca", a imagem percebida do destino e as avaliações influenciam positivamente a escolha de destinos que adotem práticas sustentáveis. Este estudo contribui para reconhecer as práticas sustentáveis que são mais frequentemente adotadas e as que passam do quotidiano para o contexto do turismo e, ainda, as ferramentas consideradas mais importantes na escolha de destinos turísticos sustentáveis.

Palavras-chave | *Slow travel*, *slow tourism*, práticas sustentáveis, turismo sustentável, *wellness*

1. Introduction

The notion of sustainability emerges based on the understanding that natural resources are finite meaning that if we do not preserve and pay attention to resources' expenditure their scarcity will increase at the risk of its absolute disappearance. Sustainable development is the process that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs (World Commission on Environment and Development, 1987). The fundamental dimensions of sustainable development are the social, the economic, and the environmental, being usually considered together, in a perspective of a balanced relationship. Wu et al. (2019) highlight that socio-environmental, socio-economic, and eco-efficient aspects should also be considered concluding with their study that socio-economic aspects have greater effect and eco-efficient aspects are presented as the crucial problem when trying to follow sustainable tourism.

The current context of the pandemic crisis of covid-19 can be beneficial to develop a more favourable attitude towards the sustainable development of tourism promoting less busy destinations where social distance is more easily ensured (Santos-Rold & Palacios-Florencio, 2020). It is up to the DMOs to "make sustainable experiences just as attractive, memorable and as much fun as unsustainable ones" (Breiby et al., 2020, p. 348) to captivate tourists to be more sustainable and to provide them with unique experiences.

2. Theoretical framework

In a general perspective, tourism is currently recognized as a set of activities that causes negative impacts on social and environmental levels despite its contribution to economic development (Nugraheni et al., 2020). Tourism can contribute to sustainable development, through the dynamism that promotes the economic growth of destinations and the connection between stakeholders (Popescu, 2018). In recent decades, research developed have focused on the need for a sustainable paradigm for tourism (Gaspar & Costa, 2021; Ferreira et al., 2021; Sgroi, 2020) and that the sustainable development of tourism can be applied to all its different categories.

Sustainable tourism can be described as "tourism that takes full account of its current and future economic, social and environmental impacts, addressing the needs of visitors, the industry, the environment and host communities" (UNWTO, 2005). Thus, it is central that tourists adopt sustainable behaviour, not negatively impacting natural resources and bringing benefits to the local and global environment (Shen et al., 2020).

According to Ko (2001, cited in Passafaro, 2019, p.4), "A tourist destination offering can be

more or less sustainable depending on the extent to which it can fulfil the specific needs of its various stakeholders". Juvan and Dolnicar (2016, p. 31) define environmentally sustainable tourist behaviour as "tourist behaviour which does not negatively impact the natural environment (or may even benefit the environment) both globally and at the destination". Holmes et al. (2021) identified the profile of sustainable tourists as young, more highly educated, with higher incomes and generally adopting more sustainable practices in their daily lives. According to Shen et al. (2020) tourists must behave sustainably at three levels: before the trip by doing a responsible and sustainable preparation of the trip, during the trip by acting sustainable at the destination and post-trip by leaving their review about the experience. This last step is crucial since the intention to visit and the attitude towards the adoption of sustainable practices may also be influenced by the opinion of previous visitors (Fernández et al., 2016). Also, "word of mouth" is important for sharing the tourist experience and according to Mohaidin et al. (2017) this can positively influence tourists' intention to choose a sustainable tourism destination. Tourists are influenced by the information they find online whether on the website or on social media of the tourism entities, and Shen et al. (2020) points out that if they are used properly, they can contribute to improving tourists sustainable and responsible behaviour. The perceived green image may lead to more favourable behavioural intentions being positively related to tourists' intention to visit the destination (Ashraf et al., 2020). Tourists' behaviour is influenced not only by internal factors such as the personal, social, and financial situation but also by external factors such as weather conditions, terrorist crises, and epidemic crises (Böhler et al., 2006). Sustainable tourists can be considered the most desirable tourists as they have the least environmental impacts and a higher spending power (Holmes et al., 2021).

Defining the term "sustainable practices" presents itself as a challenge because sustainability is the combination of environmental, technological, social, ethical, and philosophical dimensions that are difficult to delimit (Anciaux, 2019). Holmes et al. (2021) define sustainable behaviours as actions organized to protect natural and human resources. Slow travel involves a slower way of travelling which will result in fewer and longer trips using alternative means of transport and travellers who are younger, and students will more easily adopt this philosophy due to tighter budgets (Gunesch, 2019). According to Dickinson et al. (2010) people who practice slow tourism are motivated by the consequent reduction of the ecological footprint, environmental benefits, and the quality of the experience. On the other hand, mass tourism will most likely negatively affect tourist satisfaction of the experience and consequently the intention to visit (Oh et al., 2016). However, a way of reinventing tourism that involves firstly choosing the mean of transport and then the destination, promoting tourism of quality instead of tourism of quantity (Dickinson et al., 2010). Slow tourism has three main requirements which are slowness, travel experience, and environmental consciousness (Lumsdon & McGrath, 2011). Thus, slow travel focuses on how people travel using more sustainable means of transport that reduce the emission of polluting gases. On the other hand, slow tourism focuses on reciprocal benefits for tourists relating to experience beneficial experiences and for the local community the financial benefits from local businesses (Conway & Timms, 2012), promoting the involvement of different stakeholders.

3. Methods

The research methodology considered most appropriate was the questionnaire survey, which was used as a primary data collection instrument. Thus, a quantitative approach (correlational, descriptive, and transversal) was used. The questions

presented in the questionnaire survey were selected according to the concepts addressed in the literature review and are related to the units of analysis. Before carrying out the survey, it was tested by a representative group to validate it. The questionnaire used was based on different studies (Ernszt & Marton, 2020; Haaf, 2018; Hiere, 2018; Rubright, 2014). Part of the survey applied was based on pre-existing questionnaires (Rubright, 2014) for questions related to the tools that influence the intention to visit and sustainable practices adopted by respondents. The questionnaire comprised questions to assess the frequency of adoption of certain sustainable practices (Haaf, 2018; Hiere, 2018) for questions related to sustainability and its dimensions. For the questionnaire group questions related to the themes of slow tourism and slow travel the study by Ernszt and Marton (2020) were considered.

The questionnaire was applied during March of 2021 addressed to people over 18 years old who have taken at least one trip lasting more than three days and a total of 209 valid responses were collected. The sampling was simple random probabilistic, and the sample error was 6.7% using a 95% confidence level.

The general objective of this paper is to analyze the difference between tourists' sustainable behavior in their daily lives and in the context of tourism. The research hypothesis helps to answer the starting question: What is the difference between an individual's sustainable behavior in their everyday life's and when taking a tourist trip? From the general objective different specific objectives were developed and research hypotheses were built to provide answers to them. The first two specific objectives are: identifying which are the sustainable practices adopted by tourists in their daily life; and identifying which are the sustainable practices adopted by tourists in the context of tourism. From those Hypothesis 1 was built: The adoption of sustainable practices in daily life influences the adoption of these same practices in the context of

tourism. This first hypothesis formulated intends to understand the relationship between the adoption of sustainable practices in daily life and in the context of tourism.

Another specific objective is to identify which factors influence the adoption of sustainable tourism in the context of tourism. Hypothesis 2 is formulated: There is a relationship between the frequency of adoption of sustainable practices in the context of tourism and the factors that led to the adoption of these practices. For each factor a specific hypothesis was formulated: H2a – There are differences between the frequency with which tourists adopt sustainable practices in the context of tourism and the assumption of their responsibility towards the environment; H2b – There are differences between the frequency with which tourists adopt sustainable practices in the context of tourism and the concern with environmental issues; H2c – There are differences between the frequency with which tourists adopt sustainable practices in the context of tourism and the concern with health issues; H2d – There are differences between the frequency with which tourists adopt sustainable practices in the context of tourism and adapting to their own needs; H2e – There are differences between the frequency with which tourists adopt sustainable practices in the context of tourism and the economic benefits; H2f – There are differences between the frequency with which tourists adopt sustainable practices in the context of tourism and the awareness of the negative impact of their own actions.

One more specific objective is to know the willingness of tourists to adopt sustainable practices in the context of tourism and for that hypothesis 3 was build: The resources available influence the adoption of sustainable practices in the context of tourism. It is important to demonstrate if tourists are willing to practice sustainable tourism and how often they do so, however, tourists only have the option of adopting sustainable practices if the needed resources are available, for example,

the presence of waste bins for recycling in hotels and other tourist sites.

Another specific objective pretends to know the importance attributed to different tools that influence the intention to visit a destination that adopts sustainable practices. The tools analyzed were word of mouth, the perceived image of the destination, internet, price, media (journals, magazines, tv, posters), and guests reviews.

An additional hypothesis formulated is: There is an association between the degree of agreement with various statements regarding the themes of slow travel/slow tourism and the knowledge of these concepts. With the formulation of the hypothesis, it is intended to understand if individuals who do not know the concepts of slow tourism and slow travel would adopt behaviors related to these themes.

4. Results

To analyse the individual profile of respondents will be used descriptive analysis. The questions related to the individual profile are in the last group of the questionnaire. Listed below is the table of frequency for each variable among 209 total answers.

Analysing the answers related to gender, the female predominates with 66.5% of answers. The male represents 33.5%. Related with the age, most individuals, 81 (38.8%) are in the 18-30 category, 33 (15.8%) individuals are in the 31-40, 52 (24.9%) have between 41-50, 30 (14.4%) are included in 51-60, 13 (6.2%) have equal or more than 61 years old. Related with the Civil status, the option "Single" is more representative than the others with 112 (53.6%). College/university is the most answered related with the education level representing 52.2% of the inquiries with a total of 109 answers. The second most answered was the option "Hight School" followed by "Master" with 46 (22.0%) and 39 (18.7%) respectively. Analysing

the answers related with "Professional Situation" there is one main significant group, "Employed" which represent 141 of the answers, corresponding close to 68%. The first group of questions in this questionnaire relate with some aspects of sustainability and the adoption of sustainable practices. The variables analysed in this section and presented in the table 2 concern the frequency of adoption of sustainable practices in daily life and how long the respondents adopt sustainable practices.

Table 1 | Sample individual profile

Gender	Percentage
Male	33.5%
Female	66.5%
Age	Percentage
18-30	38.8%
31-40	15.8%
41-50	24.9%
51-60	14.4%
+60	6.2%
Civil Status	Percentage
Married	39.7%
Single	53.6%
Separate	5.7%
Widower	1.0%
Education level	Percentage
High School	22.01%
College or university	52.15%
Master	18.66%
PhD	7.18%
Professional Situation	Percentage
Employed	67.5%
Employed-Student	9.7%
Student	13.4%
Unemployed	7.7%
Retired	1.9%
Gender	Percentage
Male	33.5%
Female	66.5%
Age	Percentage
18-30	38.8%
31-40	15.8%
41-50	24.9%
51-60	14.4%
+60	6.2%
Civil Status	Percentage
Married	39.7%
Single	53.6%
Separate	5.7%
Widower	1.0%
Education level	Percentage
High School	22.01%
College or university	52.15%
Master	18.66%
PhD	7.18%
Professional Situation	Percentage
Employed	67.5%
Employed-Student	9.7%
Student	13.4%
Unemployed	7.7%
Retired	1.9%

Source: Compiled by the authors

Regarding the question "Are you a person who adopts sustainable practices in everyday life?", 103 respondents representing 49.3% of the total pointed that they do it "frequently", however that are more individuals who do it "occasionally" than

"always" representing 65 (31.1%) and 37 (17.7%) answers, respectively. Concerning how long adopt inquires sustainable practices most of the answers lay on the option "+ 24 months" representing 76.6% (160) of the answers. There were 21 (10.0%) answers for the option "from 6 to 12 months" and 15 (7.2%) for "from 1 to 6 months"

and 13 (6.2%) for "from 12 to 24 months". It was analysed the importance given to different tools related with the intention to visit a destination. Listed below is the table of frequency for this question, this question was answered according to the 4 points Likert scale.

Table 2 | Table of frequencies "Sustainability and sustainable practices" section

Are you a person who adopts sustainable practices in everyday life?	n	Percentage
Never	-	-
Rarely	4	1.9%
Occasionally	65	31.1%
Frequently	103	49.3%
Always	37	17.7%
Since when you adopted sustainable practices?	n	Percentage
From 1 to 6 months	15	7.2%
From 6 to 12 months	21	10.0%
From 12 to 24 months	13	6.2%
+ 24 months	160	76.6%

Source: Compiled by the authors

Table 3 | Table of frequency "Importance given to different tools in the decision to visit a destination"

"Please indicate the importance you attach to the following tools in the decision to visit destinations that adopt sustainable practices"	1	2	3	4	Mean	Standard Deviation
Word of mouth	-	20 (9.6%)	110 (52.6%)	79 (37.8%)	3.28	0.629
Perceived image of the destination	-	10 (4.8%)	126 (60.3%)	73 (34.9%)	3.30	0.555
Internet	1 (0.5%)	19 (9.1%)	121 (57.9%)	68 (32.5%)	3.22	0.622
Price	1 (0.5%)	13 (6.2%)	124 (59.3%)	71 (34.0%)	3.27	0.592
Media (journals, magazines, tv, posters)	5 (2.4%)	51 (24.4%)	114 (54.5%)	39 (18.7%)	2.89	0.720
Guest reviews	-	22 (10.5%)	107 (51.2%)	80 (38.3%)	3.28	0.643

Note: Likert scale: 1-Not at all important; 2-Slightly important; 3- Highly important; 4-Extremely important.
Source: Compiled by the authors

Through the results presented in Table 3, and analysing the importance given to different tools in the intention to visit a destination, when considering "word of mouth" 52.6% (110) of the respondents indicated this tool as "highly important" and 37.8% (79) as "extremely important". This is in line with what was mentioned by Mohaidin et al. (2017) that according to his study states that "word of mouth" can positively influence the intention to choose a tourist destination. Analysing "perceived image of the destination", most respon-

dents (60.3%) considered "highly important" and 34.9% (73) "extremely important" which is in line with what as stated by Ashraf et al. (2020) that if a destination has a green image recognized by the tourist this will lead to more favourable behavioural intentions and being positively related to the intention to visit. When referring to "internet" this tool was considered "highly important" by 121 (57.9%) of respondents and "extremely important" by 68 (32.5%), which is in line with what was mentioned by the authors Shen et al. (2020)

that if tourist entities' websites and social media are used properly, they can contribute to improving tourists' sustainable and responsible behaviour. Regarding the tools "Price" and "Media (journals, magazines, tv, posters)" both are considered "highly important" with most answers representing 59.3% and 54.5%, respectively. On last tool analysed was "guest reviews" with 107 (51.2%) answers pointing it as "highly important" and 87 (38.3%)

answers considering "extremely important". These results are supported by Fernández et al. (2016) which states that leaving reviews is crucial since the intention to visit and the attitude towards the adoption of sustainable practices may be influenced by the opinion of previous visitors. The tool considered less important is the media (journals, magazines, tv, posters).

Table 4 | Frequency of adoption of different sustainable practices

	Percentage (%)		Wilcoxon Test	
	Daily life	Tourism	Z	p-value
"I have separated waste to recycling"				
Never	0.5	1.9		
Rarely	5.3	6.7		
Occasionally	11.5	16.7		
Frequently	28.7	38.3		
Always	54.1	36.4		
			-4.328	< 0.001
"I have used public transport instead of a car"				
Never	16.7	8.1		
Rarely	22.0	18.2		
Occasionally	23.9	20.1		
Frequently	28.2	33.5		
Always	9.1	20.1		
			-5.496	< 0.001
"I tried to reduce meat consumption"				
Never	11.0	12.9		
Rarely	16.7	18.2		
Occasionally	34.4	34.0		
Frequently	26.3	23.9		
Always	11.5	11.0		
			-1.949	0.051
"I travelled short distances by bicycle or by foot"				
Never	1.4	2.4		
Rarely	4.3	3.3		
Occasionally	19.1	17.7		
Frequently	51.2	49.3		
Always	23.9	27.3		
			-0.605	0.545
"I turned off lights and/or air conditioning when I left the room"				
Never	1.4	1.0		
Rarely	1.0	3.8		
Occasionally	4.3	7.2		
Frequently	30.6	32.5		
Always	62.7	55.5		
			-3.222	<0.001
"I brought and used a reusable water bottle"				
Never	3.3	6.7		
Rarely	9.1	11.0		
Occasionally	9.6	16.7		
Frequently	39.7	31.1		
Always	38.3	34.4		
			-3.882	< 0.001
"I felt that I have the resources/facilities to undertake environmental actions"				
Never	-	.5		
Rarely	3.3	8.1		
Occasionally	28.2	34.0		
Frequently	49.3	42.1		
Always	19.1	15.3		
			-3.872	<0.001

Source: Compiled by the authors

To make a comparative analysis between the adoption of different sustainable practices in daily life and in the context of Tourism, we used the non-parametric Wilcoxon test.

Listed below in Table 4, is possible to observe the frequency of adoption of different sustainable practices, that were answered according to the 5 points Likert scale, which means that 1 corresponds to "Never", 2 corresponds to "Rarely", 3 is "Occasionally", 4 is "Frequently" and 5 is "Always".

It is possible to observe a reduction in the frequency of separate waste to recycling from daily life to the context of tourism ($Z = -4.328$; p-value < 0.001). Once p-value < 0.05 it can be concluded that individuals recycle more in their daily life than in the context of tourism. It is also possible to verify that the use of public transport instead of a car presents differences from daily life to the context of tourism ($Z = -5.496$; p-value < 0.001). Once more, p-value < 0.05 concluding that individuals choose to use public transport more in their tourist trips than in their daily life. There was an attempt by the respondents to reduce meat consumption however the frequency reduced from daily life to the context of tourism. In this case, we obtain a p-value > 0.05 meaning that respondents who try to reduce meat consumption in their daily life also do so while on holidays. Regarding travel short distances by bicycle or on foot no significant differences were found ($Z = -0.605$; p-value $= 0.545$) and it can be concluded that respondents take short trips by bicycle or on foot both in their daily life and on their tourist trips. Once again it is possible to observe a reduction in the frequency of respondents in this case relating to turning off lights and/or air conditioning when leaving a room from daily' lives to the context of tourism ($Z = -3.222$; p-value < 0.001). Since p-value < 0.05 concluding that respondents in their daily life turn off lights and/or air conditioning when leaving a room, but do not do so in the same way in the tourism context. Regarding the acquisition and use of a reusable water bottle, there were differences from daily life to the

context of tourism with a decrease in frequency ($Z = -3.882$; p-value < 0.001) and it is possible to conclude that individuals more easily buy and use reusable water bottles in their daily life than on their tourist trips. At last, it is possible to observe a reduction in frequency regarding respondents feeling they have the resources to adopt sustainable practices ($Z = -3.872$; p-value < 0.001) and as a conclusion is possible to affirm that in the context of tourism individuals feel more the lack of resources to adopt sustainable practices than in their daily lives.

Next, to validate H_2 we used the non-parametric Mann Whitney test, and we used the variable "Frequency in the adoption of sustainable practices in the context of tourism".

Table 5 | Mann Whitney test used for H_2

Hypothesis	Test value	p-value
H_{2a}	-2.686	0.007
H_{2b}	-2.091	0.036
H_{2c}	-0.547	0.584
H_{2d}	-0.747	0.455
H_{2e}	-0.600	0.548
H_{2f}	-1.613	0.107

Source: Compiled by the authors

Regarding H_{2a} as p-value is less than 0.05 then we conclude that there are differences between the frequency with which the tourist adopts sustainable practices in the context of tourism and the assumption of their responsibility towards the environment meaning that an individual who takes responsibility towards the environment will more often adopt sustainable practices in the context of tourism. Concerning H2b since the p-value is less than 0.05 is possible to conclude that there are differences between the frequency with which the tourist adopts sustainable practices in the context of tourism and the concern with environmental issues that is an individual who is concerned with environmental issues will more often adopt sustainable practices in the context of tourism. Regarding H_{2c}, H_{2d}, H_{2e}, and H_{2f} as the p-value is greater than 0.05 then we can conclude that there are no significant differences between the frequency with

which tourists adopt sustainable practices in the context of tourism and health issues, adapting to their own needs, economic benefits, and awareness of the negative impact of the own actions, respectively.

The last group of the questionnaire was related to the concepts of slow tourism and slow travel. Listed below is the table of frequency for the knowledge of these concepts.

Table 6 | Table of frequency "Knowledge about the concepts of slow travel/slow tourism"

Do you know the concepts of slow travel/slow tourism?	Frequency/Percentage	
Yes	79	37.8%
No	130	62.2%

Source: Compiled by the authors

Most of the respondents pointed they do not know the concepts of slow travel/slow tourism, representing 62.2% of answers.

5. Conclusion

Even in a scenario of global economic slowdown, in 2019 tourism spending's continued to grow (World Tourism Organization (UNWTO), 2021). In Portugal, in 2019, tourism revenues represented 8.7% of the national GDP (Gross Domestic Product) with the tourism sector being the largest exporting economic activity accounting for 19.7% of total exports (Turismo de Portugal, 2020).

The pandemic crisis of covid-19 caused negative impacts on the economy specifically in the tourism sector, however, it is expected that the resumption of activity will be stronger and more sustainable (Turismo de Portugal, 2020). Therefore, sustainability should be the final goal of any process of tourism development (Pulido-Fernández et al., 2019). The experience of slow tourism and slow travel is related to sustainable development, as the aim is to capture local culture and his-

tory through involvement with the local community. In this sense, this paper sought to understand whether tourists who do not have the knowledge about the concepts of slow tourism/slow travel would be willing to adopt certain practices relating to these concepts, which arise in the defence of sustainable tourism.

Nowadays, the concern with the environment and sustainability are more present which can also be verified in the hotel industry where sustainable practices are more frequently implemented (Fernández et al., 2016). As sustainable practices are not that expensive and difficult to implement (Dolnicar et al., 2019) their adoption should be seen as something positive which will bring benefits, improving hotel establishment quality comparing to its competitors, providing differentiation.

There is a recognized difference between the adoption of sustainable practices in daily life and in the context of tourism (Antimova et al., 2012; Barr et al., 2010; Juvan & Dolnicar, 2014; Shen et al., 2020) because even if tourists adopted sustainable practices in their daily lives, they often do not feel the need to do so in the context of tourism (Miller et al., 2007, cited in Xu et al., 2020). Considering a range of sustainable practices that can be adopted in daily life and in the context of tourism it was intended to understand if their adoption varies depending on the context of the respondents. Considering the sustainable practices analysed only "I tried to reduce meat consumption" and "I travelled short distances by bicycle or by foot" were presented as consistent in the two contexts. These results are in line with Haaf (2018) highlighting that an individual consuming less meat at home will more effortlessly do the same in the context of tourism. In this way, these two practices validate H1, however considering the other sustainable practices it is rejected. Considering the tools analysed in the decision to visit destinations that adopt sustainable practices from the descriptive analysis performed it was possible to conclude that the importance given to all tools except one, media, was consis-

tent. This is the tool that is given less importance and even though most respondents evaluated this tool as "highly important" they evaluated it more as "sightly important" than as "extremely important".

The experience of slow tourism is closely related to sustainability (Sørensen & Bærenholdt, 2020). Slow tourism emerges as a response to the negative impacts of mass tourism (Moira et al., 2017) such as sustainable tourism. However, the concepts of slow tourism/slow travel are still not properly recognized.

The results presented show different contributions. It is crucial that the sustainable practices which are most frequently adopted are recognized so that the resources are made available to tourists to put them into practice and to improve those that are lacking so that tourists do not stop adopting sustainable practices because they feel that the necessary resources are not available (Moira et al., 2017; Iaquinto & Pratt, 2020). The results also show that there are tools not being considered as important for the decision to visit a destination that adopts sustainable practices such as the media (journals, magazines, tv, posters) and other that are considered much more important such as mouth to mouth (Mohaidin et al., 2017), perceived image of the destination (Ashraf et al., 2020), and guest reviews (Fernández et al., 2016).

Acknowledgements

References

Anciaux, A. (2019). "On Holidays, I Forget Everything... Even My Ecological Footprint": Sustainable Tourism through Daily Practices or Compartmentalisation as a Keyword? *Sustainability, 11*(17), 4731. https://doi.org/10.3390/su11174731

Antimova, R., Nawijn, J., & Peeters, P. (2012). The awareness/attitude-gap in sustainable tourism: A theoretical perspective. *Tourism Review, 67*(3), 7–16. https://doi.org/10.1108/16605371211259795

Ashraf, M. S., Hou, F., Kim, W. G., Ahmad, W., & Ashraf, R. U. (2020). Modeling tourists' visiting intentions toward ecofriendly destinations: Implications for sustainable tourism operators. *Business Strategy and the Environment, 29*(1), 54–71. https://doi.org/10.1002/bse.2350

Barr, S., Shaw, G., Coles, T., & Prillwitz, J. (2010). A holiday is a holiday: Practicing sustainability, home and away. *Journal of Transport Geography, 18*(3), 474-481. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtrangeo.2009.08.007

Böhler, S., Grischkat, S., Haustein, S., & Hunecke, M. (2006). Encouraging environmentally sustainable holiday travel. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice, 40*(8), 652–670. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tra.2005.12.006

Breiby, M. A., Duedahl, E., Øian, H., & Ericsson, B. (2020). Exploring sustainable experiences in tourism. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism, 20*(4), 335–351. https://doi.org/10.1080/15022250.2020.1748706

Conway, D., & Timms, B. F. (2012). Are Slow Travel and Slow Tourism Misfits, Compadres or Different Genres? *Tourism Recreation Research, 37*(1), 71–76. https://doi.org/10.1080/02508281.2012.11081689

Dickinson, J. E., Robbins, D., & Lumsdon, L. (2010). Holiday travel discourses and climate change. *Journal of Transport Geography, 18*(3), 482–489. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtrangeo.2010.01.006

Dolnicar, S., Knezevic Cvelbar, L., & Grün, B. (2019). A Sharing-Based Approach to Enticing Tourists to Behave More Environmentally Friendly. *Journal of Travel Research, 58*(2), 241–252. https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287517746013

Ernszt, I., & Marton, Z. (2020). Sensing the Destination in a Slow or in a Fast Style? – The Lessons of a Hungarian Survey. *Proceedings of the ENTRENOVA - ENTerprise REsearch InNOVAtion Conference*, Virtual Conference, 10-12 September 2020, 6, 605–615. https://www.econstor.eu/handle/10419/224726

Fernández, C., Cea, J., Jamett, G., Santander, P., & Yáñez, D. (2016). Attitude and Behavior on Hotel Choice in Function of the Perception of Sustainable Practices. *Tourism & Management Studies, 12*(1), 60–66.

Ferreira, S., Martins, I., & Vareiro, L. (2021). Sustentabilidade ambiental nos hotéis e o papel dos colaboradores na implementação de práticas ecológicas. *Revista Turismo & Desenvolvimento, 36*(2), 259-276. https://doi.org/10.34624/rtd.v36i2.9127

Gaspar, B., & Costa, R. (2021). What do emotions say about guest satisfaction? Hotel Moliceiro Case Study. *Revista Turismo & Desenvolvimento, 36*(2), 69-79. https://doi.org/10.34624/rtd.v36i2.26010

Gunesch, K. (2019). Literary Discourses and Cultural Movements of Slowness in the 1980s and 1990s, Actualized in the Travel Form of Slow Tourism and Affirming the Political Component of Sustainability via the Triple Bottom Line's Social and Environmental Dimensions. ed. Irma Ratiani, Political Events and Literary Discourses of the 1980s and 1990s, *Proceedings of the International Symposium, Part II'*, TSU Press (Tbilisi State University) and GCLA Press (Georgian Comparative Literature Association), Tbilisi, Georgia, 2019, 213-254. ISBN: 978-9941-13-919-2 (Part I and II); ISBN: 978-9941139215 (Part II), http://conference.litinstituti.ge/2019/en/symposium-proceedings/

Haaf, A. T. (2018). *Why do we behave less responsible towards the environment on holiday?.* [Master thesis], Wageningen University & Research, Netherlands.

Hiere, E. (2018). *The perception of customers on Sustainable Tourism.* [Master thesis], ISCTE Business School, Lisbon, Portugal.

Holmes, M. R., Dodds, R., & Frochot, I. (2021). At Home or Abroad, Does Our Behavior Change? Examining How Everyday Behavior Influences Sustainable Travel Behavior and Tourist Clusters. *Journal of Travel Research, 60*(1), 102–116. https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287519894070

Iaquinto, B. L., & Pratt, S. (2020). Practicing sustainability as a backpacker: The role of nationality. *International Journal of Tourism Research, 22*(1), 100–107. https://doi.org/10.1002/jtr.2321

Juvan, E., & Dolnicar, S. (2014). The attitude–behaviour gap in sustainable tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research, 48*, 76–95. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2014.05.012

Juvan, E., & Dolnicar, S. (2016). Measuring environmentally sustainable tourist behaviour. *Annals of Tourism Research, 59*, 30–44. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2016.03.006

Ko, J. T.G. (2001). Assessing progress of tourism sustainability. *Annals of Tourism Research, 28*(3), 817–820. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383(00)00070-0

Lumsdon, L. M., & McGrath, P. (2011). Developing a conceptual framework for slow travel: A grounded theory approach. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 19*(3), 265–279. https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2010.519438

Moira, P., Mylonopoulos, D., & Kondoudaki, A. (2017). The Application of Slow Movement to Tourism: Is Slow Tourism a New Paradigm? *Journal of Tourism and Leisure Studies, 2*, 1–10. https://doi.org/10.18848/2470-9336/CGP/v02i02/1-10

Nugraheni, A. I. P., Priyambodo, T. K., Sutikno, B., & Kusworo, H. A. (2020). The Social Dimensions' Aspects of Sustainable Tourism Development Analysis: A Systematic Literature Review. *Digital Press Social Sciences and Humanities, 4*, 00001. https://doi.org/10.29037/digitalpress.44348

Oh, H., Assaf, A. G., & Baloglu, S. (2016). Motivations and Goals of Slow Tourism. *Journal of Travel Research, 55*(2), 205–219. https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287514546228

Passafaro, P. (2020). Attitudes and Tourists' Sustainable Behavior: An Overview of the Literature and Discussion of Some Theoretical and Methodological Issues. *Journal of Travel Research, 59*(4), 579–601. https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287519851171

Popescu, D. (2018). Contemporary Approaches and Challenges of Tourism Sustainability. *Amfiteatru Economic, 20*(12), 830-832. https://doi.org/10.24818/EA/2018/S12/830

Publituris. (2009). «Slow», Um Novo Conceito de Turismo. https://www.publituris.pt/2009/10/14/slow-um-novo-conceito-de-turismo-2/

Pulido-Fernández, J. I., Cárdenas-García, P. J., & Espinosa-Pulido, J. A. (2019). Does environmental sustainability contribute to tourism growth? An analysis at the country level. *Journal of Cleaner Production, 213*, 309–319. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.12.151

Rubright, H. L. (2014). *Consumer Purchasing in Sustainable Tourism: Attraction Sustainability and Its Impact on Decision-Making*. [Master thesis], East Carolina University, Greenville, North Carolina, USA.

Santos-Rold, L., Canalejo, A., Berbel-Pineda, J., & Palacios-Florencio, B. (2020). Sustainable Tourism as a Source of Healthy Tourism. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 14*. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17155353

Sgroi, F. (2020). Forest resources and sustainable tourism, a combination for the resilience of the landscape and development of mountain areas. *Science of The Total Environment, 736*, 139539. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.139539

Shen, S., Sotiriadis, M., & Zhou, Q. (2020). Could Smart Tourists Be Sustainable and Responsible as Well? The Contribution of Social Networking Sites to Improving Their Sustainable and Responsible Behavior. *Sustainability, 12*(4), 1470. https://doi.org/10.3390/su12041470

Sørensen, F., & Bærenholdt, J. O. (2020). Tourist practices in the circular economy. *Annals of Tourism Research, 85*, 103027. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2020.103027

Turismo de Portugal (2020). Visão Geral. http://www.turismodeportugal.pt/pt/Turismo_Portugal/visao_geral/Paginas/default.aspx

UNWTO. (2005). Making tourism more sustainable - A guide for policy makers. https://www.unwto.org/sustainable-development

World Commission on Environment and Development (1987). Brundtland Report - Our common future. http://www.un-documents.net/our-common-future.pdf

World Tourism Organization (2021), International Tourism Highlights, 2020 Edition, UNWTO, Madrid, DOI: https://doi.org/10.18111/9789284422456