

Slow Tourists: A Comparative Research Based on Cittaslow Principles

H. Ridvan YURTSEVEN, Ph.D.

Professor

Canakkale Onsekiz Mart University
Gokceada School of Applied Sciences
Gokceada, Canakkale, TURKEY

Ozan KAYA, Ph.D.

Research Assistant

Canakkale Onsekiz Mart University
School of Tourism and Hotel Management
Canakkale, TURKEY

Abstract

Slow Food is a non-profit, eco-gastronomic, member-supported organization founded in 1989 to counteract Fast Food and fast life. A further development of Slow Food is the Cittaslow Movement, which builds on the ideas of Slow Food but extends the philosophy to cities and destinations. Slow Tourism has evolved as an extension of slow philosophy to encompass travel and tourism activities. Slow Tourism can be discussed from a consumer behavior, marketing or sustainable tourism perspective. Not much research has yet been done on the slow tourists. The main objective of this paper is determining who slow tourists are. Therefore, the empirical research has been realized in Seferihisar where is the first Cittaslow and slow destination in Turkey. According to the Cittaslow principles, Seferihisar visitors are categorized into three different types: dedicated, interested, and accidental slow tourists. Results show that, there are statistically significant differences between whole attractiveness means of slow tourist types.

Key Words: Cittaslow, Slowness, Slow Food, Slow Tourism, Slow Tourist

1. Introduction

One of today's trends in the field of tourism is called Slow Tourism. To be genuine, Slow Tourism must follow two essential principles: taking time and attachment to a particular place. Taking time means modification of the daily time relationship, specifically a different perception of nature and living in harmony with a place, its inhabitants, and their culture. The environment is not merely perceived by sight, but by using all five senses. Tourists must be able to change pace, to look rather than to see, to experience the area rather than to endure it (Matos, 2004). The guiding philosophy of slow then is partly an antithesis to fast, but there is also a connectedness with ecology and sustainable development which comes from an interest in locality and place as well as from strands of green travel (Dickinson, 2009; Dickinson and Lumsdon, 2010). Sustainable development, which includes economic, environmental, and socio-cultural sustainability, should be perceived as a pillar of the philosophy of Slow Tourism (Matos, 2004).

Slowness is an effective concept of Slow Tourism. Slow Food underlines the philosophy of slowness. It is dedicated to a food that is based on the principles of high quality and taste, environmental sustainability, and social justice in essence, a food system that is good, clean, and fair. Slow Food seeks to catalyze a broad cultural shift away from the destructive effects of an industrial food system and fast life; toward the regenerative cultural, ecological, social, and economic benefits of a sustainable food system, regional food traditions, the pleasures of the table, and a slower and more harmonious rhythm of life (Croce and Perri, 2010; Parkins and Craig, 2006; Petrini, 2003, 2007, 2010). Cittaslow, which means slow city, is an international network of small towns that originated in Italy less than a decade ago with the aim of addressing the Slow Food philosophy in their urban design and planning. The network is proliferating in many other countries, in Europe and in other continents, and there are 141 Cittaslow towns around the world (Miele, 2010; Pink, 2008). A Cittaslow agrees to work towards a set of goals that aim to improve the quality of life of its citizens and its visitors, and to share good ideas, experiences and knowledge across the national and international Cittaslow networks (Heitmann, Robinson and Povey, 2011; Hoeschele, 2010; Miele, 2010).

In the Cittaslow Statute signed in Orvieto on 15 October 1999 by Carlo Petrini, founder and President of Slow Food and Cittaslow, and the Mayors of Bra, Greve in Chianti, Orvieto and Positano, it is clearly specified that Cittaslow towns are those where (Knox, 2005; Mayer and Knox, 2009; Pink, 2007, 2008): an environmental policy is carried on with the aim of maintaining and developing the characteristics of the territory and the urban fabric, starting with techniques for salvaging and recycling; an infrastructure policy is implemented that will make the most of the territory and not its occupation; a proper use of new technology is promoted to improve the quality of the environment and the urban fabric; the production and use of natural and organic food products produced with techniques that respect the environment, with the exclusion of transgenic products, is stimulated, and if necessary Controlling Bodies to protect and to develop typical production at risk are set up; indigenous products rooted in the culture and traditions and that contribute to the identification of the territory are safeguarded, maintaining sites and manner of production and keeping consumers and quality producers in direct contact; the quality of hospitality is promoted as an important link to the community and its unique characteristics, eliminating structural and cultural obstacles that might jeopardize a total usage and a proper diffusion of the town's resources; an awareness is promoted among all citizens and operators, an awareness that they live in a Cittaslow town, focused particularly on young people and schools through a systematic education in taste.

For a town to become a member, the population must number less than 50.000 and comply with a list of criteria covering the six pillars of environmental policies, infrastructural policies, technologies and facilities for urban quality, safeguarding autochthonous production, hospitality and awareness (Heitmann, Robinson and Povey, 2011). Slow Tourism emphasizes an engagement with place, encouraging travelers to establish local routines, indulge in local cuisines, and become connoisseurs of local culture. Slow Tourism encapsulates a range of lifestyle practices that are connected to social movements such as Slow Food and Cittaslow. Slow Tourism can be considered from several different perspectives. The first central element of tourism activity is the necessity for transport and travel to a new place. Second, the slow philosophy shares common characteristics with sustainable tourism. Third, Slow Tourism as a product requires a discussion on the value that the label slow attaches to a product or service. Finally, we need to establish who the slow tourist is and highlight ideas on how slow fits in with theories of consumer behavior (Heitmann, Robinson and Povey, 2011). Not much research has yet been done on the slow tourists. The objectives of this paper are defining Slow Tourism in the light of Slow Food and Cittaslow, and determining who slow tourists are. Therefore, the empirical research has been realized in Seferihisar where is the first Cittaslow and slow destination in Turkey.

2. Methodology

The research data were obtained through a questionnaire that consists of four sections. Closed multiple-choice and five-point scale questions in the first section determine the information sources from which visitors had found out about the Seferihisar and effect of sources on choosing Seferihisar for their holiday. The second section of questionnaire defines the importance of primary and secondary attractiveness elements that include five point scale expressions (Kozak and Rimmington, 1998; Laws, 1995) for choosing Seferihisar as a slow destination. The third section was composed of 5-point Likert Scale statements adapted by Cittaslow Charter (1999) to classify the Seferihisar visitors based on Cittaslow principles. The last part of the questionnaire includes personal questions explored the demographic and socio-economic profile, and travel behavior characteristics of Seferihisar visitors.

The pilot research was conducted with 20 randomly selected visitors in June 2010. After the pilot research, some small modifications on design of questionnaire were done. The population of the research was Seferihisar visitors in July and August 2010. Convenience sampling method was used. Visitors answered questionnaires by self or by interviewers in order to maximize response rates. 450 questionnaires were distributed and yielded 391 valid responses (86,80%). Sample size is large enough for 95 % confidence and 5% error. The questionnaires were collated and analyzed by using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences Program (SPSS). Cluster analysis for separating Seferihisar visitors into clusters of Cittaslow principles, and one-way ANOVA tests for finding out mean differences between the visitor types' destination attractiveness were employed. Cronbach's Alpha reliability tests were performed. The results of the tests were 0,957 for the visitor types based on Cittaslow principles, and 0,626 for the destination attractiveness.

3. Main Contributions

3.1 Slow Tourist Types based on Cittaslow Principles

Cittaslow principles were used to cluster analyze the sample to determine slow tourist types of Seferihisar visitors. K-means clustering approach was used and classifications from two to six clusters were examined.

The three-cluster solution was chosen, because it offered both the most even spread of respondents and the clearest interpretation. The largest visitor type (62,40%) based on Cittaslow principles had high mean scores (4,50). This visitor type was labeled Dedicated Slow Tourists (DST). The second visitor type (27,63%) that had low mean scores (3,50) for all principles was labeled Interested Slow Tourists (IST). The last type of visitors (9,97%) was labeled as Accidental Slow Tourists (AST) that had lowest mean scores (2,31). Table 1 shows the mean scores for each of the three clusters for the 15 principles of Cittaslow.

3.2 Profiles of Slow Tourist Types

The profiles of slow tourist types are outlined in Table 2. There are more male (54,00%), married (52,20) and young (55,00% of the sample is 15-34 years old) visitors than female (46,00%), single (47,80%) and middle aged (38,90% is 35-54 years old) or old (6,10% is 55-64 years old). Level of education is skewed toward the high end of the continuum, with 62,20% reported having graduated from vocational college, university or higher. More than half (58,60) reported a monthly personal income between 500€-1500€. Almost half of slow tourists are owner/manager/executive (22,30%), teacher/engineer/doctor (21,50%) and clerical staff (14,10%).

3.3 Travel Behaviors of Slow Tourist Types

Travel behaviors of slow tourist types are shown in Table 3. With regard to membership in a group, majority of the sample (44,50%) visited Seferihisar with their family. In the category of the number of previous visits to Seferihisar, 60,10% of the visitors did not have previous experience with the area. Almost 62,20% of slow tourists visited 1 to 2 times. Furthermore, 15,4 0% of the respondents visited 3 times, whereas 22,40% visited 4 times or more. Most of the respondents (82,40%) reported that they didn't use travel agency for their Seferihisar travel. In terms of distance traveled by slow tourists, the largest group of visitors (57,60%) traveled 500 km. or less, the middle group (29,90%) traveled 501 to 1000 km., and the smallest group (12,50%) traveled 1000 km. or more. 41,20% of sample preferred pensions for their accommodation. Similarly, 39,40% preferred bed and breakfast as pension type. Lastly, regarding to expenditure of slow tourists, almost half of respondents (48,30%) spent less than € 250, followed by € 251- € 500 (37,30%) and € 501-€ 750 (12,00%). Only 2,30% of the visitors spent more than €751. Information sources about Seferihisar used by the slow tourists are listed in Table 4. The sample most often turns to friends (49,60%), family (46,30%), TV news and discussion programs (34,80%), inter-net (17,10%) and co-workers (14,10%). Seferihisar visitors appear to make more organic information (family and friends) and affected them during their decision process.

3.4 Slow Tourist Types and Destination Attractiveness

Data concerning to destination attractiveness allow the application of One-Way Analyses of Variance (ANOVA). Therefore, one-way ANOVA tests were used to analyze averaged scores of the level of destination attractiveness factors. The purpose of one-way ANOVA test is to find out whether three means differ significantly for the groups: Dedicated Slow Tourists, Interested Slow Tourists, and Accidental Slow Tourists. The statistically differences are noted and given a preliminary explanation. Table 5 shows slow tourist types and destination attractiveness. With regard to destination attractiveness items, whole items were found statistically significant: Variety of things to see in the region ($F= 57,827, p <0.000$), protected traditional architecture ($F= 126,711, p <0.000$), variety of cultural events ($F= 117,952, p <0.000$), existence of tasting local food and drink opportunity ($F= 25,923, p <0.000$), popularity of the area ($F= 80,387, p <0.000$), bustling ambient ($F= 84,821, p <0.000$), different culture of the region ($F= 41,776, p <0.000$), to have opportunity to see natural life ($F= 62,386, p <0.000$), protected local culture ($F= 56,828, p <0.000$), variety of accommodation services ($F= 25,707, p <0.000$), variety of car rental services ($F= 98,948, p <0.000$), variety of travel agencies ($F= 97,044, p <0.000$), to be close to see side ($F= 4,131, p <0.05$), nightlife ($F= 65,472, p <0.05$), variety of shopping facilities ($F= 7,996, p <0.05$).

Then, we applied Tukey honestly significant differences (Tukey HSD) post hoc tests that correct for multiple comparisons to identify significant differences between groups and destination attractiveness items. Findings of Tukey HSD tests indicate Dedicated Slow Tourists pay more importance to cultural, environmental, historical local values (items: 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 13) of the town than Interested Slow Tourists and Accidental Slow Tourists. However, Accidental Slow Tourists have the highest scores in secondary attractiveness items (items: 5, 6, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15). In the other hand, Interested Slow Tourists as Dedicated Slow Tourists depicted higher scores related to cultural, environmental, historical values of the region.

4. Conclusion

The Slow Food and Cittaslow movements are not directly aimed at tourism and thus are not about tourism or destination marketing. However, they can influence local tourism in two ways.

First, they can have an influence on destination development; and second, the brand Slow can bring a quality reputation with it. Subsequently, Slow Tourism and its associates, Slow Food and Cittaslow, can make use of the label slow to attract quality tourists and quality tourism development (Heitmann, Robinson and Povey, 2011). Tourism development, according to the slow philosophy, brings together processes guided by a slow ideology that influence the quality of a destination's appearance and environment, as well as its public image (Heitmann, Robinson and Povey, 2011). In terms of destination-specific resources, the attractions mainly build on cultural heritage such as historical buildings, pedestrian streets, street markets and gastronomy. While the focus is more on the supply side and less on the demand side, marketing has not been explored by any Cittaslow yet-this omission might be intentional in order to avoid too much tourism, or due to a lack of skills. Nevertheless, the concept indirectly influences segmentation (Heitmann, Robinson and Povey, 2011).

The main purpose of this research was to determine profile of slow tourists and their travel behaviors. For this purpose, we selected Seferihisar where is the first Cittaslow in Turkey as the research area. According to Cittaslow principles, Seferihisar visitors were categorized into three different types: Dedicated Slow Tourists, Interested Slow Tourists, and Accidental Slow Tourists. Results showed that, there were statistically significant differences between whole attractiveness means of visitor types.

Dedicated Slow Tourists;

- are open to slow experiences and discover new and different cultures and identities,
- are educated, and have a good cultural knowledge and slow philosophy,
- are independent traveler,
- have high expectation with regard to the region they are visiting,
- enjoy eco-gastronomy.

There were numerous similarities between Dedicated Slow Tourists and Interested Slow Tourists. Interested Slow Tourists have moderate to high interest in slowness, Slow Food, and Cittaslow. On the contrary, Accidental Slow Tourists got highest means related with mass tourism components. They see slowness as a tourist attraction of the town visited. But their interest aroused by general tourism promotion. The consumer's interest is a distinctive point in Slow Food, Cittaslows and subsequently Slow Tourism. Slow Tourism is the possible segmentation of the market-quality products and services aimed at the (environmentally or culturally) conscious consumer. Furthermore, the close link between Cittaslow and Slow Food influences Slow Tourism and potential marketing activities through a common brand identity that can benefit any slow products and services (Croce and Perri, 2010; Heitmann, Robinson and Povey, 2011). Just as the Slow Food and Cittaslow movements oppose Fast Food and globalization, Slow Tourism can be considered to be the antidote to mass tourism and the subsequent mass tourism development and commodification of local culture to cater for mass tourists. This does not mean that Slow Tourism can be considered niche tourism. Instead, it is suggested that the meaning of slow is applied to destination management, business operations and consumer behavior to create a change of status quo to oppose existing tourism ontologies (Heitmann, Robinson and Povey, 2011).

References

- Cittaslow (1999). Cittaslow International Charter. Orvieto-Italy: International Cittaslow.
- Croce, E., & Perri, G. (2010). Food and Wine Tourism. Cambridge: CAB International.
- Dickinson, J. (2009). Adapting Tourism For a Lower Carbon Future: A Slow Travel Approach. In M. Landre(Edt.), Transport and Tourism: Challenges, Issues and Conflicts (pp. 32-45). Rotterdam-Breda, the Netherlands: The Travel And Tourism Research Association Europe.
- Dickinson, J., & Lumsdon, L. (2010). Slow Travel and Tourism. London-Washington, DC: Earthscan Publications Ltd.
- Heitmann, S., Robinson, P., & Povey, G. (2011). Slow Food, Slow Cities and Slow Tourism. In P. Robinson, S. Heitmann, & and P. Dieke (Eds.), Research Themes for Tourism (pp.114-127). UK: CAB International.
- Hoeschele, W. (2010). Measuring Abundance: The Case of Cittaslow's Attempts to Support Better Quality of Life. *International Journal of Green Economics*, 4 (1), 63-81.
- Knox, P. (2005). Creating Ordinary Places: Slow Cities in a Fast World. *Journal of Urban Design*, 10 (1), 1-11.
- Kozak, M., & Rimmington, M. (1998). Benchmarking: Destination Attractiveness and Small Hospitality Business Performance. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 10 (5), 184-188.
- Laws, E. (1995). *Tourist Destination Management: Issues, Analysis and Policies*. NY: Routledge.

- Matos, R. (2004). Can Slow Tourism Bring New life to Alpine Regions?. In K. Weirmair, & C. Mathies (Eds.), *The Tourism and Leisure Industry Shaping the Future* (pp. 93-104). USA: Routledge.
- Mayer, H., & Knox, P. L. (2009). *Pace of Life and Quality of Life: The Slow City Charter*. Community Quality-of-Life Indicators, 1, 21-40.
- Miele, M. (2008). CittaSlow: Producing Slowness against the Fast Life. *Space and Polity*, 12 (1),135-156.
- Parkins, W., & Craig, G. (2006). *Slow Living*. Oxford: Berg.
- Petrini, C. (2003). *Slow Food: The Case for Taste*. New York Chichester, West Sussex: Columbia University Press.
- Petrini, C. (2007). *Slow Food Nation: Why Our Food Should Be Good, Clean, and Fair*. New York: Rizzoli Ex Libris.
- Petrini, C. (2010). *Terra Madre: Forging a New Global Network of Sustainable Food Communities*. USA: Chelsea Green Publishing.
- Pink, S. (2007). Sensing CittaSlow: Slow Living and The Constitution of The Sensory City. *The Senses and Society*, 2 (1), 59–77.
- Pink, S. (2008). Sense and Sustainability: The Case of the Slow City Movement. *Local Environment*, 13 (2), 95-106.

Table 1: Slow Tourist Types based on Cittaslow Principles

Cittaslow Principles		DST	IST	AST
1	Ban on the use of O.G.M. in agriculture.	4,84	4,17	3,46
2	Plans for improving and for the reclamation of historical centers and/or works of cultural or historical value.	4,59	3,91	2,03
3	Quality green areas and service infrastructures (interconnecting green areas, play grounds, etc.).	4,61	3,89	2,23
4	Plan for the distribution of merchandise and the creation of commercial centers for natural products.	4,48	3,56	2,08
5	Agreement with the shopkeepers with regards to the reception and assistance to citizens in trouble: friendly shops.	4,35	3,74	2,54
6	Plans for the development of organic farming.	4,75	3,81	3,08
7	Certification of the quality of artisan produced products and objects and artistic crafts.	4,36	2,97	1,74
8	Programs for the safeguarding of artisan and/or artistic craft products in danger of extinction.	4,49	3,09	2,10
9	Safeguarding traditional methods of work and professions at a risk of extinction.	4,47	3,07	2,03
10	Use of organic products and/or those produced in the territory and the preservation of local traditions in restaurants, protected structures, and school cafeterias.	4,60	3,56	2,79
11	Favoring the activities of wine and gastronomic Slow Food Presidia for species and preparations risking extinction.	4,41	3,42	2,05
12	Census of the typical products of the territory and support of their commercialization (updating of markets for local products, creation of appropriate spaces).	4,39	3,53	1,77
13	Promoting and preserving local cultural events.	4,36	3,63	2,05
14	Training courses for tourist information and quality hospitality.	4,47	3,81	2,59
15	Preparation of slow itineraries of the city (brochures, websites, home pages, etc.).	4,35	3,69	2,15
Overall		4,50	3,59	2,31
N (391)		244	108	39

Table 2: Profiles of Slow Tourist Types

Elements	DST		IST		AST		Total	
	N	%	n	%	n	%	N	%
Sex								
Male	149	38,1	46	11,8	16	4,1	211	54,0
Female	95	24,3	62	15,9	23	5,9	180	46,0
Marital Status								
Married	142	36,3	47	12,0	15	3,8	204	52,2
Single	102	26,1	61	15,6	24	6,15	187	47,8
Level of Education								
Primary School	16	4,1	9	2,3	8	2,0	33	8,4
High school	68	17,4	25	6,4	22	5,6	115	29,4
Vocational College	19	4,9	20	5,1	3	0,8	42	10,7
University	113	28,9	50	12,8	6	1,5	169	43,2
Master	21	5,4	4	1,0	-	-	25	6,4
Doctorate	7	1,8	-	-	-	-	7	1,8
Age								
15-24	29	7,4	26	6,6	8	2,0	63	16,1
25-34	91	23,3	46	11,8	15	3,8	152	38,9
35-44	74	18,9	22	5,6	13	3,3	109	27,9
45-54	32	8,2	8	2,0	3	0,7	43	11,0
55-64	18	4,6	6	1,5	-	-	24	6,1
Monthly Personal Income								
Less than € 500	60	15,3	32	8,2	12	3,1	104	26,6
€ 500 - € 1.000	105	26,9	44	11,3	7	1,8	156	39,9
€ 1001-€1500	40	10,2	21	5,4	12	3,1	73	18,7
€ 1501-€2000	18	4,6	8	2,0	5	1,3	31	7,9
€ 2001-€2500	14	3,6	1	0,3	3	0,8	18	4,6
€2501 and higher	7	1,8	2	0,5	-	-	9	2,3
Occupation								
Owner/Manager/Executive	45	11,5	27	6,9	15	3,8	87	22,3
Teacher/Engineer/Doctor	68	17,4	16	4,1	-	-	84	21,5
Clerical Staff	34	8,7	19	4,1	2	0,5	55	14,1
Worker	7	1,8	6	1,5	4	1	17	4,3
Student	19	4,9	19	4,9	4	1,0	42	10,7
Retired	23	5,9	10	2,6	-	-	33	8,4
Housewife	27	6,9	8	2,0	5	2,0	40	10,2
Other	10	2,6	2	0,5	5	1,3	17	4,3
Unemployed	11	2,8	1	0,3	4	1,0	16	4,1

Table 3: Travel Behaviors of Slow Tourist Types

Elements	DST		IST		AST		Total	
	N	%	n	%	n	%	N	%
Membership in a Group								
Alone	15	3,8	4	1,0	-	-	19	4,9
With wife/husband	54	13,8	19	4,9	9	2,3	82	21,0
Family	121	30,9	45	11,5	8	2,0	174	44,5
Friends	41	10,5	23	5,9	19	4,9	83	21,2
With boyfriend/girlfriend	12	3,1	15	3,8	2	0,5	29	7,4
Others	1	0,3	2	0,5	1	0,3	4	1,0
Past Experience at Seferihisar								
Yes	115	29,4	39	10,0	2	0,5	156	39,9
No	129	33,0	69	17,6	37	9,5	235	60,1
Number of Visiting (n=156)								
1	39	25,0	11	7,1	-	-	50	32,1
2	32	20,5	14	9,0	1	0,6	47	30,1
3	21	13,5	3	1,9	-	-	24	15,4
4 or more	23	14,7	11	7,1	1	0,6	35	22,4
Usage of Travel Agency								
Yes	12	3,1	25	6,4	32	8,2	69	17,6
No	232	59,3	83	21,2	7	1,8	322	82,4
Distance of Travel								
250 km. or less	99	25,3	44	11,3	7	1,8	150	38,4
251km.-500 km.	56	14,3	17	4,3	2	0,5	75	19,2
501km.-750 km.	44	11,3	23	5,9	17	4,3	84	21,5
751km.-1000 km.	21	5,4	10	2,6	2	0,5	33	8,4
1001 km. or more	24	6,1	17	3,6	11	2,8	49	12,5
Length of Stay								
1-3 days	80	20,5	42	10,7	9	2,3	131	33,5
4-6 days	72	18,4	15	3,8	16	4,1	103	26,3
7 days or more	92	26,5	51	13,0	14	3,6	157	40,2
Type of Accommodation								
Hotel	44	11,3	38	9,7	32	8,2	117	29,2
Motel	10	2,6	1	0,3	-	-	11	2,8
Pension	117	29,9	39	10,0	5	1,3	161	41,2
Tent/Outdoor	25	6,4	16	4,1	-	-	41	10,5
Local house	43	11,0	12	3,1	-	-	55	14,1
Caravan	1	0,3	1	0,3	1	0,3	3	0,8
Others	4	1,0	1	0,3	1	0,3	6	1,5
Pension Types								
Room only	68	17,4	32	8,2	2	0,5	102	26,1
Bed and breakfast	113	28,9	37	9,5	4	1,0	154	39,4
Half board	34	8,7	8	2,0	5	1,3	47	12,0
Full Board	5	1,3	2	0,5	-	-	7	1,8
All inclusive	24	6,1	29	7,4	28	7,2	81	20,7
Expenditure								
Less than € 250	138	35,3	44	11,3	7	1,8	189	48,3
€ 251- € 500	79	20,2	47	12,0	20	5,1	146	37,3
€ 501- € 750	23	5,9	12	3,1	12	3,1	47	12,0
More than € 751	4	1,0	5	1,3	-	-	9	2,3

Table 4: Information Sources and Its Affects on Destination Choice

Information sources of Visitors (n=391)*			Affects of Information Sources on Destination Choice**	
Sources	n	%	Mean	SD
Family	181	46,3	3,0691	1,68792
Friends	194	49,6	3,4527	1,49947
Co-workers	55	14,1	2,0921	1,43463
TV News and Discussion Programs	136	34,8	2,5013	1,53569
Movies	10	2,6	1,5115	0,92223
Documentaries	10	2,6	1,5448	98054
Newspapers and Magazines	27	6,9	1,9156	1,29319
Books	3	0,8	1,3913	0,75977
Travel Agencies	43	11,0	1,8286	1,31219
Internet	67	17,1	2,4194	1,47389
Others	4	1,0		

*Multiple responses

** 5-point scale (1=not affect me, 5=affect me)

Table 5: Slow Tourist Types and Destination Attractiveness

No	Elements	ANOVA					Tukey HSD	
		Mean			F	P	B	p
		DST	IST	AST				
1	Variety of things to see in the region	4,3361	3,9352	2,7692	57,827	0,000	AST- DST AST-IST DST- IST	0,000 0,000 0,000
2	Protected traditional architecture	4,3115	3,7500	2,0513	126,711	0,000	AST- DST AST-IST DST- IST	0,000 0,000 0,000
3	Variety of cultural events	4,1066	3,5556	1,7436	117,952	0,000	AST- DST AST-IST DST- IST	0,000 0,000 0,000
4	Existence of tasting local food and drink opportunity	4,2541	3,9074	3,0513	25,923	0,000	AST- DST AST-IST DST- IST	0,000 0,000 0,008
5	Popularity of the area	1,7828	2,3333	4,4103	80,387	0,000	AST- DST AST-IST DST- IST	0,000 0,000 0,000
6	Bustling ambient	1,8361	2,5741	4,5385	84,821	0,000	AST- DST AST-IST DST- IST	0,000 0,000 0,000
7	Different culture of the region	3,8934	3,6944	2,4359	41,776	0,000	AST- DST AST-IST	0,000 0,000
8	To have opportunity to see natural life	4,2336	3,7685	2,6410	62,386	0,000	AST- DST AST-IST DST- IST	0,000 0,000 0,000
9	Protected local culture	4,3361	3,7870	2,7949	56,828	0,000	AST- DST AST-IST DST- IST	0,000 0,000 0,000
10	Variety of accommodation services	2,6844	2,6019	4,1795	25,707	0,000	AST- DST AST-IST	0,000 0,000
11	Variety of car rental services	1,7623	2,3889	4,4359	98,948	0,000	AST- DST AST-IST DST- IST	0,000 0,000 0,000
12	Variety of travel agencies	1,7910	2,5556	4,5385	97,044	0,000	AST- DST AST-IST DST- IST	0,000 0,000 0,000
13	To be close to see side	4,0369	4,1574	4,5128	4,131	0,017	AST- DST	0,014
14	Nightlife	1,9262	2,5741	4,4359	65,472	0,000	AST- DST AST-IST DST- IST	0,000 0,000 0,000
15	Variety of shopping facilities	2,6680	2,6944	3,4615	7,996	0,000	AST- DST AST-IST	0,000 0,001

* Significant at < 0.05