MASTER THESIS

LGBT TRAVELERS AS WINE TOURISTS IN THE CONTEXT OF PORTUGAL FROM A TOUR OPERATOR'S PERSPECTIVE.

CHUN-HSIANG TSENG

Internship developed at Catavino Tours
Porto, Portugal

Professional Supervisor
Ryan Opaz

Academic Supervisor
Professor Luís Cunha
University of Porto

June 2020

Table of Content

Abstract, Keywords, and Abbreviations

1. Introduction ***1***
   1.1 Description of the company and internship duties ***2***
   1.2 Proposal ***2***

2. Literature Review ***3***
   2.1 LGBT tourism ***3***
   2.2 LGBT travelers ***5***
      2.2.1 Destination selection ***5***
      2.2.2 The power of pink dollar ***5***
   2.3 LGBT-themed advertisements ***6***
   2.4 Benefits of becoming LGBT-friendly and LGBT-inclusive ***8***
      2.4.1 ‘LGBT-inclusion’ ***9***
      2.4.2 ‘LGBT-friendliness’ ***9***
   2.5 Portugal as a LGBT-friendly destination ***11***
      2.5.1 Portuguese attitudes towards LGBT community ***11***
      2.5.2 Travelers perceptions of Portugal as LGBT-friendly destination ***12***

3. Methodology ***13***
   3.1 Hypotheses and research questions ***13***
   3.2 Research tool ***13***
   3.3 Procedure ***15***

4. Results ***16***
   4.1 Hypotheses testing ***16***
   4.2 Research questions ***21***

5. Conclusion ***25***
   5.1 Practical implementation ***26***
   5.2 Limitations and future research ***27***

6. Reference ***28***

7. Annex ***35***

Abstract

The tourism industry is cognizant of the economic potential of LGBT market; however, the LGBT demographic has yet to be addressed as wine tourists by neither the academic field nor Turismo de Portugal. Developed alongside a professional internship at Catavino Tours, a wine tour operator and destination management company, the three main objectives of this paper are to investigate the relations between wine tourism and LGBT tourism, examine LGBT travelers' perceptions of Portugal as a LGBT-friendly destination, and evaluate the wine tour operator attribute importance ratings among LGBT guests. Based on past literature and the needs of Catavino Tours, an online survey was developed and distributed, and subsequently, a sample of 198 LGBT vacationers from across the globe was explored. Analyzing responses from the survey, 84% of the participants showed interests in wine tourism and opportunities to improve LGBT-friendliness in Portugal were observed. Moreover, the most important attributes LGBT travelers look for in a wine tour operator were determined. On the basis of the results, it is recommended for stakeholders in wine tourism to focus on the LGBT market as one of their targets, and more specifically, in the context of wine tour operator, LGBT tourists who are over the age of 25 and have a limited knowledge of wine should be the demographic they emphasized on. Additionally, ensuring an experience with no discrimination and violence must be the priority of any LGBT-friendly wine tour operator.

Keywords: LGBT tourism, wine tourism, LGBT-friendliness, Portugal, LGBT wine tourists

Abbreviations

COVID-19: Coronavirus disease 2019
DINK: Double income, no kids
H: Hypothesis
ILGA: The International Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Trans, and Intersex Association
LGBT: Lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender
LGBTI: Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and intersex
LGBTQ: Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and questioning (or queer)
RQ: Research question
WINTOUR: International Master on Wine Tourism Innovation

*There are a variety of acronyms to describe the community of lesbian, gay bisexual, trans, queer, questioning, and intersex (e.g. LGBT, LGBTQ, LGBTI). In order to ensure the acronyms are uniformized in this study, LGBT would be the abbreviation used for this specific community throughout the paper.

1. Introduction

Previous research has focused on the sectors of wine tourism and lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) tourism as independent subjects; however, there is currently no academic literature addressing the LGBT demographic as wine tourists. The primary objective of this research is to encourage stakeholders in wine tourism to consider LGBT travelers as one of their emphases since previous studies have revealed similarities between the profiles of wine tourists and LGBT tourists. According to Mitchell & Hall (2006), the demographics of wine tourists are usually between the age of 30 to 50, with moderate to high disposable income, and are regular wine consumers. Meanwhile, the LGBT market is considered by the tourism industry to be a lucrative one since LGBT individuals are accepted as having high disposable income (Delozier & Rodrigue, 1996; Ginder & Byun, 2015); moreover, in a survey regarding alcohol consumption among LGBT individuals, wine was recognized as homosexual's favorite alcoholic beverage (CMI, 2019). Since LGBT consumers are deemed to be wine lovers with a higher expendable income, it is reasonable to presume that they would be interested in being wine tourists.

In Portugal, wine tourism has long been considered by the Portuguese government as one of its tourism assets due to its traditional winemaking techniques, stunning landscape, indigenous Portuguese grape varietals, unique terroir, and a well-established wine-drinking culture. In order to further establish itself as one of the global benchmarks of wine tourism, Turismo de Portugal initiated efforts and launched promotion campaigns to attract international travelers to visit rural regions in Portugal as part of the Tourism Strategy 2027. In addition to wine tourism, the segment of LGBT tourism was mentioned as a focus for the first time in the newest edition of strategic plan – an attempt to demonstrate the governmental commitment to welcome all diversity (Araújo, 2017). In the past, the LGBT market was not fully explored by the Portuguese tourism industry, and the few who had attempted had failed to create meaningful communication with the target audience (Silva et al., 2019). In an effort to remedy past missed opportunities, Variações – Associação de Comércio e Turismo LGBTI de Portugal, was founded in 2018 with the goals of improving synergies between LGBT firms and helping local businesses to adopt a more LGBT-inclusive communication and language. Furthermore, as stated on the website of Variações (2020), this non-governmental organization collaborated with Turismo de Portugal in late 2019 to initiate a new campaign, *Proudly Portugal*, to promote Portugal as a leading LGBT-friendly destination through various digital channels.

While Portugal has begun to promote LGBT tourism, the effort has largely been focused on the cosmopolitan life and the coastline. Wine tourism, though viewed as a strength of the Portuguese tourism, has yet to be integrated as part of the promoted LGBT tourist experience

(Variações, n.d.). In Europe, gay travelers are overlooked as wine tourists not only in Portugal but also in its neighboring wine-producing regions. For instance, a mature LGBT destination with world-renowned wines such as Catalonia has been promoting both LGBT tourism and wine tourism; however, under the section of 'Catalonia LGBTI' on the official tourism website of Catalonia, no wine-related activities are listed as suggestions, but instead, it predominately advertises experiences in Barcelona and Costa Brava (Agència Catalana de Turisme, n.d.).

***H1.** LGBT travelers would be interested in being wine tourists.*

1.1 Description of the company and internship duties

Catavino Tours, a destination management company, was founded by Ryan Opaz in 2014. Ryan, a prominent figure in the wine industry, has quite an impressive resume. Previously, he had worked as a winery consultant, a digital wine marketer, a judge for wine competitions, and an organizer for wine events. In addition, he started the first ever wine blog in the world and co-founded the European wine blogger conference. As a fortified wine enthusiast, he became a knighted member of the Port wine brotherhood, a certified Sherry educator, and a certified Port educator.

Catavino Tours is located in Porto, Portugal where it acts both as an office and a natural wine shop. Currently, the company focuses on offering luxury custom food and wine tours in Portugal and Spain. The specialization of the business is in providing multi-day tours, but day tours could also be arranged. Typically, an eight-day itinerary would cost an average of 5000 euros per traveler. On the other hand, a day in the Douro Valley would cost a traveler between 250 to 400 euros, which includes a private driver, a private tour guide, boat tours, meals, and two winery visits. Although the price of the tours is on the more premium spectrum, Ryan's qualifications and connections in the wine industry justify the price of Catavino Tours. Presently, the majority of his clients are from North America.

As an intern of Catavino Tours, the researcher's main duty is to conduct market research. Originally, Ryan was also interested in developing a LBGT-friendly itinerary after the research is completed; however, with the disruption of COVID-19, this part of the project was halted.

1.2 Proposal

As previously addressed, the principal objective of this research is to urge stakeholders in wine tourism to focus on the LGBT demographic as one of their target markets. With the consideration that the researcher's professional internship took place at a Portugal-based

destination management company, this study will have an emphasis on tour operators in the context of Portugal. Mitchell & Hall (2006) state that wine tourists are usually regular wine consumers and between the age of 30 to 50, but Gregorio & Licari (2006), more specifically, address that wine tourists who would be involved in booking guided wine tours are typically wine enthusiasts over the age of 25 and are looking to improve their wine knowledge. Inversely, wine experts tend to not depend on tour operators and would organize their own winery visits.

While Catavino Tours has been welcoming LGBT travelers since the beginning, the main goal of this proposal is to encourage this company to transition into a LGBT-friendly business in a responsible manner. Granting that Mr. Opaz showed interest in the proposal, one of the primary concerns he raised was the backlash he could potentially experience from the heterosexual community when becoming a LGBT-friendly business. In this study, through the combination of literature review and a carefully thought-out questionnaire, the aims are to address the following main topics: (1) Are LGBT travelers interested in wine tourism? (2) Are LGBT travelers who fit the descriptions of wine tourists the demographic a wine tour operator should focus on? (3) What are the benefits of a LGBT-friendly and LGBT-inclusive business? (4) What is the best advertising method to appeal to both LGBT and non-LGBT consumers? (5) Do LGBT travelers think of Portugal as a LGBT-friendly destination? In addition, since this is the first study regarding LGBT wine tourism, an additional purpose of this research is to find out what are the key attributes LGBT travelers expect from a LGBT-friendly wine tour operator.

***H2.** LGBT travelers above the age of 25 would be more interested in being wine tourists.*
***H3.** LGBT travelers with a lower level of wine knowledge would be more motivated to book a guided wine tour.*

***RQ1.** What are LGBT travelers' priorities when selecting a wine tour operator?*
***RQ2.** What types of tours are LGBT travelers most interested in regarding length and size?*
***RQ3.** What would prohibit LGBT travelers from rebooking from the same tour operator?*

2. Literature Review

2.1 LGBT tourism

According to the International LGBTQ+ Travel Association (IGLTA), tourism products and services developed and marketed specifically to lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, or queer individuals are referred to as 'LGBT tourism' (Jordan, 2018). The most crucial element that differentiates LGBT tourism from non-LGBT tourism is that LGBT tourism constitutes an outlet to alleviate minority stress, which develops from discrimination, prejudice, hiding one's sexual

orientation, and rejection (Meyer, 2003). LGBT tourism presents an opportunity for LGBT individuals to behave and express themselves freely in a welcomed environment where hostilities and oppressions are minimized (Herrera & Scott, 2005; Hughes, 2002).

A global LGBT rights movement was born in 1969 as an aftermath of the Stonewall Riots, an event where gays and lesbians publicly protested police oppression and harassment in New York City. In the subsequent year, the first Pride parades were held in Chicago, New York, San Francisco, and Los Angeles. For the first time in history, LGBT individuals had the audacity to proudly march through the streets declaring their pride, their existence, and their love (Kates & Belk, 2001). The Pride parades were quick to become a global phenomenon, and soon, many international cities joined in on the movement – as a result, the concept of 'LBGT tourism' was conceived (Jordan, 2017). Feeling invigorated by the gay rights movement, LGBT people everywhere were suddenly motivated to travel and attend Pride events in these 'gay meccas' for an opportunity to experience being their true authentic selves and socialize with other members in the community (Jordan, 2018; Vorobjovas-Pinta & Hardy, 2015). As increasingly more homophiles longed to escape cultural stigmatization and sought to visit urban areas with a thriving LGBT community and gay scene, some trailblazing companies determined an market opportunity and began to organize tours to help LGBT travelers meet, socialize, seek sexual encounters, and travel safely (Jordan, 2017).

Since its origins, the concept of LGBT tourism has undergone a gradual evolution. Rather than being confined to LGBT-specific activities and destinations, LGBT tourism has seen a steady progression in growth and diversification thanks to a combination of advance in equal rights, greater social acceptance, increase in LGBT visibility, and digitalization (Jordan, 2018). When the notion of gay tourism first emerged, the LGBT demographic was perceived as a homogeneous group, and the market responded by predominately offering tourism products designed exclusively for gays and lesbians (Herrera & Scott, 2005; Hughes, 2005). However, as social attitudes towards homosexuality becomes increasingly more positive, many LGBT individuals no longer depend on LGBT-specific tours and spaces to interact with one another. Nowadays, the demand for 'hetero-inclusive' LGBT products has seen an increase as many openly gay travelers wish to involve their non-LGBT friends and family on their trips (Jordan, 2018). Furthermore, a more diversified range of products are now being offered since the tourism industry begins to acknowledge the significant diversity within the LGBT demographic, and segment this highly diverse traveler market into smaller subgroups based on travel behavior and socio-demographic characteristics (Hattingh & Spencer, 2018; Jordan, 2017; Ro et al., 2017; Vorobjovas-Pinta & Hardy, 2015).

In the present day, despite many countries having now recognized the importance of

LGBT rights, discrimination and anti-gay prejudice is still prevalent in society, and in many parts of the world, LGBT individuals still live in a constant fear of facing persecution; therefore, in order for them to express their sexuality comfortably, even if it is only temporarily, LGBT people will continue to seek out travel destinations that exhibit tolerance and favor tourism service providers who would make them feel welcomed and ensure their safety (Jordan, 2018). In short, as long as LGBT individuals continue to endure inequality and discrimination, LGBT tourism will remain vital for this historically marginalized group.

***H4.** LGBT travelers from more conservative regions would rely more on LGBT-friendly tours to socialize with other members of the LGBT community.*

2.2 LGBT travelers

2.2.1 Destination selection

Due to being longtime victims of discrimination, cultural openness to LGBT community and safety remain the foremost attributes when selecting a travel destination among LGBT travelers. According to a recent survey, a significant percentage of LGBT individuals stated that they were treated differently because of their sexual orientation and gender identity, and moreover, many of them expressed the necessity to camouflage their identities and change the way they act when traveling in order to feel safe (Jordan, 2017). For many LGBT travelers, not only do they have to worry about their safety as a foreigner, but their self-identities also add another dimension to their safety concerns.

Looking beyond the level of societal acceptance and safety in a destination, ‘comfort and relaxation’ and ‘culture and sights’ were outlined as two of the standout categories affecting LGBT travelers’ decision-making process (Vorobjovas-Pinta & Hardy, 2015). In 2018, more than 40% of the LGBT holidaymakers identify themselves as relaxation travelers, natural explorers, history enthusiasts, sightseers, and local culture immersers (CMI, 2018). Since landscape, relaxation, outdoor activities, and local culture are some of the attributes used to define wine tourism (Lavandoski et al., 2016), the overlapping attributes could persuade tourism shareholders in wine regions to start considering LGBT segment as a target market.

2.2.2 The power of pink dollar

Pink dollar, referred to the spending power of the LGBT community, has proven to be a challenging matter to estimate since it is difficult to grasp the actual size of the LGBT market. According to a recent study by Yale School of Public Health, approximately 83% of the LGBT

population in the world keeps their sexual orientation hidden (Pachankis & Bränström, 2019). However, gay-focused literature often distinguishes the LGBT market as a lucrative one (Fejes, 2000; Ram et al., 2019), because in comparison to their heterosexual counterparts, LGBT individuals were found to have higher education and income (Delozier & Rodrigue, 1996; Ginder & Byun, 2015). Furthermore, many LGBT households/couples are identified as DINK, meaning a family with dual incomes and no kids. These presumptions of LGBT people lead the tourism industry to believe that LGBT travelers have higher disposable income to spend on vacation and the freedom to travel more frequently (Ro et al., 2017; Vorobjovas-Pinta & Hardy, 2015).

Recently, research demonstrated that the global LGBT population held a combined share of total household wealth of $18 trillion USD and possessed $3.6 trillion USD in purchasing power. If the LGBT community worldwide was to be considered as a country, it would have a stronger economy than Germany, United Kingdom, and Brazil (LGBT Capital, 2018). Moreover, in 2016, same-sex couples in the United States were revealed to have a higher average household income than their heterosexual counterparts based on the data published by the U.S. Treasury department – with gay couples and lesbian couples earning roughly $63.000 USD and $11.000 USD more than heterosexual couples (Fisher & Looney, 2018). In an annual LGBT community survey, 57% of the American LGBT individuals also indicated that they believed their current financial situations were better than the average (CMI, 2019). In fact, LGBT travelers reported to take an average of 4 leisure trips per year and the annual spending of global LGBT travel market now exceeded $200 billion USD (CMI, 2019; Guaracino & Salvato, 2017).

The statistics above not only confirm the strength of pink economy, but also assist in explaining why the LGBT segment should not be overlooked by the tourism industry. However, it is important to emphasize that the LGBT market is not a homogenous group. In countries where discrimination towards LGBT is still common, the income level of LGBT individuals is stated as lower than the national average (Badgett et al., 2014); therefore, the presumption of LGBT travelers as an affluent group is only appropriate when discussing LGBT consumers residing in socially liberal countries.

***H5.** LGBT households are normally DINK (Double income, no kids) family and have higher spending powers.*

2.3 LGBT-themed advertisements

In the 1980s, publishers of LGBT newspapers and magazines began to vocalize about

how underserved the LGBT market was and urged companies to start featuring LGBT-themed advertisements. However, in fear of upsetting the heteronormative public, mainstream media was reluctant to do so. Realizing the potential of LGBT market, a few companies began to produce ads including well-known LGBT figures, but in order for them to enjoy the best of both worlds, they publicized these ads exclusively in LGBT media outlets. In the 1990s, the social acceptance for this minority group improved and LGBT print campaigns began to gain some visibilities (Hester & Gibson, 2007). Since entering the 21st century, homosexual imagery in advertising has no longer been limited to niche markets and appeared more frequently in mass media targeted at both heterosexual and homosexual audiences (Read et al., 2018). As LGBT-themed ads became more widespread, the interest in finding a form of advertisements that could potentially appeal to both homosexual and heterosexual consumers began to build.

Oakenfull and Greenlee (2005) attempted to investigate the matter by carrying out a study examining how different demographics would respond to four different types of imagery – heterosexual, explicit gay, explicit lesbian, and implicit gay/lesbian. Implicit LGBT-themed ads employ gay symbols (e.g., rainbow flag), which might not be obvious to the heterosexual consumers, to convey subtle message of gayness. Conversely, a straightforward gay visual element (e.g., a photo of a gay couple) is utilized in explicit LGBT-themed ads (Um et al., 2013). Through their study, Oakenfull and Greenlee (2005) found that while heterosexual consumers did not favor explicit gay and lesbian imagery, implicit LGBT imagery appeared to please both heterosexual and homosexual participants. In a later study, using the same criteria, homosexual consumers showed a stronger preference to explicit LGBT imagery than implicit gay and lesbian ad content (Doston et al., 2009). Even though explicit LGBT print ad was favored by the LGBT members, in both studies, it was proven that implicit LGBT ads could not only reach homosexual audiences but also would not evoke negative feelings among heterosexual consumers (Doston et al., 2009; Oakenfull & Greenlee, 2005).

To elaborate on the matter, researchers began to examine the impact of homosexual ad contents on brand image. Angelini and Bradley (2010) found that while heterosexual consumers responded negatively towards the LGBT-themed ad, the negative feelings towards the brand were marginal. Um (2014) explained that since brand perception is formed over an accumulated period and opinion of gay-themed ad is formed promptly after the ad exposure, the less positive attitudes towards the ad would not have a long-term effect towards the brand. Moreover, cultural context was suggested to have an influence on the findings. In countries where machismo is entrenched, the reactions to LGBT ad contents from heterosexuals are extremely negative. Males from masculine-oriented countries often reject homosexuality since gay males do not fit in the traditional gender role, and for that reason, gays living in hetero-macho society, who are often ostracized, feel very enthusiastic about the gay ad since it gives

them a sense of belonging (Eisend & Hermann, 2019).

The findings of LGBT-themed advertisements have established that each demographic respond most positively to an imagery of someone who they could relate to the most – heterosexuals prefer heterosexual visual contents, lesbians favor explicit lesbian ads, and gays are partial to explicit gay images (Angelini and Bradley, 2010; Oakenfull & Greenlee, 2005). Since each demographic has its own preference, companies who have the ambitions to target both heterosexual and homosexual consumers need to find a felicitous practice to maintain a harmonious balance. While employing implicit homosexual imagery seems like a sensible solution, it is also noteworthy to know LGBT consumers prefer when companies reach out to them through LGBT media outlets. According to a recent survey, 72% of the LGBT participants voiced that they would be more likely to purchase an item if companies advertised in LGBT media, and furthermore, LGBT respondents stated that the impact is greater when companies advertised in publications targeted LGBT individuals than in general publications (CMI, 2019).

In Portugal, men have traditionally been expected to be virile; however, with the societal perception of gender role gradually evolving (Monteiro et al., 2019), it would be interesting to see how heterosexual males in rural wine regions react to homosexual ad content. In the case of wine tour operators in Portugal, since the advertisements are meant to target international travelers, they would not have to be concerned about imposing negative feelings towards Portuguese heterosexual males.

2.4 Benefits of becoming LGBT-friendly and LGBT-inclusive

The terms ‘LGBT-friendly’ and ‘LGBT-inclusive’ are often used synonymously; however, Philip McCabe, the president of the National Association of Lesbian and Gay Alcoholism Professionals (NALGAP), pointed out the subtle difference between these two phrases and encouraged people to avoid using them interchangeably. According to McCabe’s explanation, ‘LGBT-friendly’ is considered as a marketing descriptor and is solely utilized to convey the message of welcomeness. Conversely, the term ‘LGBT-inclusive’ demonstrates a place has recognized the importance of sexual minorities and implemented further measurements to ensure LGBT employees and clients are respected (Valentino, 2019). For example, LGBT travelers feel welcomed in Japan, but currently, this East Asian country has not enforced any nationwide law prohibiting discrimination based on sexual orientation (Mendos, 2019), and therefore, Japan is considered as a ‘LGBT-friendly’ destination but not ‘LGBT-inclusive’.

2.4.1 'LGBT-inclusion'

Companies have begun to see the importance of LGBT inclusion since it has been proven LGBT-inclusive businesses perform better on the market (Badgett, 2020; Box, 2015; Shan & Zheng, 2017). For a business to be considered as 'LGBT-inclusive', offering same benefits to LGBT partners as their heterosexual counterparts and prohibiting discrimination concerning sexual orientation are two exemplary polices that should be implemented. When LGBT staffs feel protected, they feel happier in their workplace and exhibit higher level of productivity, and thus, resulting in lower turnover rate (Badgett, 2020). Moreover, LGBT-inclusive companies have demonstrated higher market valuation and stock return (Shan & Zheng, 2017). LGBT inclusion may not be the sole attribute contributing towards stronger business performance per se, but it indicates the power of collective difference. When a company embraces its LGBT employees, it also reveals its acceptance towards different types of diversity. In the present day, tolerant and diverse businesses have been proven to possess higher ability to retain talents and the potential to further enhance their reputations on the market, and consequently, they would appear to be more attractive to financial investors (Box, 2015).

On a national level, economic development and LGBT inclusion are also thought as mutually reinforcers to each other. Based on a comprehensive economy research examining 132 countries, the quantitative data gathered suggested that there is a correlation between a nation's economic growth and LGBT rights; gross domestic product (GDP) per capita has a tendency to be higher in countries with more progressive LGBT rights (Badgett et al., 2019). Aside from the economic benefits, Ram et al. (2019) has found that the level of satisfaction among both LGBT and non-LGBT travelers are higher in LGBT-inclusive travel destinations.

2.4.2 'LGBT-friendliness'

Based on McCabe's definition, a 'LGBT-friendly' business or destination simply implies that it offers a welcoming environment for LGBT individuals; however, with increasingly more firms marketed themselves as LGBT-friendly, the societal definition for this marketing term has become more stringent. Since there is currently no governmental regulation establishing the standard for 'LGBT-friendliness', the potential factors influencing LGBT people's assessments of corporate LGBT-friendliness remains a subjective matter.

According to Tuten (2006) and Gudelunas (2010), product placement in LGBT television shows, advertisement in LGBT media, inclusion of LGBT imagery in mainstream media, policies towards LGBT equality, and sponsorship of LGBT charities and events are identified as the five main factors influencing LGBT people's perception of corporate LGBT-friendliness.

From these findings, it is evident that marketers should realize that it has been increasingly more difficult to separate LGBT marketing from LGBT social movements. LGBT individuals are aware the term ‘LGBT-friendly’ is often utilized solely as an empty marketing rhetoric, and therefore, for LGBT consumers to perceive businesses’ usage of this marketing descriptor as a responsible example, companies would have to offer more than a welcoming environment.

In the present day, entering the LGBT market requires a long-term commitment that goes beyond simply placing gay-orientated advertisements and acknowledging LGBT acceptance. In addition, incorporating opportunistic business practices, such as selling rainbow-themed merchandise and temporarily including a rainbow flag in company’s logo, only throughout the month of LGBT Pride (June) is no longer regarded as a substantial effort to demonstrate corporate LGBT-friendliness. In fact, according to Falco & Gandhi (2020), when businesses voice their support for the LGBT community only during the Pride season, they are perceived as inauthentic and appeared like they are exploiting sexual orientation for profit. Nowadays, firms who market themselves as LGBT-friendly are expected to carry out year-round efforts to exhibit their commitment to the LGBT community, and in return, their genuine and continuous outreach will translate into gains in brand loyalty within the LGBT market (Oakenfull, 2013).

LGBT consumers are without doubt more loyal to LGBT-friendly brands, but some corporations might be hesitant to advertise themselves as LGBT-friendly in fear of facing backlash from the heterosexual community. In a study evaluating the brand image of LGBT-friendly companies, Tuten (2005) has discovered that this marketing positioning is viewed as somewhat positively, and at worst, neutrally by heterosexual respondents. This finding proves that companies who have shown their commitment to LGBT equality can appeal to both heterosexual and homosexual consumers.

From the previous studies, the difference between ‘LGBT-friendly’ and ‘LGBT-inclusive’ is defined; however, these two phrases seem inextricably interwoven since implementation of LGBT-inclusive policies is deemed as one of the main factors affecting LGBT consumers’ impression of corporate LGBT-friendliness. The academic findings have also suggested that LGBT-friendly businesses perform better due to the higher stock return, brand loyalty, market valuation, talent retention rate, and customer satisfaction observed among these firms. Nevertheless, it is noteworthy to point out that these studies have largely focused on socially liberal regions, and Berggren & Elinder (2010) have found that ‘LGBT-friendliness’ could negatively impact a business in conservative countries.

2.5 Portugal as a LGBT-friendly destination

2.5.1 Portuguese attitudes towards LGBT community

While Portugal has one of the most progressive legislations regarding same-sex relationships in the world (Costa & Salinas-Quiroz, 2018), multiple studies have shown that there is still an existing gap between the formal legislations and the general public's perception of the LGBT community (Oliveira et al., 2013; Costa et al., 2017). The Portuguese government first began to recognize same-sex civil partnership back in 2001, and the LGBT equality progressed even further when Portugal became the eighth country in the world to grant same-sex couples the right to marry in 2010. Donor insemination and same-sex adoption were then approved in 2016 (Costa & Salinas-Quiroz, 2018). Despite being one of the first European countries to legalize same-sex marriage, the Portuguese citizens were not very supportive of this cause back when the law was first passed. In 2011, two studies regarding Europeans' attitudes towards same-sex relationships were conducted. One study revealed that only 29% of the Portuguese citizens were favorable of same-sex marriage (Commissioner of Human Rights, 2011), and the other study demonstrated that Portugal, alongside with other former Soviet Union countries, was in fact among the least-accepting countries for homosexuality in Europe (Lottes & Alkula, 2011).

Over the years, public opinion towards homosexuality has gradually improved since same-sex marriage first became legal in Portugal; however, discrimination on the grounds of gender identity and sexual orientation is still highly prevalent. In particular, the group of Catholic, right-wing, heterosexual male from rural areas exhibits the highest level of sexual prejudice against LGBT people (Lopes et al., 2016). Many recent studies have demonstrated that homophobia is still widespread in Portugal. In 2013, a small group of Portuguese LGBT individuals were interviewed for a homonormativity study, and out of all the participants, most of them stated they had experienced some forms of discrimination during their lifetime, whether it was physical, verbal, or emotional. In addition, the interviewees also mentioned that they felt the needs to alter their behaviors in order to fit in the heteronormative society (Oliveira et al., 2013). Further study had exposed that many LGBT individuals in Portugal experienced homophobic bullying early on in life – with some falling victims to discrimination as early as the age of five. Nevertheless, in fear of losing their family support by disclosing their sexual orientation, none of the young victims had the courage to report the violence (Rodrigues et al., 2016).

Though sexual prejudice based on sexual orientation and gender identity is still common, recent findings have shown that the Portuguese attitudes towards homosexuality had become more positive and fewer incidents of discrimination had been reported. According to an

annually published report on discrimination observation, in 2018, the Portuguese LGBT survey respondents reported the lowest levels of verbal abuse and bullying incidents since the discrimination report was first published in 2013; 39.3% and 14.5%, respectively (Associação ILGA Portugal, 2018). Besides Associação ILGA Portugal, the European Union also regularly carries out surveys regarding discrimination. In 2019, 74% of the Portuguese believed same-sex marriage should be legalized throughout Europe, and moreover, 78% of them agreed that LGBT people should have the same rights as their heterosexual counterparts. Apart from perceptions of legal framework, 34% of the Portuguese respondents stated they would feel totally comfortable seeing displays of public affection between same-sex couples, and furthermore, 32% of the participants expressed that they would feel comfortable knowing that one of their children was in a same-sex relationship – an increase of 16% and 5% from 2015, respectively (European Union, 2019).

In Portugal, the legal regulations entail an advancement for LGBT rights. However, despite these laws having gained support from the Portuguese public over the years, they coexist with practical discrimination in real daily life; therefore, creating a contradictory landscape. LGBT travelers arriving in Portugal should understand that while they would not face any unlawful discrimination, most Portuguese, particularly individuals who reside in rural villages, still feel uncomfortable seeing same-sex couples displaying public affections (European Union, 2019); thus, if LGBT tourists would like to avoid any social stigma and discrimination, it is best for them to respect local cultural norms and act accordingly while traveling.

2.5.2 Travelers perceptions of Portugal as LGBT-friendly destination

Portugal has consistently been rated as one of the most LGBT-friendly countries in the world thanks to its advance on equal rights (Spartacus Travel, 2020). However, despite a good track record of LGBT rights and an increase in positive social attitudes towards LGBT community, international travelers do not have Portugal in mind when they envision being at a LGBT-friendly destination. In a recent survey, travelers from China, Japan, Russia, Brazil, and the United States were asked to answer three questions regarding their perceptions of LGBT-friendliness in the European Union: the country that provides the best overall experience for LGBT travelers, the country with the best quality of life for LGBT residents, and the country that offers the best LGBT festivals and events. For all three questions on the survey, Portugal did not rank in top ten in any of them. European countries with less liberal equality legislations, such as Italy, Greece, and Czech Republic, were perceived to be better travel destinations for LGBT travelers than Portugal (Jordan, 2018). Regardless of being rated high on the gay travel index, Portugal struggles to convey that message to travelers worldwide.

***H6.** LGBT travelers who have been to Portugal would think Portugal is more LGBT-friendly compared to travelers who have yet been to Portugal.*

***RQ4.** Do LGBT travelers think of Portugal as a LGBT-friendly destination?*
***RQ5.** Do LGBT travelers think there is enough LGBT visibility in Portugal?*

3. Methodology

3.1 Hypotheses and research questions

Based on the previous academic literature and author's discussion with Catavino Tours, the subsequent hypotheses and research questions were formed.

***H1.** LGBT travelers would be interested in being wine tourists.*
***H2.** LGBT travelers above the age of 25 would be more interested in being wine tourists.*
***H3.** LGBT travelers with a lower level of wine knowledge would be more motivated to book a guided wine tour.*
***H4.** LGBT travelers from more conservative regions would rely more on LGBT-friendly tours to socialize with other members of the LGBT community.*
***H5.** LGBT households are normally DINK (double income, no kids) family and have higher spending powers.*
***H6.** LGBT travelers who have been to Portugal would think Portugal is more LGBT-friendly compared to travelers who have yet been to Portugal.*

***RQ1.** What are LGBT travelers' priorities when selecting a wine tour operator?*
***RQ2.** What types of tours are LGBT travelers most interested in regarding length and size?*
***RQ3.** What would prohibit LGBT travelers from rebooking from the same tour operator?*
***RQ4.** Do LGBT travelers think of Portugal as a LGBT-friendly destination?*
***RQ5.** Do LGBT travelers think there is enough LGBT visibility in Portugal?*

3.2 Research tool

The primary research instrument to answer the presumed hypotheses and research questions was a questionnaire that comprised six parts and was developed together with Catavino Tours and according to their needs (to review the survey, see Annex 7.1). The first part of the survey addressed the socio-demographic information (e.g. preferred gender identity, identified sexual orientation, region of residence, region of origin, age, and relationship status). The preferred gender identity question included six options: female, male, transgender, queer,

Table 1. Descriptive data of survey participants

	Total N = 210	
Demographic Description	N	%
Gender Identity		
Male	150	71.4%
Female	52	24.8%
Queer	7	3.3%
Other	1	0.5%
Transgender		
Yes	3	1.4%
No	207	98.6%
Sexual Orientation		
Gay	141	67.1%
Lesbian	25	11.9%
Bisexual	21	10.0%
Straight	12	5.7%
Queer and Other	11	5.3%
Age Group		
18 – 25	42	20.0%
26 – 35	80	38.1%
36 – 45	46	21.9%
46 – 55	23	11.0%
56 – 65	15	7.1%
66+	4	2.0%
Region of Residence		
Western Europe	53	25.2%
Eastern Europe	7	3.3%
North America	93	44.3%
Asia	27	12.9%
Australia & Pacific	10	4.8%
Central/South America	11	5.2%
Middle East	2	1.0%
Africa	7	3.3%

intersex, and a ‘prefer not to answer’ option. The identified sexual orientation question included seven options: gay, lesbian, bisexual, straight, queer, other, and a ‘prefer not to answer’ option. For both questions above, participants could select as many options as they deem applicable.

The second part of the questionnaire focused on the traveler’s preference (e.g. general budget, trip motivations, countries they desire to visit, interest in wine tourism). If participants stated that they would be interested in visiting a wine region during their holidays, the third part of questionnaire would appear. This conditional part of the section was solely focused on wine tourism (e.g. interest in traveling with a tour operator, preferred size and length of the tour). For the fourth part of the questionnaire, participants were asked to rank the features on a Likert scale from 1 to 5 (1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree) based on how important each feature was in motivating a LGBT traveler when choosing a tour operator.

The fifth and sixth part of the questionnaire addressed the perception of Portugal as a LGBT-friendly destination. Firstly, the participants were asked to rank Portugal as a LGBT-friendly destination on a Likert scale from 1 to 5 (1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree) based on their personal perceptions, and then, they were asked if they had visited Portugal in the past five years. If the respondents had not traveled to Portugal in the past five years, the questionnaire would conclude; however, if they had been to Portugal in the last five years, they would then have to answer the final part of the questionnaire. The sixth and last part of the questionnaire focused on participants’ experiences as a LGBT traveler in Portugal. This section contained two closed-ended questions and an open-ended question.

3.3 Procedure

In this research, an anonymous internet-based survey including both quantitative and qualitative questions was applied, an increasingly common mean of data collection instrument utilized in social sciences and humanities (Rodrigues et al., 2016). The questionnaire was distributed through social media channels on the researcher’s own Facebook and Instagram page as well as various LGBT travel groups on Facebook (e.g. LGBTQ Travel, Gay Travel Club, LGBT Travel Network, and LGBT Expats, Immigrants & Friends in Portugal). Besides social media, the questionnaire was also posted on two websites that help researchers to find survey participants: FindParticipants and PollPool.

Two hundred and ten questionnaires were collected over a period of one month. In total, 51 cisgender women, 148 cisgender men, 1 transgender woman, 2 transgender men, 7 who identified as queer, and 1 respondent who identified as “other” participated in the questionnaire. In terms of demographics of sexual orientation, gays encompassed the largest proportion of

the survey participants; gay = 141, lesbian = 25, bisexual = 21, straight = 12, queer and other = 11. Furthermore, within this sample size, 80% were between 18 and 45 years-of-age, and 44.3% resided in North America (for a more completed descriptive statistics analysis of the survey participants, see Table 1). Lastly, since this research is focused on LGBT travelers, the 12 responses completed by participants who identified as straight were excluded from the study, and consequently, only 198 surveys were utilized for statistical analysis.

4. Results

4.1 Hypotheses testing

H1. LGBT travelers would be interested in being wine tourists.

Table 2. LGBT travelers' interest in being wine tourists

	Observed N	Expected N	Residual
Would you be interested in visiting a wine region?			
Yes	167	99	68
No	31	99	-68
Total	198		

χ^2 (1, N = 198) = 93.41, p = 0.000

Based on the claimed research hypothesis, the observed frequency of LGBT travelers who would be interested in being wine tourists will be different than that expected by the null hypothesis; the null hypothesis, in this case, would be that there will be no difference between expected frequencies for both LGBT travelers who would be interested in being wine tourists and LGBT travelers who would not be interested in being wine tourists (see Table 2). As specified by Goonatilake et al. (2007), when these three assumptions are met: (1) The sample of data was randomly collected from the population, (2) The values for the variable are mutually exclusive, and (3) a minimum expectation of five occurrences in each category, the statistical analysis method – *chi* square "goodness of fit" with '*2 x 1 contingency table*' analysis test would be applicable in this scenario.

We sampled 198 LGBT travelers, and evaluated whether the number of LGBT travelers who would be interested in visiting a wine region (f = 167) was equal to the number of LGBT travelers who would not be interested in visiting a wine region (f = 31). The data was analyzed utilizing a *chi* square "goodness of fit" test. The null hypothesis was rejected, **χ^2 (1, N = 198) = 93.41, $p \leq 0.05$**. More than half of the LGBT travelers would be interested in visiting a wine region; thus, to conclude, we could state that **LGBT travelers are interested in wine tourism.**

H2. LGBT travelers above the age of 25 would be more interested in being wine tourists.

Table 3. Crosstabulation of interests in being a wine tourist based on LGBT travelers' age

		Interested in visiting a wine region?	
		Yes	No
Age group	Under 25	27	12
	Over 25	140	19

χ^2 (1, N = 198) = 8.40, p = 0.004

Upon examining whether there is a relationship between age (under 25 = 1 and above 25 = 2) and traveler's interests in visiting a wine region (yes = 1 and no = 2), a chi square test of association was performed. Originally, seven different age groups were specified on the survey; however, in order to address this hypothesis more directly, the seven age groups were further categorized into two groups: under 25 and above 25.

Referring to Table 3, the result of the chi square test of independence with '*2 x 2 contingency table*' shows that there is a significant association between LGBT traveler's age (under/over 25) and their interests in being wine tourist, **χ^2 (1, N = 198) = 8.40, $p \leq 0.05$**. The null hypothesis of no establishing relationship between age and interests in being wine tourists is rejected; and therefore, from this statistics analysis, we could state that **LGBT travelers who are over the age of 25 are more likely to be wine tourists**.

H3. LGBT travelers with lower level of wine knowledge would be more motivated to book a guided wine tour.

Table 4. Crosstabulation of interests in booking a guided wine tour based on the level of wine knowledge

		Interests in booking a guided wine tour?	
		Yes	No
Level of wine knowledge	Non-expert	126	30
	Expert	5	5

χ^2 (1, N = 166) = 5.35, p = 0.021

Out of the 198 survey respondents, 167 of them stated that they would be interested in visiting a wine region. The question of whether they would be interested in visiting a wine region is conditional, and when responded with yes to this question, a section regarding to traveler's interest in booking guided wine tours would appear. Among the 167 participants who desire to travel to a wine region, one of them did not address whether he/she would be interested in booking a guided tour, and thus, making the sample size a bit smaller – 166. In

the survey, participants were asked to select their level of wine knowledge based on their own personal opinions, and in which, six possible answers were: ‘I have no interest in wine and I don't consume wine’, ‘I have limited knowledge but I enjoy a glass of wine now and then’, ‘I have some basic knowledge and I take time to select a wine when purchasing’, ‘I am knowledgeable and I seek out specific wines’, ‘I have in-depth knowledge and I study wine on my free time’, and ‘I am a wine professional’. For the purpose of this hypothesis, the six possible answers were further categorized into two groups: expert and non-expert.

In this hypothesis testing (see Table 4), travelers who has in-depth wine knowledge are grouped as ‘experts’ while the rests of them are categorized as ‘non-experts’. Despite having a small sample size of wine experts, the chi square test of independence is still appropriate here since the requirement of a minimum expectation of five occurrences in each category was met (Goonatilake et al., 2007). After a chi-square test of association was performed, it demonstrated that there was a strong evidence against the null hypothesis. The result of the chi square test of independence with ‘*2 x 2 contingency table*’ shows that the relationship between the level of wine knowledge and the interests in booking a guided wine tour is significant, χ^2 **(1, *N* = 166) = 5.35, *p* ≤ 0.05**. From this statistical test, we could state that **LGBT travelers who are not wine experts are more likely to book a guided wine tour**.

H4. LGBT travelers from more conservative regions would rely more on LGBT-friendly tours to socialize with other members of the LGBT community.

Table 5. Correlation between LGBT traveler’s origin and their desires to socialize with others in tour groups

Spearman rho Correlation			
		How conservative is the region in which you currently reside?	Possibility of socializing with other members of the LGBT community
How conservative is the region in which you currently reside?	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	0.077
	Sig. (2-Tailed)	.	0.283
	N	198	196
Possibility of socializing with other members of the LGBT community	Correlation Coefficient	0.077	1.000
	Sig. (2-Tailed)	0.283	.
	N	196	196

$r_s(196) = 0.077$, $p = 0.283$

With the intention of examining whether LGBT travelers from a more conservative area value ‘the possibility of socializing with other LGBT members’ more when selecting a tour, a Spearman's rank-order correlation was conducted. Referring to Table 5, the test demonstrated

the relationship between ‘how conservative is the region in which you currently reside’ and ‘possibility of socializing with other members of the LGBT community’ was not statistically significant, $r_s(196) = 0.077, p > 0.05$, which indicated that there was no correlation between the two; therefore, the hypothesis was rejected.

H5. LGBT households are normally DINK (double income, no kids) family and have higher spending powers.

Table 6. LGBT travelers who are in a relationship

	Total = 198	
Are you single?	N	%
Yes	75	37.8%
No	123	62.2%

In order to examine this hypothesis, three different steps were taken. First, participants who are single, separated, divorced, or widowed are grouped as single. Respondents who are in a monogamous relationship, in a polygamous relationship, in an open relationship, engaged, or married are grouped as non-single (see Table 6). Out of the 198 LGBT participants, 75 of them are single and 123 are not single. The 123 survey respondents who are not single are considered in this research to be in a LGBT household.

Table 7. LGBT households with children

	Observed N	Expected N	Residual
Do you have children?			
Yes	14	61.5	-47.5
No	109	61.5	47.5
Total	123		

χ^2 (1, N = 123) = 73.37, p = 0.000

Secondly, referring to Table 7, the null hypothesis is that the frequency counts of LGBT households with or without children would be the same. After running a *chi* square “goodness of fit” with ‘*2 x 1 contingency table*’ analysis test, the null hypothesis was rejected. We sampled 123 LGBT households to evaluate whether the number of LGBT households who have children (f = 14) was equal to the number of LGBT households who did not have any children (f = 109). In this case, the chi square result was $\chi^2 (1, N = 123) = 73.37, p \leq 0.05$. More than fifty percent of the LGBT households did not have any kids; thus, to sum up, we could state that LGBT couples tend to not have children**.**

Table 8. LGBT households with higher budget to travel

Are your travel budgets high?	Observed N	Expected N	Residual
Yes	100	61.5	38.5
No	23	61.5	-38.5
Total	123		

χ^2 (1, N = 123) = 48.20, p = 0.000

Lastly, referring to Table 8, another *chi* square "goodness of fit" with '*2 x 1 contingency table*' analysis test was run to determine whether LGBT couples usually have higher budget to travel. For the purpose of this research, survey respondents who thought of themselves as "moderate price traveler", "moderate price traveler with a little luxury", and "luxury traveler" are grouped as travelers with higher spending powers. Participants who categorized themselves as "budget traveler with occasional splurge" and "budget/economy traveler" are considered as travelers with less spending powers. After sampling 123 LGBT couples to evaluate whether the number of LGBT couples who have higher spending powers (f = 100) was equal to the number of LGBT couples who have less spending powers (f = 23), the chi square test rejected the null hypothesis, **χ^2 (1, N = 123) = 48.20, $p \leq 0.05$.** Therefore, we could claim that LGBT households tend to have higher spending powers.

As a combination of results from the three tests run for this hypothesis, we could conclude that the hypothesis is correct – **LGBT households are DINK and they tend to have higher spending powers for travel.**

H6. LGBT travelers who have been to Portugal would think Portugal is more LGBT-friendly compared to travelers who have not been to Portugal.

In order to examine the differences in gay travelers' perceptions of LGBT-friendliness of Portugal between travelers who have been to Portugal and those who have not, an independent samples *t* test was performed (see Table 9). Given a violation of Levene's test for homogeneity of variances, F(1,196) = 7.97, p = 0.005, an independent *t* test not assuming homogeneous variances was calculated. The results of this test indicated that the perceptions of LGBT-friendliness of Portugal between the two groups did not differ statistically significantly, ***t*(170.11) = 1.41, *p* = 0.16, *d* = 0.2, 95% CI [0.076, 0.453]**. The mean for travelers who have been to Portugal (M = 3.64; SD = 1.044) was not significantly different than those who have yet to visit Portugal (M = 3.45; SD = 0.81). **These findings do not support the idea that travelers who have been to Portugal perceive Portugal as more LGBT-friendly than those who have not**; therefore, the hypothesis was rejected.

Table 9. Independent samples t-test between LGBT travelers who have or have not been to Portugal

		N = 198		
	Have you been to Portugal?	N	Mean	Standard deviation
I consider Portugal to be a LGBT-friendly destination	Yes	92	3.64	1.044
	No	106	3.45	0.806

		Independent samples t-test		
		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
I consider Portugal to be a LGBT-friendly destination	Equal variances not assumed	1.406	170.11	0.162

$t(170.11) = 1.41$, $p = 0.16$, $d = 0.2$, 95% CI [0.076, 0.453]

4.2 Research questions

RQ1. What are LGBT travelers' priorities when selecting a wine tour operator?

In order to gain a better understanding of LGBT customer's expectations from a LGBT-friendly wine tour operator, a section of the survey was dedicated to examining this matter. 15 attributes were listed in this segment of the survey, and participants were asked to rate the level of importance for each listed attribute on a five-point scale (1 = not important; 5 = very important). For this question, the five-point Likert scales are treated as interval data. When the Likert-type scales are considered as interval data, the use of mean as the measure of central tendency is appropriate (Jamieson, 2004). Means and standard deviations for all 15 attributes were calculated in order to compare the level of importance for each variable (see Table 10).

From the perspective of LGBT travelers, guarantee of safety and not experiencing any form of discrimination or violence (**M = 4.52**) is viewed as the most important characteristic. Aside from the attribute with the highest mean, variables with means higher than 4 are considered significant for the purpose of this study. With that parameter set, staff's knowledge of local wines and wine regions (**M = 4.31**), value for money (**M = 4.25**), positive referrals from friends (**M = 4.13**), providing staff diversity training of sexual orientation and gender identity (**M = 4.02**), and reviews on internet (**M = 4.01**) are attributes that are deemed important by the homosexual participants. Upon reviewing the top six variables that LGBT travelers look for in a LGBT-friendly wine tour operator, it is worth mentioning that only the attribute "providing staff diversity training" is LGBT-specific.

Table 10. Preference of attributes that impact LGBT travelers' decisions on tour operator selection

Variables	Mean (Standard deviation)
Value-related attributes (Scales 1 – 5)	
Value for money	4.25 (0.78)
Reputation-related attributes (Scales 1 – 5)	
Reviews on internet	4.01 (0.87)
Positive referrals from friends	4.13 (1.08)
Support LGBT community	3.73 (1.13)
Advertisements on LGBT print or internet media	2.73 (1.25)
Include members of LGBT community on marketing materials	3.10 (1.24)
Tour operator's affiliation with gay rights or travel organization	3.25 (1.22)
LGBT-owned business	2.95 (1.20)
'LGBT-friendliness' attributes (Scales 1 – 5)	
Guarantee of safety	4.52 (0.87)
Advertise itself as LGBT-friendly	3.40 (1.24)
Staff's knowledge of local LGBT history, community, and events	3.15 (1.26)
Possibility of socializing with other members of the LGBT community	3.66 (1.16)
'LGBT-inclusive' attributes (Scales 1 – 5)	
Provide staff diversity training on sexual orientation and gender identity	4.02 (1.16)
Employee tour guides who are members of the LGBT community	3.25 (1.12)
Wine-related attributes (Scales 1 – 5)	
Staff's knowledge of local wines and wine regions	4.31 (1.13)

RQ2. What types of tours are LGBT travelers most interested in regarding length and size?

Table 11. Preferred length of wine tours among LGBT travelers (check-all-that-apply)

Length of the tour	N	%
Day tour	107	64.1%
1 to 2 days	77	46.1%
2 to 3 days	22	13.2%
More than 3 days	19	11.4%

Table 12. Preferred group size of wine tours among LGBT travelers (check-all-that-apply)

Size of the tour group	N	%
Large group (More than 8 people)	27	16.2%
Small group (Less than 8 people)	119	71.3%
Private group	63	37.7%

LGBT participants who indicated an interest to visit a wine region during their holidays (N = 167) were asked to answer two check-all-that-apply (CATA) questions. These two questions were designed to understand what types of tours LGBT travelers are most likely to book through a LGBT-friendly wine tour operator regarding length and size. Since CATA questions are employed, the frequency of mentions is used to measure of level of interests for each variable. As shown in Table 11, shorter-length tours are more popular, with day tour being the most desirable. In terms of size of the tour groups, as presented in Table 12, smaller-sized groups with less than 8 people are the most popular among LGBT travelers. In addition, there is also a high level of interests in private tours within the LGBT market. Lastly, although larger-sized groups with more than 8 people scored the lowest, the result demonstrated that there are travelers out there who desire to socialize with other travelers.

RQ3. What would prohibit LGBT travelers from rebooking from the same tour operator?

Table 13. Attributes that would prohibit LGBT travelers from being a repeated customer

	N = 109	
Categories	N	%
Discrimination	44	40.4%
Unprofessional behaviors	35	32.1%
Bad value for money	10	9.2%
False advertisement	13	11.9%
Lack of knowledge	7	6.4%

To address this issue, an open-ended question was included in the survey and a total of 109 responses were received. The qualitative answers were then grouped into five categories: false advertisement, bad value for money, unprofessional behaviors, discrimination, and lack of knowledge. After analyzing the responses, the findings suggested the response categories ‘discrimination’ (40.4%) and ‘unprofessional behaviors’ (32.1%) to be the most significant (see Table 13). Regarding examples of what actions were considered as unprofessional behaviors, tardiness, disorganization, rudeness, lack of passion, and dull personality were some of the phrases mentioned by survey participants.

RQ4. Do LGBT travelers think of Portugal as a LGBT-friendly destination?

Table 14. Descriptive statistics of LGBT travelers who consider Portugal as a LGBT-friendly destination

	N = 198			
	N	Percentage	Statistics	
Strongly agree	31	15.7%		
Agree	72	36.4%	Median	4
Neither agree nor disagree	70	35.4%	Mode	4
Disagree	23	11.6%	Interquartile	1
Strongly disagree	2	1.0%	range	

In the survey, respondents were asked to rate the statement, 'I consider Portugal as a LGBT-friendly destination', on a five-point scale (1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree). For this question, the Likert scale is used to measure attitude and the data is being treated as ordinal data. Because the data is ordinal, the mean and standard deviation are not considered as the appropriate measurements for central tendency, but instead, the median is employed (Jamieson, 2004). In addition, the interquartile range (IQR) is utilized to assess the level of polarization in participants' opinions on this matter – a relatively small IQR would be an indication of consensus (Fisher & Marshall, 2009). Upon analyzing the statistics, the finding suggests consensus. While not strongly agreeing, most participants indicated agreement with the idea that Portugal is a LGBT-friendly destination, **Mdn = 4, IQR = 1** (see Table 14).

Table 15.

Frequency of mentions of countries with wine tourism in which travelers assumed to be LGBT-friendly

Ranking		N	%
1	Germany	166	80.2%
2	Canada	160	77.3%
3	Spain	159	76.8%
4	France	151	72.9%
5	Portugal	109	52.7%
6	United States	100	48.3%
7	Italy	88	42.5%
8	Austria	70	33.8%
9	Argentina	45	21.7%
10	Uruguay	41	19.8%

The participants were also asked to answer a CATA question in addition to the Likert-type question mentioned above. This CATA question was designed to assess which countries with

wine tourism they assumed to be LGBT-friendly. Out of the 14 countries listed on the survey, Portugal ranked fifth – with 52.7% of the respondents assuming Portugal to be a LGBT-friendly wine country (see Table 15). From the result of this question, the presumption of LGBT wine tourists might choose Germany, Canada, Spain, and France to visit over Portugal was made.

RQ5. Do LGBT travelers think there is enough LGBT visibility in Portugal?

Table 16. Descriptive statistics of LGBT travelers who think there is enough LGBT visibility in Portugal

	N = 90			
	N	Percentage	Statistics	
Strongly agree	6	6.7%		
Agree	10	11.1%	Median	3
Neither agree nor disagree	30	33.3%	Mode	3
Disagree	24	26.7%	Interquartile	1
Strongly disagree	20	22.2%	range	

Survey participants who have visited Portugal in the past five years were asked to rate the statement, 'there is enough visibility of LGBT community in Portugal', on a five-point scale (1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree). Using the median as the measure of central tendency, the data would interpret as most of the 90 respondents who have recently traveled to Portugal neither agree nor disagree with the statement, **Mdn = 3, IQR = 1** (see Table 16). However, in this case, the median should not be the sole indicator since the frequency distribution skewed to the left. If we categorized the five-point Likert scale into three groups: disagree, neutral, and agree, the group "disagree" has the highest percentage – 48.9%, and thus, we could state that LGBT travelers do not think there is enough LGBT visibility in Portugal.

5. Conclusions

The primary objective of this research was to establish a relationship between wine tourism and LGBT tourism. The result examined LGBT travelers' interests in being a wine tourist, the attributes LGBT travelers look for in a LGBT-friendly wine tour operator, and LGBT travelers' perceptions of Portugal as a LGBT-friendly destination. Previous studies have focused on LGBT tourism and wine tourism as independent topics; conversely, the present work puts an emphasis on studying LGBT travelers as potential wine tourists. Hypotheses 1, 2, and 3 revealed that LGBT wine tourists who would be interested in booking a guided wine tour are travelers over the age of 25 and not self-identified as wine experts. In addition, hypothesis 5 confirmed that LGBT households generally have no kids and a higher disposable income; thus, they could travel more frequently and spend more money during their holidays.

While Turismo de Portugal has begun to focus on LGBT tourism and the country has consistently been rated as one of the most LGBT-friendly countries in the world (Araújo, 2017; Spartacus Travel, 2020), research questions 4 and 5 indicated that there is still rooms for improvement for Portuguese LGBT-friendliness. First, most LGBT travelers believe there is not enough visibility of the LGBT community in Portugal, and second, despite ranking third in gay travel index, a list of other countries are considered to be more LGBT-friendly in the minds of gay travelers. Lastly, hypothesis 6 suggested that there is no difference in perceptions of 'LGBT-friendliness' between travelers who have been to Portugal and those who have not. This result proved to be problematic since many travelers do not have Portugal in mind when they think of a destination that is friendly to the LGBT community (Jordan, 2018).

5.1 Practical implementation

Based on this research, Catavino Tours should transition itself to become a LGBT-friendly business and begin to target the LGBT market. According to the literature review, this transition would benefit Catavino Tours economically. Furthermore, the company should demonstrate its year-long support of LGBT community and include LGBT-inclusive policies, such as providing diversity training, in order for the LGBT community to view this firm as a responsible LGBT-friendly business. In addition, to increase exposure in LGBT community, the company should cooperate with Variações and Proudly Portugal. Last of all, to avoid upsetting the heterosexual community, the company could start with using implicit gay imagery as digital advertisements on Instagram, Facebook, and their websites as a way to show their LGBT-friendliness.

As a wine tour operator trying to penetrate the LGBT travel market, research question 1 revealed that Catavino Tours should employee tour guides with sufficient wine knowledge, guarantee travelers a trip without experiencing any form of discrimination and violence, and offer a tour which travelers believed to be worth the money. In terms of the types of tours LGBT travelers would be interested in, research question 2 indicated that the company should focus on offering shorter-length tours with less than eight group members or private tours. Echoing the outcomes of research question 1, research question 3 suggested staff's unprofessional behaviors and display of discriminatory attitudes towards the LGBT community would prevent LGBT travelers from rebooking. For instance, LGBT travelers do not want to feel like they are being treated differently but they expect the staff to practice LGBT-inclusive language. Lastly, hypothesis 4 demonstrated that it does not matter whether the travelers come from a more progressive or conservative region, they would be equally interested in using the wine tour as a mean to meet other LGBT holidaymakers.

5.2 Limitations and future research

This research has several limitations. First, the questionnaire was distributed online and the numbers of people who were interested in completing the survey were limited due to the length of the questionnaire and the fact that there was no compensation. Second, the numbers of attributes listed to determine the priorities of LGBT travelers when selecting a wine tour operator were shortened to 15 in order to keep the survey completion time under five minutes. Third, the researcher originally had the idea to assess the readiness to receive LGBT travelers among Portuguese wine tourism stakeholders, but because of the COVID-19 pandemic and the fact that the researcher was not affiliated with any governmental tourism organization, companies showed a lack of interest to respond.

Since this was the first study concerning LGBT travelers as wine tourists, the research was broader, and the researcher treated the LGBT market as a homogenous group. In the future, more specific studies could focus on the subgroups of the LGBT demographic (e.g. lesbian, nonbinary, transgender). Furthermore, since wineries are usually situated in rural regions, a further study could focus on wine tourism stakeholders' attitudes towards LGBT travelers in rural areas.

Acknowledgements

The author would like to thank the consortium of the International Master on Wine Tourism Innovation (WINTOUR), University of Porto, Professor Luis Cunha, Lucas Salinas, and Jireh Tan for their help and support. Additionally, the author would like to show his upmost gratitude to Ryan Opaz for his relentless support and encouragement during the development of this master thesis.

6. Reference

Agència Catalana de Turisme. (n.d.). Catalonia LGTBI. Retrieved May 05, 2020, from http://www.catalunya.com/what-to-do/how-to-travel/lgbt-catalonia

Angelini, J. R., & Bradley, S. D. (2010). Homosexual Imagery in Print Advertisements: Attended, Remembered, But Disliked. *Journal of Homosexuality*, *57*(4), 485–502. doi: 10.1080/00918361003608665

Araújo, L. (2017). Portuguese tourism strategy 2027 Leading the tourism of the future. *Worldwide Hospitality and Tourism Themes*, *9*(6), 646–652. doi: 10.1108/whatt-09-2017-0052

Associação ILGA Portugal. (2018). *Discriminação contra Pessoas LGBTI+ [Discrimination against LGBTI+ People].* Lisbon, Portugal: Associação ILGA Portugal.

Badgett, M. V. L., Nezhad, S., Waaldijk, K., & Rodgers, Y. V. D. M. (2014). *The relationship between LGBT inclusion and economic development: an analysis of emerging countries*. Los Angeles, U.S.A.: the Williams Institute, UCLA School of Law.

Badgett, M. V. L., Waaldijk, K., & Rodgers, Y. V. D. M. (2019). The relationship between LGBT inclusion and economic development: Macro-level evidence. *World Development*, *120*, 1–14. doi: 10.1016/j.worlddev.2019.03.011

Badgett, M. V. L. (2020). *The economic case for LGBT equality: why fairness and equality benefit us all*. Boston, U.S.A.: Beacon Press.

Berggren, N., & Elinder, M. (2010). Is tolerance good or bad for growth? *Public Choice*, *150*(1-2), 283–308. doi: 10.1007/s11127-010-9702-x

Box, L. (2015). It’s Not Personal, It’s Just Business: The Economic Impact of LGBT Legislation. *Indiana Law Review*, *48*(3), 995. doi: 10.18060/4806.0016

Commissioner for Human Rights. (2011). *Discrimination on grounds of sexual orientation and gender identity in Europe.* Strasbourg, France: Council of Europe Publishing.

Community Marketing & Insights (CMI). (2018). *23rd Annual LGBTQ Tourism & Hospitality Survey*. San Francisco, U.S.A.: Community Marketing.

Community Marketing & Insights (CMI). (2019). *13th Annual LGBTQ Community Survey*. San Francisco, U.S.A.: Community Marketing.

Costa, P. A., Carneiro, F. A., Esposito, F., D'Amore, S., & Green, R.-J. (2017). Sexual Prejudice in Portugal: Results from the First Wave European Study on Heterosexual's Attitudes Toward Same-Gender Marriage and Parenting. *Sexuality Research and Social Policy*, *15*(1), 99–110. doi: 10.1007/s13178-017-0292-y

Costa, P. A., & Salinas-Quiroz, F. (2018). A Comparative Study of Attitudes Toward Same-Gender Parenting and Gay and Lesbian Rights in Portugal and in Mexico. *Journal of Homosexuality*, *66*(13), 1909–1926. doi: 10.1080/00918369.2018.1519303

Delozier, D. M. W., & Rodrigue, J. (1996). Marketing to the Homosexual (Gay) Market. *Journal of Homosexuality*, *31*(1-2), 203–212. doi: 10.1300/j082v31n01_12

Dotson, M. J., Hyatt, E. M., & Thompson, L. P. (2009). Sexual orientation and gender effects of exposure to gay- and lesbian-themed fashion advertisements. *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management: An International Journal*, *13*(3), 431–447. doi:10.1108/13612020910974537

Eisend, M., & Hermann, E. (2019). Consumer Responses to Homosexual Imagery in Advertising: A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Advertising*, *48*(4), 380–400. doi: 10.1080/00913367.2019.1628676

European Union. (2019). *Special Eurobarometer 493: Report on Discrimination in the European Union*. Brussels, Belgium: Directorate-General for Communication.

Falco, A., & Gandhi, S. (2020). The Rainbow Business. *Eidos*, *9*(1), 104-107. Retrieved from http://xaviers.edu.in/ojs3/index.php/eidos/article/view/109

Fejes, F. (2000). "Making a gay masculinity." *Critical Studies in Media Communication*, *17*(1), 113–116. doi: 10.1080/15295030009388382

Fisher, M. J., & Marshall, A. P. (2009). Understanding descriptive statistics. Australian Critical Care, 22(2), 93-97. doi:10.1016/j.aucc.2008.11.003

Fisher, R., Gee, G., & Looney, A. (2018). Same-Sex Married Tax Filers After Windsor and Obergefell. *Demography*, *55*(4), 1423–1446. doi: 10.1007/s13524-018-0684-5

Ginder, W., & Byun, S.-E. (2015). Past, Present, and Future of Gay and Lesbian Consumer Research: Critical Review of the Quest for the Queer Dollar. *Psychology & Marketing*, *32*(8), 821–841. doi: 10.1002/mar.20821

Goonatilake, R., Herath, A., Herath, S., Herath, S., & Herath, J. (2007). Intrusion detection using the chi-square goodness-of-fit test for information assurance, network, forensics and software security. *Journal of Computing Sciences in Colleges*, *23*(1), 255-263.

Gregorio, D., & Licar, E. (2006). Rural development and wine tourism in Southern Italy, presented at 46th Congress of the European Regional Science Association: "Enlargement, Southern Europe and the Mediterranean". Volos, Greece: European Regional Science Association (ERSA).

Guaracino, J., & Salvato, E. (2017). *Handbook of LGBT tourism and hospitality: a guide for business practice*. New York, NY: Harrington Park Press.

Gudelunas, D. (2010). Consumer myths and the gay men and women who believe them: a qualitative look at movements and markets. *Psychology and Marketing*, *28*(1), 53–68. doi: 10.1002/mar.20380

Hattingh, C., & Spencer, J. P. (2018). Homosexual not Homogeneous: A Motivation-Based Typology of Gay Leisure Travelers Holidaying in Cape Town, South Africa. *Journal of Homosexuality*, *67*(6), 768–792. doi: 10.1080/00918369.2018.1555393

Herrera, S. L., & Scott, D. (2005). “We Gotta Get Out Of This Place!” Leisure Travel Among Gay Men Living In A Small City. *Tourism Review International*, *8*(3), 249–262. doi: 10.3727/154427205774791564

Hester, J. B., & Gibson, R. (2007). Consumer Responses to Gay-Themed Imagery in Advertising. *Advertising & Amp; Society Review*, *8*(2). doi: 10.1353/asr.2007.0039

Hughes, H. (2002). Gay mens holiday destination choice: a case of risk and avoidance. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, *4*(4), 299–312. doi: 10.1002/jtr.382

Hughes, H. (2005). The Paradox of Gay Men as Tourists: Privileged or Penalized? *Tourism Culture & Communication*, *6*(1), 51–62. doi: 10.3727/109830405776746832

Jamieson, S. (2004). Likert scales: How to (ab)use them. *Medical Education, 38*(12), 1217-1218. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2929.2004.02012.x

Jordan, P. (2017). *Second Global Report on LGBT Tourism: affiliate members report: volume fifteen*. Madrid, Spain: World Tourism Organization (UNWTO).

Jordan, P. (2018). *Handbook on the lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and queer (LGBTQ) travel segment*. Brussels, Belgium: European Travel Commission (ETC).

Kates, S. M., & Belk, R. W. (2001). The Meanings of Lesbian and Gay Pride Day. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, *30*(4), 392–429. doi: 10.1177/089124101030004003

Lavandoski, J., Vargas-Sánchez, A., Pinto, P., & Silva, J. A. (2016). Causes and effects of wine tourism development in organizational context: The case of Alentejo, Portugal. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, *18*(1), 107–122. doi:10.1177/1467358416634159

Liberato, P., Liberato, D., Abreu, A., Alén, E., & Rocha, Á. (2018). LGBT Tourism: The Competitiveness of the Tourism Destinations Based on Digital Technology. *Advances in Intelligent Systems and Computing Trends and Advances in Information Systems and Technologies*, 264–276. doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-77703-0_27

LGBT Capital. (2018). *LGBT GDP, Wealth and Travel Data.* London, England: Galileo Capital Management.

Lopes, D., Oliveira, J. M. D., Nogueira, C., & Grave, R. (2016). The Social Determinants of Polymorphous Prejudice Against Lesbian and Gay Individuals: the Case of Portugal. *Sexuality Research and Social Policy*, *14*(1), 56–70. doi: 10.1007/s13178-016-0230-4

Lottes, I. L., & Alkula, T. (2011). An Investigation of Sexuality-Related Attitudinal Patterns and Characteristics Related to Those Patterns for 32 European Countries. *Sexuality Research and Social Policy*, *8*(2), 77–92. doi: 10.1007/s13178-011-0038-1

Mendos, L. R. (2019). *State-Sponsored Homophobia 2019: Global Legislation Overview Update*. Geneva, Switzerland: ILGA World.

Meyer, I. H. (2003). Prejudice, social stress, and mental health in lesbian, gay, and bisexual populations: Conceptual issues and research evidence. *Psychological Bulletin*, *129*(5), 674–697. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.129.5.674

Mitchell, R., & Hall, C. M. (2006). Wine Tourism Research: The State of Play. *Tourism Review International, 9*(4), 307-332. doi:10.3727/154427206776330535

Monteiro, R., Vieira, A. F. S., Daniel, F., Silva, A. G. D., & Matos, F. R. N. (2019). Measurement of attitudes in masculine organizational contexts. *Revista De Administração Pública*, *53*(5), 899–916. doi: 10.1590/0034-761220170155x

Oakenfull, G. K., & Greenlee, T. B. (2005). Queer eye for a gay guy: Using market-specific symbols in advertising to attract gay consumers without alienating the mainstream. *Psychology and Marketing*, *22*(5), 421–439. doi: 10.1002/mar.20066

Oakenfull, G. K., Mccarthy, M. S., & Greenlee, T. B. (2008). Targeting a Minority without Alienating the Majority: Advertising to Gays and Lesbians in Mainstream Media. *Journal of Advertising Research*, *48*(2), 191–198. doi: 10.2501/s0021849908080239

Oakenfull, G. W. (2013). What Matters: Factors Influencing Gay Consumers' Evaluations of "Gay-Friendly" Corporate Activities. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, *32*(1_suppl), 79–89. doi: 10.1509/jppm.12.050

Oliveira, J. M. D., Costa, C. G., & Nogueira, C. (2013). The Workings of Homonormativity: Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Queer Discourses on Discrimination and Public Displays of Affections in Portugal. *Journal of Homosexuality*, *60*(10), 1475–1493. doi: 10.1080/00918369.2013.819221

Pachankis, J. E., & Bränström, R. (2019). How many sexual minorities are hidden? Projecting the size of the global closet with implications for policy and public health. *Plos One*, *14*(6). doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0218084

Read, G. L., Driel, I. I. V., & Potter, R. F. (2018). Same-Sex Couples in Advertisements: An Investigation of the Role of Implicit Attitudes on Cognitive Processing and Evaluation. *Journal of Advertising*, *47*(2), 182–197. doi: 10.1080/00913367.2018.1452653

Ram, Y., Kama, A., Mizrachi, I., & Hall, C. M. (2019). The benefits of an LGBT-inclusive tourist destination. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*, *14*, 100374. doi: 10.1016/j.jdmm.2019.100374

Ro, H., Olson, E. D., & Choi, Y. (2017). An exploratory study of gay travelers: socio-demographic analysis. *Tourism Review*, *72*(1), 15–27. doi: 10.1108/tr-05-2016-0011

Rodrigues, L., Grave, R., Oliveira, J. M. D., & Nogueira, C. (2016). Study on homophobic bullying in Portugal using Multiple Correspondence Analysis (MCA). *Revista Latinoamericana De Psicología*, *48*(3), 191–200. doi: 10.1016/j.rlp.2016.04.001

Shan, L., Fu, S., & Zheng, L. (2017). Corporate sexual equality and firm performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, *38*(9), 1812–1826. doi: 10.1002/smj.2624

Silva, S. D., Cardoso, D. D., & Sousa, B. B. (2019). O papel do marketing no turismo LGBT: Um contributo exploratório no contexto português [The role of marketing in LGBT tourism: An exploratory contribution in the Portuguese context]. *Turismo E Sociedade, 11*(2). doi:10.5380/tes.v11i2.59436

Spartacus Travel. (2020). *Gay Travel Index 2020*. Berlin, Germany: Spartacus Travel.

Tuten, T. L. (2005). The Effect of Gay-Friendly and Non-Gay-Friendly Cues on Brand Attitudes: A Comparison of Heterosexual and Gay/Lesbian Reactions. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 21(3-4), 441-461. doi: 10.1362/0267257053779073

Tuten, T. L. (2006). Exploring the Importance of Gay-friendliness and its Socialization Influences. *Journal of Marketing Communications*, *12*(2), 79–94. doi: 10.1080/13527260500422263

Um, N.-H., Kim, K.-O., Kwon, E.-S., & Wilcox, D. (2013). Symbols or icons in gay-themed ads: How to target gay audience. *Journal of Marketing Communications*, *21*(6), 393–407. doi: 10.1080/13527266.2013.775179

Um, N.-H. (2014). Does gay-themed advertising haunt your brand? *International Journal of Advertising*, *33*(4), 811–832. doi: 10.2501/ija-33-4-811-832

Valentino, T. (Ed.). (2019, July 29). NCAD Spotlight: Understanding LGBTQ Inclusive vs. LGBTQ Affirmative Treatment Programs. Retrieved May 13, 2020, from https://www.psychcongress.com/article/ncad-spotlight-understanding-lgbtq-inclusive-vs-lgbtq-affirmative-treatment-programs

Variações. (2020). Proudly Portugal. Retrieved May 05, 2020, from https://variacoes.pt/proudly-portugal/

Variações. (n.d.). Missão. Retrieved May 05, 2020, from https://variacoes.pt/#missao

Vorobjovas-Pinta, O., & Hardy, A. (2015). The Evolution of Gay Travel Research. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, *18*(4), 409–416. doi: 10.1002/jtr.2059

7. Annex

7.1 Questionnaire

Section 1 – Traveler Profile

1. What is your preferred gender identity? (Check-all-that-apply question)

- Female
- Male
- Intersex
- Queer
- Transgender
- Other
- Prefer not to answer

2. What is your sexual orientation? (Check-all-that-apply question)

- Gay
- Lesbian
- Bisexual
- Straight
- Queer
- Other
- Prefer not to answer

3. How old are you? (Single answer multiple choice question)

- 18 – 25
- 26 – 35
- 36 – 45
- 46 – 55
- 56 – 65
- 66 – 75
- 75+

4. What is your current relationship status? (Check-all-that-apply question)

- Single
- In a monogamous relationship
- In a polygamous relationship
- In an open relationship
- Engaged
- Married
- Separated
- Widowed
- Divorced
- Prefer not to answer

5. Do you have children under 18? (Single answer multiple choice question)

- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3+

6. Do you have children over 18? (Single answer multiple choice question)

- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3+

7. Where do you live? (Single answer multiple choice question)

- Western Europe
- Eastern Europe
- North America
- Asia
- Australia & Pacific
- Central/South America
- Middle East
- Africa

8. Where are you from originally? (Single answer multiple choice question)

- Western Europe
- Eastern Europe
- North America
- Asia
- Australia & Pacific
- Central/South America
- Middle East
- Africa

9. How conservative is the region in which you currently reside? (5-point Likert scale)

- 1 – very conservative
- 2 – somewhat conservative
- 3 – neutral
- 4 – somewhat progressive
- 5 – very progressive

Section 2 – Traveler's Preference

10. What is your general budget when traveling? (Single answer multiple choice question)

- Luxury traveler
- Moderate price traveler, with a little luxury
- Moderate price traveler
- Budget traveler with occasional splurge
- Budget/economy traveler

11. What is your preferred mode of transportation when traveling? (Check-all-that-apply question)

- Public transportation (train, bus, metro... etc.)
- Taxi, Uber, or other ride sharing app.
- Car rental
- Hire a private driver
- Other; _____

12. What are your main motivations when selecting a holiday destination? (Check-all-that-apply question)

- Get immersed in the local culture
- Experience local cusine
- Visit specific monuments or cultural sites
- Visit wine-growing regions and taste local wines
- Attend LGBT events (pride, party, festival... etc.)
- Experience local nightlife
- Treat myself to high quality experiences
- Spend time with loved ones/family/friends
- Relax in nature (mountain, lake, beach... etc.)
- Partake in adventure activities (hiking, skiing, kayaking, cycling... etc.)
- Other; _____

13. Which of the following countries would you consider visiting in the next three years? (Check-all-that-apply question)

- France
- Germany
- Spain
- Portugal
- Italy
- Austria
- Hungary
- Georgia
- United States
- Canada
- Argentina
- Chile
- Uruguay
- South Africa
- Other; _____

14. Which of the following countries would you assume to be LGBT-friendly? (Check-all-that-apply question)

- France
- Germany
- Spain
- Portugal
- Italy
- Austria
- Hungary
- Georgia
- United States
- Canada
- Argentina
- Chile
- Uruguay
- South Africa

15. Would you be interested in visiting a wine region on your holiday? (Single answer multiple choice question)

- Yes
- No

Section 3 - Traveler's Interest in Guided Wine Tour
(Conditional: Would only appear if answered yes to question 15)

16. What is your level of interest in wine? (Single answer multiple choice question)

- I have no interest in wine and I don't consume wine.
- I have limited knowledge but I enjoy a glass of wine now and then.
- I have some basic knowledge and I take time to select a wine when purchasing.
- I am knowledgeable and I seek out specific wines.
- I have in-depth knowledge and I study wine on my free time.
- I am a wine professional.

17. Which wine regions would you like to visit in the next three years? (Open-ended question)

18. Would you be interested in booking a guided wine tour through a tour operator on your holiday? (Single answer multiple choice question)

- Yes
- No

19. What type of tour would you be interested in booking? (Check-all-that-apply question)

- Larger sized group tour (more than 8 guests)
- Smaller sized group tour (less than 8 guests)
- Private tour
- I would not book a tour

20. What is the length of the tour that you would most likely be interested in booking? (Check-all-that-apply question)

- Day tour
- 1 to 2 days
- 2 to 3 days
- More than 3 days
- I would not book a tour

Section 4 - Traveler's Preference in Tour Operator

Please rate the importance of each attribute when selecting a tour operator on a five-point Likert scale.

21. Value for money

22. Reviews on internet

23. Positive referrals from friends

24. Guarantee of safety – not experiencing discrimination and violence during your trip

25. LGBT-owned business

26. Advertise itself as LGBT-friendly

27. Tour operator's affiliation with gay rights or travel organization

28. Support LGBT community

29. Advertisements on LGBT print or internet media

30. Include members of LGBT community on marketing materials

31. Provide staff diversity training on sexual orientation and gender identity

32. Staff's knowledge of local LGBT history, community, and events

33. Staff's knowledge of local wines and wine regions

34. Employee tour guides who are members of the LGBT community

35. Possibility of socializing with other members of the LGBT community

36. What is the one thing that a tour operator could do that might prohibit you from booking or re-booking a tour through them? (Open-ended question)

Section 5 - Perception of Portugal

37. I consider Portugal to be a LGBT-friendly destination (5-point Likert scale)

- 1 – strongly disagree
- 2 – somewhat disagree
- 3 – neutral
- 4 – somewhat agree
- 5 – strongly agree

38. Have you visited Portugal in the past five years? (Single answer multiple choice question)

- Yes
- No

Section 6 – Perception of Portugal (Continued)

(Conditional: Would only appear if answered yes to question 38)

39. Which regions did you visit? (Check-all-that-apply question)

- Lisbon
- Porto
- Douro and North
- Center
- Algarve
- Alentejo
- Azores Islands
- Madeira Islands
- Other; _____

40. I think there is enough visibility of the LGBT community in Portugal. (5-point Likert scale)

- 1 – strongly disagree
- 2 – somewhat disagree
- 3 – neutral
- 4 – somewhat agree
- 5 – strongly agree

41. What is your experience as a LGBT traveler in Portugal? (Open-ended question)