OECONOMIA
COPERNICANA

VOLUME 14 ISSUE 2 JUNE 2023

p-ISSN 2083-1277, e-ISSN 2353-1827
www.oeconomia.pl

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Citation: Gallardo-Vázquez, D. (2023). Attributes influencing responsible tourism consumer choices: Sustainable local food and drink, health-related services, and entertainment. *Oeconomia Copernicana, 14*(2), 645–686. doi: 10.24136/oc.2023.018

Contact to corresponding author: Dolores Gallardo-Vázquez, dgallard@unex.es

Article history: Received: 5.03.2023; Accepted: 15.06.2023; Published online: 30.06.2023

Dolores Gallardo-Vázquez
University of Extremadura, Spain
orcid.org/0000-0003-4749-6034

Attributes influencing responsible tourism consumer choices: Sustainable local food and drink, health-related services, and entertainment

JEL Classification: *M10; M11; M14*

Keywords: *sustainability; responsible service; local food; health-related service; entertainment; responsible consumption*

Abstract

Research background: This research focused on identifying attributes of tourism services which are guided by a responsible vision and which seek to achieve consumer satisfaction with products that respect sustainability principles. Responsible consumer choices were defined as those formed by an orientation toward sustainable local food and drink, health-related services, and entertainment.
Purpose of the article: This research had two aims. The first was to create and validate a measurement scale assessing tourists' motivations with regard to three responsible tourism service dimensions. The second was to evaluate how tourists' responsible choices affect their satisfaction.

Methods: The methodology included exploratory factor analysis, confirmatory factor analysis, and structural equation modeling to test the hypothesis developed based on a literature review. The convenience sample was made up of tourism service users.
Findings & value added: The results include a broad measurement tool that can be applied in other fields of research to detect which variables influence consumer satisfaction. The proposed model incorporates significant determining factors, namely, key aspects affecting tourism service selection by clients focused on sustainability and responsible consumption. Based on a market orientation (MO) perspective, the findings contribute to the existing literature on stakeholder theory (ST) and dynamic capability theory (DCT). The value added comprises a better understanding of responsible tourism consumers' choices based on a three-part theoretical framework (i.e., MO, ST, and DCT).

Introduction

Responsible consumption is an integral part of the United Nations' sustainable development (SD) goals as it contributes to the achievement of long-term SD (Jain *et al*., 2022; Patwary, 2023). Consumers who incorporate social and environmental values into their buying decisions engage in responsible consumption regardless of the sector in which their purchases take place (Do Paço *et al*., 2019; Vlastelica *et al*., 2023). Individuals' values reflect their personal objectives and influence how their beliefs are expressed through responsible behavior (Yuriev *et al*., 2020).

In tourism, consumers' activities during their stay and the facilities created to satisfy these clients' needs constitute the basis of value creation, so these behaviors and amenities are fundamental components of communities' SD and sustainable consumption (Cannas *et al*., 2019; García-Sánchez *et al*., 2020; Ogutu *et al*., 2023; Yang *et al*., 2022). The tourism industry contributes in positive ways to the planet's sustainability (Björk & Kauppinen-Räisänen, 2019; Kang *et al*., 2012; Line & Hanks, 2016; Stefko *et al*., 2020) by exploiting the business opportunities created when the public demands sustainable products and services and thus maximizing tourism services' positive impacts and minimizing their negative ones (Hong *et al*., 2019; Jain *et al*., 2022). This pattern constitutes another expression of responsible consumer behavior (Ivanova *et al*., 2019) in which consumers' attitudes and behaviors are essential to generating positive social, economic, and environmental impacts when they choose sustainable services.

Stakeholder theory (ST) suggests that implementing sustainability policies generates value for tourism companies, the local communities in which these firms operate, and tourism consumers. These tourists' positive relationship with destinations' environments and their attributes (e.g., resi-

dents and local suppliers' products) is extremely important as tourism consumer satisfaction benefits locals and tourism activity providers (Alderighi, Bianchi, & Lorenzini, 2016; Björk & Kauppinen-Räisänen, 2019; Line & Hanks, 2016; Vlastelica *et al*., 2023).

Sustainability initiatives ensure tourists and host regions' needs are met, protecting and fostering future opportunities (Font *et al*., 2021) while contributing to SD. Sustainable tourism focuses on finding a balance between the maximum use of destinations' economic, social, cultural, and natural resources; visitors' satisfaction; and negative impacts on host communities or the environment (Chen *et al*., 2020; Molina-Azorín & Font, 2015).

The present study was based on this perspective as shown by the research question addressed: In SD contexts, what tourism product attributes can respond to consumers' social responsibility motivations and increase these tourists' satisfaction? This research thus sought to determine which features guide consumers' choice of more sustainable services and how these aspects influence tourists' satisfaction.

The dimensions that correspond to responsible consumption were defined as local food and drink, health-related services, and entertainment. The goal was to achieve the research aims in two steps. The first was to create and validate a measurement scale assessing tourists' motivations with regard to the three dimensions of responsible services. The second step was to evaluate how tourists' choices influence their satisfaction. The data were subjected to exploratory factor analysis (EFA) and confirmatory factor analysis (CFA), as well as structural equation modeling (SEM), in order to test the research hypothesis.

The sample comprised a set of tourism service users selected based on convenience criteria from the target population. The participants were drawn from groups that were more immediately available, including colleagues involved in this research project and known for their active involvement in social or professional networks. The data were collected in 2019 in the Extremadura region of Spain and processed during 2020.

The results include a broad measurement tool that can be applied in other areas of research and a confirmation of the positive relationship between responsible service and tourist satisfaction. The findings make four specific contributions to the existing literature. First, the literature on ST and sustainability shows that the search for SD has become the rule for organizations, so managers consider having the ability to guide consumer choices and contribute to sustainability of great value. Second, this study's

novel market orientation (MO) based on dynamic capability theory (DCT) can be applied by service providers to encourage consumers to make more sustainable choices. Third, the measurement tool developed produced data that confirmed the hypothesis postulated, thereby adding to other previously developed scales with different but complementary approaches (Hong *et al*., 2019; Ivanova *et al*., 2019; Jain *et al*., 2022). Last, the findings contribute to improving theoretical and methodological frameworks in tourism research and have implications for tourism management and tourism consumer choices.

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows. The second section presents the theoretical background of the study's framework. The third section explains the conceptual model and research hypothesis. The methodology used to conduct the empirical research is described in the fourth section, while the results are discussed in the fifth section. The final section contains this study's conclusions and limitations, as well as suggestions for future research.

Literature review

Growing wealth around the world has contributed to increasingly excessive consumption, yet experts warn that resources are being depleted and underscore the need for responsible consumption (Jain *et al*., 2022; Quoquab *et al*., 2019). The latter is a more conscious use of assets based on knowledge and value judgments in order to prevent further environmental degradation (Jain *et al*., 2022). Responsible consumption also seeks to meet social needs and to be economically viable (Gupta *et al*., 2020; Phang *et al*., 2021).

The current research shared multiple authors' vision that proximity between the places where products are manufactured and consumed favors local consumption and enhances processes' sustainability and responsible value (Hubacek *et al*., 2016; Quoquab *et al*., 2019). This approach reduces greenhouse gas emissions and increases energy savings, with subsequent favorable effects on the environment (Blake, 2019). Thus, goods that are manufactured and consumed locally constitute the basis of responsible consumption (Jain *et al*., 2022; Sadollah *et al*., 2020).

Tourism, like all other sectors, needs to strengthen socially responsible consumption linked to individuals' selection of services that they can enjoy

responsibly. Studies have focused on this goal from varied perspectives, but all have collected data based on consumers' perceived behavior (Hong *et al*., 2019; Ivanova *et al*., 2019; Jain *et al*., 2022). Multiple constructs and items have been developed to measure the multidimensional nature of socially responsible consumption (Quoquab *et al*., 2019; Palacios-González & Chamorro-Mera, 2022).

Responsible consumption's importance requires that close attention be paid to how it is measured to assess more accurately the value of actions beyond the specific behavioral outcomes involved. The present research concentrated specifically on responsible consumption in tourism, so a new measurement instrument had to be developed for this study. Various scales can be found in the literature, each emphasizing different dimensions. This extensive heterogeneity is mainly due to the broad scope of sustainability, so the items included depend on which social, labor, ethical, or environmental factors researchers consider important (Palacios-González & Chamorro-Mera, 2022).

The first scale related to this topic comprised 20 items measuring purchases in different ways: products linked to social causes, from small companies, and with a local origin; companies' responsible behavior; and the volume of consumption (François-Lecompte & Robert, 2006; François-Lecompte & Valette-Florence, 2006). A later scale was created in China (Yan & She, 2011), which covered nine dimensions reflecting various aspects, such as animal and environmental protection. The items assessed energy conservation, support for local companies, national brands, observed misconduct, and attention paid to consumer rights, as well as evaluating moderate consumption and ruling out irresponsible businesses (Yan & She, 2011). Durif *et al.* (2011), in turn, focused on different aspects of citizenship behavior, environmental protection, recycling, local consumption, animal protection, and sustainable transport.

A more recent scale considered five dimensions: safeguarding rights and interests, moderating consumption, increasing local residents' income, respecting local cultures, and conserving resources (Hong *et al*., 2019). In addition, Ivanova *et al.* (2019) conducted a systematic review of environmental topics addressed by different components, for example, food, housing, and transportation. The cited authors highlighted local service options including adequate design, durable infrastructure, and repeated use of products. More recently, Jain *et al*. (2022) concluded that five dimensions

should be measured: rationality, sustainable consumption, local consumption, ethical consumption, and minimalism.

The current study concentrated on aspects that correspond to responsible consumption in tourism, which can be defined as local food and drink, health-related services, and entertainment. The measurement scale developed to cover these dimensions included health services and entertainment, which previous measurement scales have failed to address. Items were also included to evaluate local consumption, which has been mentioned in prior research (Durif *et al*., 2011; François-Lecompte & Robert, 2006; François-Lecompte & Valette-Florence, 2006; Quoquab *et al*., 2019).

This more individualized definition of responsible consumers facilitated the incorporation of psychometric values. The latter completed the scales and complement them with tourism consumer qualities considered to be social perception dimensions, such as warmth and competence. Warmth refers to traits that reflect each person's intention, for instance, being friendly, trustworthy, affectionate, or helpful. Competence denotes characteristics that reflect individuals' ability to achieve their intended goals including, among others, intelligence, power, ability, and efficiency (Sarkar *et al*., 2023).

The present research sought to address previous studies' limitations. Jain *et al*. (2022) called for further investigations of responsible consumption dimensions' impact on demography-based findings because differences due to cultural and economic factors can have specific connotations. The current research complements Jain *et al*.'s (2022) study in India because Spain's tourists have quite different characteristics. Other prior investigations have been limited by their cross-sectional nature (Vlastelica *et al*., 2023), as well as samples made up of participants from a single country, so longitudinal studies are needed to fill this gap. The present research provides a starting point for future longitudinal studies.

Theoretical framework

This research focused on linking tourists' choice of services with the goal of maintaining a responsible vision. Achieving consumer satisfaction is an objective of all organizations at all times, which requires an appropriate MO (Björk & Kauppinen-Räisänen, 2019; Jogaratnam, 2017; Kajalo & Lindblom, 2015; Wang *et al*., 2020). MO is a business philosophy with a specific perspective on how organizations should adapt to their clients'

particular situation to achieve competitive advantages (Gallardo-Vázquez & Valdez-Juárez, 2022; Jiang *et al*., 2020; Kholi & Jaworski, 1990; Liao *et al*., 2011; Slater & Narver, 2000; Wang *et al*., 2020). This orientation generates market intelligence regarding customers' current and future needs in order for the entire organization to respond appropriately (Jiang *et al*., 2020; Kholi & Jaworski, 1990). In this context, companies obtain customer information and then take actions to offer better services (Keiningham *et al*., 2020; Slater & Narver, 2000; Varadarajan, 2020). Clients can thus benefit from superior value (Björk & Kauppinen-Räisänen, 2019; Narver & Slater, 1990) due to products specifically orientated toward these consumers, and they are placed at the center of companies' activities, which helps these organizations to strengthen customer retention (Brady & Cronin Jr., 2001; Varadarajan, 2020).

The MO perspective currently is associated with a great demand for products marked by organizations' implementation of sustainable strategies. SD includes transforming societies so that they support the sustainable production of maximum economic and social value (Dey *et al*., 2020). This process aims to integrate economic activities and environmental well-being in sustainable ways (Gabor & Oltean, 2019; Lin & Hsieh, 2022; Scarpellini *et al*., 2019; Yang *et al*., 2019). Thus, SD is achieved through the implementation of initiatives at the micro (i.e., consumers) and macro (i.e., regions) levels (Geissdoerfer *et al*., 2017; Van Wijk *et al*., 2019).

The theoretical model applied in the present study was based on the ST and DCT, which are wide-ranging, topical theories that provided the framework for this research. ST groups together multiple groups with diverse interests, which intervene in consumers' selection of responsible services. In addition, this theory identifies value generation as one of companies' main drivers. The benefits obtained are a critical dimension of business activities, but these advantages are only one of the value creation process's many results (Sarkar *et al*., 2023; Theodoulidis *et al*., 2017).

Concurrently, ST recognizes that this value must be shared with multiple interest groups that may be linked to companies' operations (Freeman, 1999; Kiessling *et al*., 2016; Martínez-Ferrero, 2014), among which are potential customers. These groups must be considered when decisions are made, so these stakeholders' expectations and satisfaction are important to how business models are configured (Fassin *et al*., 2016). Companies must, therefore, give priority to developing a comprehensive discourse with stakeholders and incorporating their responses into sustainable scenarios

(Richter & Dow, 2017), thereby maintaining a sustainable MO perspective (Vaitoonkiat & Charoensukmongkol, 2020).

ST provided various advantages in the current research context. First, this theory is efficient because, if firms treat their stakeholders well, the latter will engage in positive behavior toward these organizations, for example, buying more products or services. Second, ST effectively combines and funnels interest groups' energy toward fulfilling business organizations' objectives. Last, this theory is useful in terms of both sustainable and unpredictable environments because companies that manage their interest groups well have more information on which to base business decisions and to become more attractive to other market participants. These organizations gain a degree of strategic flexibility unavailable to companies that fail to concentrate on stakeholder management (Assidi, 2023; Harrison *et al*., 2015).

The well-known resource-based and capacities theories are the DCT's foundation — a new approach to double orientation (i.e., company-society and/or company-consumer) that seeks to inspire companies to take on more responsibility, in this case, regarding consumers. This theory includes the detection and exploitation of potential markets' opportunities to help organizations exploit internal and external resources to achieve sustainable results (Björk & Kauppinen-Räisänen, 2019; Font *et al*., 2021; Kachouie *et al*., 2018; Teece, 2007). DCT posits that a complementarity exists between MO's strategic capabilities and sustainability, which function as pillars supporting organizations' growth and competitiveness (Ledesma-Chaves *et al*., 2020; Teece, 2018). A key dynamic capability is the process of generating knowledge about consumers' needs and thus facilitating companies' implementation of strategic plans (Sarkar *et al*., 2016).

The resources and information generated, in turn, stimulate the development of new dynamic capabilities (Bitencourt *et al*., 2020), and the resulting new or redesigned products promote sustainability (Ünal *et al*., 2018). Sustainability is clearly a complementary goal that provides fresh incentives for stakeholders, so an appropriate MO includes paying attention to sustainability (Popkova *et al*., 2018). This goal is essential for SD's ability to improve human health and well-being (Gabor & Oltean, 2019; Lin & Hsieh, 2022; Popkova *et al*., 2018), as well as the balanced use of natural resources such as water and land. Tourism is the present study's focus because this industry is important to sustainability (Haldar, 2019) given that an appro-

priate management of tourism's dynamic capabilities can promote consumer satisfaction and thus economic growth and value creation.

Conceptual model and hypothesis development

Independent variable: responsible service

The literature contains recent research based on food and beverages' observed attractiveness, including numerous interesting theories regarding local food and drink consumption (Boniface, 2003; Chang & Mak, 2018; Crompton & McKay, 1997; Jakubowska & Radzymińska, 2019; Kim & Eves, 2012; Kim *et al*., 2009; Lee & Lee, 2001; Mynttinen *et al*., 2015; Polat & Özdemir, 2021; Poria *et al*., 2006; Steptoe *et al*., 1995). The current research sought to expand on previous contributions by concentrating on the importance of local food and drink consumption in sustainability (Alderighi *et al*., 2016; Björk & Kauppinen-Räisänen, 2019; Jakubowska & Radzymińska, 2019; Quoquab *et al*., 2019; Polat & Özdemir, 2021). In sustainable environments, this consumption is promoted along with local culture and suppliers (Boniface, 2003; Kim *et al*., 2009; Kivela & Crotts, 2006) to help consumers experience other cultures (McKercher *et al*., 2023), learn how other people live, and observe things that tourists normally fail to see.

Scholars have recently also shown interest in responsible consumption from a food and drink perspective (Haque *et al*., 2021; Jaud *et al*., 2022; Quoquab *et al*., 2019; Rasool *et al*., 2021). Both products are considered social artifacts with an added value that legitimizes their social and cultural status (Ford *et al*., 2022; Kassai *et al*., 2016; Lunardo *et al*., 2021; Wang & Spence, 2018). Consuming local food and drink falls into tourism's cultural dimension as they give tourists opportunities to appreciate destinations' flavors and traditions (Alderighi *et al*., 2016; Björk & Kauppinen-Räisänen, 2019; Boniface, 2003; Kivela & Crotts, 2006; McKercher *et al*., 2023; Polat & Özdemir, 2021). Local food and drink motivate people to travel because each region's gastronomy includes new and even exotic food and drink characteristics experienced through not only taste, but also other senses such as sight, smell, and touch (Alderighi *et al*., 2016; Kim *et al*., 2009; Nair *et al*., 2020). Experiencing local food and drink up close allows tourists to learn about flavors and discover unfamiliar dishes, which translates into special, authentic experiences. Meals made with hitherto unknown local

products can lead to motivating and satisfying experiences that encourage consumers to go on outings offered by tourism establishments (Boniface, 2003; Kim *et al*., 2009; Nair *et al*., 2020; Polat & Özdemir, 2021; Rust & Oliver, 2000; Sparks *et al*., 2003).

Some tourists may perceive local food and drink as a chance to venture outside their daily routine, so they opt for local tasting menus rather than other services — regardless of the special effort needed to participate in gastronomy tourism experiences (Björk & Kauppinen-Räisänen, 2019; Boniface, 2003; Ford *et al*., 2022; Lunardo *et al*., 2021; Polat & Özdemir, 2021). A key feature of local food and drink is how it brings consumers closer to the surrounding country and region (Boniface, 2003; Luoh *et al*., 2020; Poria *et al*., 2006), as well as to other people with similar interests (Crompton & McKay, 1997; Haque *et al*., 2021; Kim *et al*., 2009; Rasool *et al*., 2021) and to good times with family and friends (López *et al*., 2019; Lunardo *et al*., 2021; Steptoe *et al*., 1995).

In addition, these experiences become sustainable when they allow tourists to appreciate and enjoy more fully the surrounding region's true nature and learn to conserve the resources that, according to DCT, make tourism activities more successful. In short, tasting local food and drink fosters a commitment to the immediate environment and generates competitive advantages for varied interest groups, thereby making a positive contribution to communities and their stakeholders' SD (i.e., ST). Food and drink's diversity and distinctiveness determines whether this kind of tourism can satisfy most of the relevant stakeholders' needs. These products contribute to tourists' enjoyment of varied multi-cultural experiences (Boniface, 2003; Nair *et al*., 2020) and strengthens regions' tourism reputation (Kassai *et al*., 2016).

When selecting tourism destinations, tourists need to think about which establishments will provide health-related services during stays and express a concern for guests' health (Kim *et al*., 2009). The hospitality facilities chosen should get to know their clients during their trip and help them feel completely relaxed and mentally free (Hallmann *et al*., 2015). If establishments increase visitors' well-being, the latter can experience less physical tension after staying in a stimulating environment (Gabor & Oltean, 2019; Lin & Hsieh, 2022). In addition, guests should be able to count on good medical services when needed since tourists place a high value on quality medical attention during their trips. Tourism consumers also appreciate their chosen destination's ability to provide services that make them feel

relaxed and especially allow them to rest at the right times (Sirgy *et al.*, 2011).

After tourism experiences, clients see feeling mentally recharged as another health benefit they value, which motivates them to make repeat visits to destinations (Gabor & Oltean, 2019). Links are generated with these places that generate a commitment to return (López et al., 2019). This benefit can lead — along with physical activities — to improvements in tourists' physical health (Sirgy *et al.*, 2011). These healthy experiences are also sustainable since they contribute to tourism consumers' better personal and social status, thereby strengthening SD's social benefits. Every aspect of these services should offer opportunities to think about — and decide which are — the most important aspects of life as trips help tourists to escape everything that surrounds them in daily life and yet also consider what really matters to them. In this sense, DCT can help hospitality establishments provide the knowledge and experiences needed to ensure guests enjoy health-related services.

In addition to the previously described subconstructs, the present study examined what tourists think about facilities that offer them opportunities to have pleasant, entertaining stays. Eid and El-Gohary (2014) suggest that this type of service requires destinations to develop their physical attributes, including those providing leisure activities. Tourists find destinations attractive when their recreational facilities allow visitors to spend time doing varied sports (Hallmann *et al.*, 2015; Illescas-Manzano *et al.*, 2023). Moreover, visitors value space and time to read and to enjoy activities with their family (Sirgy *et al.*, 2011). Facilities can contribute to guests achieving the ever elusive balance between work and family life, so they appreciate destinations that make this possible. Opportunities to visit romantic places or those of interest to family can also motivate repeat visits to destinations (Björk & Kauppinen-Räisänen, 2019; Gabor & Oltean, 2019).

Besides recreational activities, tourists are increasingly interested in opportunities to attend festivals (Polat & Özdemir, 2021). Cultural tours also stand out as a way to learn, especially through visits to cultural and heritage sites, as well as culinary and restful experiences centered around, for example, farms, vineyards, and rural environments (Hwang & Lee, 2019). On these trips, many types of information are acquired, which helps tourists feel more satisfied.

In sustainable regions, tourism develops in harmony with the natural environment, contributing greatly to the surroundings and communities'

SD (Yu *et al*., 2011). This process fosters individuals' connection with and commitment to responsible consumption (Pierce *et al*., 2020; Rezapouraghdam *et al*., 2021). The service dimensions defined thus create value for tourists, as posited by DCT and ST.

Dependent variable: tourist satisfaction

Tourism consumers' satisfaction with destinations depends on not only economic aspects, but also subjective, cognitive, and emotional factors that result in positive evaluations (Gardiner *et al*., 2022; Prebensen *et al*., 2013; Rodríguez del Bosque & San Martin, 2008; Stefko *et al*., 2020). Both emotions and social recognition are decisive contributors to satisfaction (Lee *et al*., 2011). The current research's conceptualization of general satisfaction included feedback on service performance and emotions derived from tourism experiences, as well as tourists' overall post-purchase attitude (Eid & El-Gohary, 2015; Gardiner *et al*., 2022; Nam *et al*., 2011). In this way, the enrichment of experiences with food, drink, health, and entertainment increases tourism experiences' value and generates customer satisfaction, thereby adding to the tourism sector's economic importance. Tourists' satisfaction is increased by tasting food and beverages, enjoying them in local settings, visiting wineries, and attending product fairs (Polat & Özdemir, 2021).

This approach gave the construct a multidimensional character that highlighted quality, social aspects, and the performance levels achieved (Prebensen *et al*., 2013). Tourists' experience of services decides their level of satisfaction, including how these consumers perceive what is happening and what they receive (Sandström *et al*., 2008; Stefko *et al*., 2020), thereby fullfilling the goals defined by ST. The present study analyzed the relationships between service, customer predisposition, and service experience, which DCT sees as the result of market exchanges. The analysis also focused on how these factors are linked to the creation of value for customers (Dong & Siu, 2013; Siu *et al*., 2013), especially the benefits defined by ST. Through tourism, consumers experience intangible dimensions of destinations' culture, which highlights each place's authenticity or unique lifestyle (Polat & Özdemir, 2021).

Figure 1 presents the present study's theoretical framework and the hypothesized relationships tested. The MO approach offers a specific perspective on how organizations adapt to meet their clients' particular needs. In

this process, companies have to consider the strong demand for products that satisfy different stakeholders' needs. As a result, the theoretical model was also based on ST and DCT. The first covers consumers' diverse interests and expectations and identifies companies' most important values. The second theory focuses on firms' development of capabilities and the opportunities this generates to increase customer satisfaction.

As previously noted, the conceptual model also implied that responsible services should be treated as a reflective second-order construct formed by three first-order subconstructs: local food and drink, health-related services, and entertainment. Tourist satisfaction was defined as a first-order construct. These suppositions resulted in the following hypothesis:

H1: *Based on ST and DCT, the choice of responsible and sustainable services will lead to greater tourism consumer satisfaction.*

Research methods

Data collection and sample

The data were collected during 2019. The research project started, but had to be put on hold after the data were gathered due to the coronavirus pandemic. The data were finally processed during 2020. The overall target population was quite wide and diverse as the potential participants were all residents of Spain's Autonomous Community of Extremadura. The convenience sample consisted of a group of 1,500 consumers chosen from this population.

The respondents were selected from different groups available locally and colleagues involved in the research project who were known for their active participation in social or professional networks such as Facebook, WhatsApp or LinkedIn. The data were gathered with a structured Google questionnaire distributed via email to the consumers contacted through these networks. The answers provided self-reported information. An online questionnaire format was used because it could be easily developed and accessed from any place and at any time and the responses would be received quickly, which saved much time. In addition, the questionnaires would be immediately available for processing, and the survey's cost was considerably lower than any other option.

After the questionnaire was prepared, it was subjected to a pre-test to check if the items were interpreted correctly. Twenty consumers read and answered the questions and then gave their opinion of the questionnaire's content. As a result, some expressions in the text were modified to avoid misinterpretation and improve the participants' ability to understand those items. This process ensured the questionnaire's content was correctly worded, the items were clear, the questions would be easy to read and sound natural, and, finally, the questions were realistic.

Once the questionnaire had been finalized, it was sent to the research population in an electronic format. A maximum of four reminder emails were sent to each consumer when no response was received. Finally, 229 valid questionnaires were submitted, which provided the data elicited from consumers who were interested in sharing their views regarding the subject under study (i.e., a response rate of 15.27%).

Cohen (1988) and Green's (1991) power tables and Roldán and Sánchez-Franco's (2012) approach were applied to assess the adequacy of the consumer sample's size. A medium effect size was assumed, with a power of 0.80 and alpha level of 0.05. In the present research, a minimum sample of 76 cases was needed, so the final sample exceeded the required number of cases to estimate the model. The sample size thus ensured that the maximum margin of error for the estimate of proportion (i.e., the relative frequency of responses to specific questionnaire items) was less than 0.0596 points, with a 95% confidence interval. The sample size was also large enough to conduct SEM analysis. The data sheet is presented in Table 1.

A statistical analysis revealed that 57% of the participants were women, and 43% were men, while 66% were under 35 years old. All respondents resided in the Autonomous Community of Extremadura, mostly in Badajoz (64%). Most had completed high school (42%) and university (35%), and they earned an income of up to 1,000 euros (70%) (see Table 2).

Measures and questionnaire

The literature review discussed above facilitated the questionnaire's development, including supplying the most appropriate items to collect data on each model construct. A measurement scale was developed for each variable: responsible and sustainable service (*RESER*) (local food and drink [*LOCF*], health-related services [*HEALS*], and entertainment [*ENTER*]), and tourism consumer satisfaction (*SAT*). The *RESER* variable was measured as

a second-order multidimensional construct, estimated in mode A, by applying a two-step SEM approach. The *SAT* variable was assessed as a first-order one-dimensional construct as follows:

- The 10 *LOCF* items were adapted from scales developed by Crompton and McKay (1997), Kim *et al*. (2009), Lee and Lee (2001), Poria *et al.* (2006), and Steptoe *et al.* (1995).
- The 6 items assessing the *HEALS* dimension were defined based on a variety of researchers' work, including, among others, Hallmann *et al.* (2015) and Sirgy *et al.* (2011).
- The 9 items in the *ENTER* scale were adapted from Hallmann *et al.* (2015), Sirgy *et al.* (2011), and Yu *et al.* (2011).

Finally, the 11 *SAT* items were adapted from Eid and El-Gohary (2015) and O'Cass and Sok (2015).

The questionnaire was divided into two sections. The first included questions to gather the general data needed, such as the consumers' gender, age, city of residence, education, and net income per month. The second section was made up of items assessing the research variables: *RESER* (*LOCF*, *HEALS*, and *ENTER*) and *SAT*. The participants' perceptions were reported on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 ("Totally disagree") to 7 ("Totally agree") to ensure valid answers. The data processing was supported by IBM SPSS v. 23 (i.e., EFA) and SmartPLS v. 3.2.8 Professional software (i.e., CFA and SEM analysis). The questionnaire's items are provided in full in Table 3.

Results

Descriptive statistics

Distribution measures were estimated to check for normality. The results revealed negative asymmetry, and, in relation to kurtosis, leptokurtic distributions predominated (see Table 4).

EFA

The new measurement scale was specifically created for this study based on a set of 36 items supported by the relevant literature. Thus, the indicators needed to be validated to facilitate any subsequent use of these

scales. To this end, EFA was conducted in order to identify and group together variables (i.e., items) that are strongly correlated with each other and whose correlations with variables of other complex constructs (i.e., factors) are lower.

Before the analysis could be conducted, two statistical tests were run to check whether the scale items were highly correlated (Comrey, 1973): Bartlett's test of sphericity (BTS) and the Kaiser-Mayer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy (KMO). BTS confirmed the absence of correlation between the indicators, and significance values lower than 0.100 indicated that the data were appropriate for further analysis. The KMO is a statistic that reflects the data's quality in such a way that values greater than 0.6 suggest that the data are of suitable quality and that EFA can be conducted.

For the present research model's construct and three subconstructs, the values produced are as follows. For local food and drink, the BTS statistic is 601.741 ($p < 0.001$), and the KMO value is 0.867. For health-related services, BTS obtained 69.920 ($p < 0.001$) and the KMO 0.659. For entertainment, the BTS value is 417.532 ($p < 0.001$) and the KMO 0.779. For tourist satisfaction, BTS obtained 4100.002 ($p < 0.001$) and the KMO 0.957. For all four dimensions, the BTS values are statistically significant at $p < 0.001$. In addition, the KMO statistics are higher than 0.6. These results supported the conclusion that the sample was appropriate and factor analysis could be performed.

The factor extraction was carried out using the principal axis method because of the data's distribution and because this method is most often recommended when variables do not follow the principle of normality. As mentioned previously, the data were collected with a questionnaire and a 7-point Likert-type scale, and the indicators were discrete. These aspects suggested that the distribution failed to satisfy the criterion of normality[1], which justified applying the principal axis method.

Regarding the number of factors, the eigenvalues' implications were considered as these indicate the proportion of variance explained. Factors with eigenvalues below 1 were excluded (Kaiser, 1960). To satisfy the standard criterion of the percentage of total minimum explained variance for social science research, the factors have to explain about 60% of the total variance observed in the original indicators. In the case of local food and

[1] To confirm this finding, the model variables' normality was analyzed using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, which was considered appropriate given the sample size. After more than 50 observations, the results included significance level values under 0.05 ($p < 0.05$), thereby confirming the absence of normality.

drink, the first factor explains 36.454% of the variance, the second 10.30%, and the third 10.067%, for a total explained variance of 56.827%. The results for health-related services show that the first factor explains 25.331% of the variance, the second 18.274%, and the third 16.773%, for a combined explained variance of 60.378%. In the case of entertainment, the first factor explains 33.496% of the variance, the second 12.152%, and the third 11.287%, for a total explained variance of 56.935% of the total variance. Finally, tourist satisfaction's first factor explains 84.040% of the total variance.

After the factor structure was adjusted, the indicators were subjected to Varimax rotation, which is the recommended technique when developing factor scales (Kline, 1986, 1994; Nunnally, 1978). After rotation, the variables are located closer to the factors that explain them, the variables' variance is concentrated on a smaller number of factors, and the factorial solution obtained is easier to interpret (Kaiser, 1958). Using the matrix of rotated factors generated for the present study, the factor loadings' significance was analyzed. The literature reports that loadings greater than or equal to 0.55 are considered significant (Hair *et al*., 2009). After this criterion was applied, two indicators were eliminated for local food and drink (i.e., LOCF7 and LOCF8), which left 3 factors assessed by 8 items. For health-related services, 3 indicators were excluded (i.e., HEALS2, HEALS5, and HEALS6) so that 3 factors with 3 items remained. For entertainment, 2 indicators were eliminated (ENTER3 and ENTER7), leaving 3 factors with 7 items. Finally, for tourist satisfaction, no indicator was removed, so this single factor was assessed by all 11 indicators and their items. Table 5 shows the rotated factor and component matrices for the four constructs. These results were next subjected to CFA to test the measurement scale's validity.

CFA

CFA was conducted to validate the measurement scales (Anderson & Gerbing, 1988; Fornell & Larcker, 1981) using SEM and Smart PLS v.4 Professional software. This procedure has been widely used by researchers to assess their measurement scales' validity (Ivanova *et al*., 2019; Vlastelica *et al*., 2023). The analysis checked the model's goodness of fit, composite reliability, and convergent and discriminant validity. According to Chin (2010), goodness of fit is determined based on each structural path's

strength and the coefficient of determination's (R^2) value, namely, the variance explained by the latent dependent variables. According to Falk and Miller's (1992) guidelines, the dependent construct should have an R^2 value greater than a minimum of 0.1. This condition was met in the current research, thereby confirming that the proposed model has adequate predictive power (see Table 6). In addition, the dependent construct's predictive power was measured using partial least squares with Stone-Geisser's Q^2 as the criterion. According to Chin (2010) and Hair *et al.* (2011), Q^2 can be calculated by applying the blindfolding technique. The results are interpreted as follows (Chin, 2010; Hair *et al.*, 2011). If $Q^2 > 0$, the model has predictive power, but, if $Q^2 < 0$, the model has no predictive capability. According to Chin's (1998a) recommended limits, the present model has significant predictive power (see Table 6).

Various indices are also available for use with partial least squares (Henseler, 2017, 2018; Henseler *et al.*, 2016). The first is the standardized root mean square residual (SRMR), while the second index is unweighted least squares discrepancy (d_ULS). The third is geodesic discrepancy (d_G), and the fourth and fifth indices are the normalized fit index (NFI) and root mean square error correlation (RMStheta).

The analysis showed that the SRMR has a satisfactory value of 0.074, below the usual upper limit of 0.08 proposed by Henseler *et al.* (2014) and Hu and Bentler (1998). The d_ULS and d_G fit tests were performed using inferential statistics based on bootstrapping (Henseler *et al.*, 2015), producing values of 0.577 and 0.378, respectively (i.e., lower than the 95% percentile), which confirm that any discrepancies are statistically nonsignificant. The adjusted model further has an acceptable level for the NFI (0.93), thereby exceeding the minimum value recommended (0.90) (Escobedo Portillo *et al.*, 2016). Finally, the RMStheta has a value of 0.109, which satisfies the standard requirement of being close to 0 but less than 0.12 (Henseler *et al.*, 2016). The tests thus confirmed that the proposed model is a good fit for the data and well aligned with the existing theory. Table 6 above lists the results for the different fitness tests.

Reliability analysis was conducted next in order to determine the internal consistency of each construct's multiple indicators (Lu *et al.*, 2009), which traditionally relies on Cronbach's alpha. However, this coefficient may not always be sufficient evidence of reliability (Cronbach & Shavelson, 2004), so composite reliability can also be used to estimate a set of latent construct indicators' share of a relevant construct (Hair *et al.*, 1998). Nun-

nally (1978) and Nunnally and Bernstein (1994) recommend that values above 0.7 be considered acceptable when research is still exploratory, but more advanced research must achieve values equal to or greater than 0.8. In the current study, all the composite reliability values were between 0.855 and 0.950, which confirms that the measures used are reliable (Hair *et al*., 2012).

Subsequently, the constructs' average variance extracted (AVE) was calculated to check for convergent validity (Fornell & Larcker, 1981; Hair *et al*., 2011). Fornell and Larcker (1981) recommend that the AVE values be greater than 0.50. Since the present results range between 0.622 and 0.665, the AVE value for each construct exceeded the suggested cut-off value, and the model's convergent validity was established. The composite reliability and AVE values are shown in Tables 7 and 8.

Finally, the model constructs' discriminant validity was evaluated to indicate "the extent to which a given construct differs from other constructs" (Roldán & Sánchez-Franco, 2012, p. 204). Fornell and Larcker (1981) propose that AVE be used to confirm this type of validity and recommend that values should be greater than the squared correlations between the construct in question and the others in the model. An analysis of the present results revealed that the square root of each construct's AVE (i.e., values in bold on the diagonal in Tables 9 and 10) is greater than the correlations between that construct and the rest of the model constructs. The first-order constructs' values are as follows: 0.816 > 0.459, 0.428 and 0.381; 0.793 > 0.459, 0.561 and 0.636; 0.795 > 0.428, 0.561 and 0.540; and 0.788 > 0.381, 0.636 and 0.540. The results for the second-order constructs are 0.795 > 0.630 and 0.815 > 0.630. These values indicate that the constructs under study fulfill the established criteria for discriminant validity as stipulated by Fornell and Larcker (1981).

The heterotrait-monotrait ratio of correlations was also used to check discriminant validity, for which a maximum value of 0.90 is acceptable (Henseler *et al*., 2015; Roldán & Sánchez-Franco, 2012). All the values obtained for the proposed model fall below that threshold (see Tables 9 and 10 above), so all the model's variables also have discriminant validity. The results, therefore, confirm that all the constructs incorporated into the present study meet the established discriminant validity criteria.

Structural model assessment

SEM was carried out next because the variables that form the conceptual model were latent or unobserved variables that formed higher-order and lower-order constructs. These variables could not be measured directly because they could only be inferred from the relevant indicators (Chin, 1998b), so second generation multivariate analysis was conducted. This procedure facilitated the incorporation of abstract constructs.

SEM was also used to clarify the relationships between predictor variables, compare the criteria for each, and determine the degree to which the measurable variables describe the latent variables. Finally, this method tested the hypothesis formulated based on the available theoretical knowledge (Chin, 1998a).

The structural model thus evaluated the weight and magnitude of the relationships between the proposed model's different variables. The predictor variable's contribution to the endogenous variable's explained variance was evaluated based on the standardized regression coefficients of the variables' weights (i.e., path coefficient [β]). These weight coefficients need to present values over 0.2 but ideally greater than 0.3 (Chin, 1998a). In the present study, the β value was 0.630 ($p = 0.000$) (see Table 11).

The paths' significance (i.e., β) can also be analyzed to verify if empirical support exists for the hypothesis formulated. Nonparametric resampling (i.e., a bootstrapping procedure) was applied using 5,000 subsamples, which provided both the standard error and the Student's *t*-statistic values for the parameters. The latter was based on the tail of a *t*-distribution with $n - 1$ degrees of freedom, in which n is the number of subsamples (Chin, 1998a; Hair *et al*., 2011). The test was conducted with the sample data, which produced quite satisfactory results and thus confirmed the current research's hypothesis (i.e., $\beta = 0.630$; $p = 0.000$). This finding underlines that choosing responsible services contributes to tourism consumers' satisfaction. The variables included in the hypothesis have the expected significant positive effects. In addition, the bootstrapping procedure used to analyze the percentile confidence intervals, as well as the bias corrected, produced values that exceed 0, as recommended by Chin (1998a).

Discussion

The full scope of sustainability and harmonious SD needs to be covered by each business activity. More specifically, companies providing tourism services must implement responsible actions that motivate tourists and other consumers to make decisions and adopt behaviors that promote sustainability. These actions contribute to consumer satisfaction and thus to repeat purchases of services leading to the desired value creation for customers, companies, and societies. This approach implies an MO that concentrates on tourists' needs by being sensitive to their demands and post-purchase responses (Björk & Kauppinen-Räisänen, 2019; Gallardo-Vázquez & Valdez-Juárez, 2022; Jiang *et al*., 2020; Keiningham *et al*., 2020; Kholi & Jaworski, 1990; Slater & Narver, 2000; Varadarajan, 2020; Wang *et al*., 2020).

This focus on achieving tourist satisfaction is related to two theories included in the present study's conceptual framework. In this context, ST takes on a specific meaning, namely, the maximization of this interest group's (i.e., tourists) greater good and that of the companies to which these consumers turn to provide sustainable services (Assidi, 2023). DCT, in turn, helps tourism firms manage their resources, provide added value to clients (Asher *et al*., 2005; Richter & Dow, 2017), and achieve sustainable performance (Kachouie *et al*., 2018). The current research thus confirmed the feasibility of broadening the MO perspective to include social responsibility strategies and a multi-stakeholder approach, thereby contributing to the literature on ST, DCT, and sustainability.

This study succeeded in developing a measurement scale to evaluate tourism consumers' choice of responsible services and the satisfaction these choices generate, as well as examining the causal relationship between both variables. An exhaustive literature review facilitated the definition of the initial scale's indicators, which were then subjected to EFA and then CFA, thereby ensuring the final scale's validity and reliability. Previous research has followed similar procedures, but they have taken different theoretical approaches, which means that this study contributes to expanding the existing knowledge about this topic (Hong *et al*., 2019; Ivanova *et al*., 2019; Jain *et al*., 2022). The methodology applied has been widely tested and supported by research specifically on tourism, so the selected methods were deemed appropriate for this study (Ivanova *et al*., 2019; Jain *et al*., 2022; Onuferová *et al*., 2020; Vlastelica *et al*., 2023).

The data analyses validated the defined hypothesis (i.e., H1), indicating that a relationship exists between tourists' satisfaction and their choice to engage in responsible consumption. This finding is in line with Jain *et al.* (2022) and Patwary's (2023) results. The present investigation answered the research question defined by confirming that, in an SD context, local food and drink, health-related services, and entertainment can tap into tourism consumers' responsible motivations and ensure these tourists' satisfaction. The findings indicate that tourism businesses need to incorporate these attributes into their services — a strategy that will guarantee greater customer satisfaction. This link between sustainability and consumers' positive response extends Kholi and Jaworski (1990) and Narver and Slater's (1990) conceptualization of MO strategy. The current study's approach connected MO with a sustainable perspective on tourism.

From a theoretical standpoint, this investigation's main contribution comprises empirically robust support for the ways that responsible decisions determine individual consumers' satisfaction. From an empirical research perspective, a new reliable and valid measurement scale was developed and validated for measuring consumers' choice of responsible and customer-centered tourism services. This tool is made up of 29 items that integrate specific aspects: local food and drink, health-related services, and entertainment.

As mentioned previously, these results are in line with those of Jain *et al.* (2022), but the current scale contains new and more diverse dimensions that complement previous measurement tools. This study thus contributes to increasing the number of measurement scales focused on responsible consumption and to improving the knowledge available and its applicability in different sectors (Hong *et al*., 2019). The present results should encourage tourism companies to offer services that meet these two criteria and to orient their offer toward sustainability. These findings, therefore, add significantly to the growing body of literature on tourism and sustainability.

Conclusions

The growing wealth worldwide has led to increasingly excessive consumption even though experts warn that resources are being depleted and stress the need for responsible consumption (Jain *et al*., 2022). In the tourism sec-

tor, the present study identified three attributes of responsible consumption choices according to tourists' attitudes and behaviors (Ivanova *et al*., 2019).

The above findings have theoretical, practical, management, and public policy implications. The measurement scale developed is applicable to other investigations and contexts. As mentioned previously, this scale also contributes to the literature on ST, DCT, and sustainability. At a time when organizations' search for SD has become a guiding principle, managers place great value on being able to influence consumer choices and contribute to sustainability.

In addition, the proposed MO based on DCT can encourage consumers to choose sustainable services. This study confirmed the hypothesis defined by demonstrating that appropriate choices of responsible services contribute to consumer satisfaction. Further practical implications include the identification of factors that determine key aspects of sustainable service selection. The results clarify what is required of companies, namely, a commitment on their part to incorporate the desired attributes, thereby guaranteeing customers' increased satisfaction.

Managers in turn must focus on specialization when designing their products to incorporate socially responsible attributes. These features will motivate tourists to behave in ways that encourage sustainability via their choice of attractive services with social and environmental components that generate added value. Finally, with respect to public policy, organizations should strive to engage in credible, realistic marketing campaigns aimed at offering clear, relevant information on sustainable services' attributes. If these campaigns are correctly perceived, responsible consumers will feel more satisfied and show interest in repeating the services in question.

Despite these significant contributions, this research was subject to several limitations. First, the sample had shortcomings. The data were collected from a convenience sample, so they cannot be considered representative of the study population or of other populations. In addition, the sample size was limited even though it met the generally accepted requirements for this type of analysis.

Other limitations were the subjectivity inherent in the participants' self-reported answers, and the focus on a single autonomous community in Spain, which is a country with distinctive cultural, educational, and financial characteristics. The results and conclusions can thus only be extrapolated to other Spanish regions and countries with all due caution. Despite

these issues, the findings include a model that provides a clearer perspective on responsible consumption in the tourism sector.

Another limitation was introduced by the methodology used. SEM was used to test the research hypothesis because of this method's advantages, but other techniques could also have been used. Finally, online questionnaires have deficiencies that can imply major restrictions due to the following aspects. First, the quality of participants' Internet connection may have caused difficulties if specific technical problems arose. Second, the researcher's absence at the time respondents completed their questionnaire could have resulted in responses that lack the accuracy and sincerity that surveys require, as well as questions about the items that remained unanswered for the participants.

These limitations can open up further research opportunities, among which would be studies that expand their sample by including more national and international tourists to strengthen the results' generalizability. Different demographic dimensions exist in each country, so researchers could check whether the proposed responsible consumption model is applicable to other nations. Concurrently, scholars may get interesting results by using other methods to test the hypothesis and comparing the results. In conclusion, three theories were integrated into this study's model, which contributes to expanding the findings' theoretical applications and opening up future lines of research for the academic community.

References

Alderighi, M., Bianchi, C., & Lorenzini, E. (2016). The impact of local food specialties on the decision to (re)visit a tourist destination: Market-expanding or business-stealing? *Tourism Management*, *57*, 323–333. doi: 10.1016/j.tourman.2016.06.016.

Anderson, J., & Gerbing, D. (1988). Structural equation modeling in practice: A review and recommended two-step approach. *Psychological Bulletin*, *103*(3), 411–423. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.103.3.411.

Asher, C., Mahoney, J. M., & Mahoney, J. T. (2005). Towards a property rights foundation for a stakeholder theory of the firm. *Journal of Management Governance*, *9*(1), 5–32. doi: 10.1007/s10997-005-1570-2.

Assidi, S. (2023). Voluntary disclosure and corporate governance: Substitutes or complements for firm value? *Competitiveness Review*. Advance online publication. doi: 10.1108/CR-08-2022-0112.

Bitencourt, C. C., Santini, F. D., Ladeira, W., Santos, A. C., & Teixeira, E. K. (2020). The extended dynamic capabilities model: A meta-analysis. *European Management Journal*, *38*(1), 108–120. doi: 10.1016/j.emj.2019.04.007.

Björk, P., & Kauppinen-Räisänen, H. (2019). Destination foodscape: A stage for travelers' food experience. *Tourism Management*, *71*, 466–475. doi: 10.1016/j.tourman.2018.11.005.

Blake, M. K. (2019). More than just food: Food insecurity and resilient place making through community self-organizing. *Sustainability*, *11*(10), 2942. doi: 10.3390/su11102942.

Boniface, P. (2003). *Tasting tourism: Travelling for food and drink*. Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.

Brady, M. K., & Cronin Jr, J. J. (2001). Customer orientation: Effects on customer service perceptions and outcome behaviors. *Journal of Service Research*, *3*(3), 241–251. doi: 10.1177/109467050133005.

Cannas, R., Argiolas, G., & Cabiddu, F. (2019). Fostering corporate sustainability in tourism management through social values within collective value co-creation processes. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, *27*(1), 139–155. doi: 10.1080/09669582.2018.1501053.

Chang, R. C. Y., & Mak, A. H. N. (2018). Understanding gastronomic image from tourist´s perspective: A repertory grid approach. *Tourism Management*, *68*, 89–100. doi: 10.1016/J.TOURMAN.2018.03.004.

Chen, Y. S., Lin, Y. H., & Wu, Y. J. (2020). How personality affects environmentally responsible behaviour through attitudes towards activities and environmental concern: Evidence from a national park in Taiwan. *Leisure Studies*, *39*(6), 825–843. doi: 10.1080/02614367.2020.1778773.

Chin, W. W. (1998a). The partial least squares approach to structural equation modeling. In G. A. Marcoulides (Ed.). *Modern methods for business research* (pp. 295–336). Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Chin, W. W. (1998b). Issues and opinion on structural equation modeling. *MIS Quarterly*, *22(*1), 7–16.

Chin, W. W. (2010). How to write up and report PLS analyses. In V. Esposito, W. W. Chin, J. Henseler & H. Wang (Eds.). *Handbook of partial least squares: Concepts, methods and applications in marketing and related fields* (pp. 655–690). Berlin: Springer.

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Comrey, A. L. (1973). *A first course in factor analysis*. Nueva York: Academic Press.

Crompton, J. L., & McKay, S. L. (1997). Motives of visitors attending festival events. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *24*, 425–439. doi: 10.1016/S0160-7383(97)80010-2.

Cronbach, L. J., & Shavelson, R. J. (2004). My current thoughts on coefficient alpha and successor procedures. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *64*(3), 391–418. doi: 10.1177/0013164404266386.

Dey, P. K., Malesios, C., De, D., Budhwar, P., Chowdhury, S., & Cheffi, W. (2020). Circular economy to enhance sustainability of small and medium-sized enterprises. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, *29*, 2145–2169. doi: 10.1002/bse.2492.

Dong, P., & Siu, N. Y. M. (2013). Servicescape elements, customer predispositions and service experience: The case of theme park visitors. *Tourism Management*, *36*, 541–551. doi: 10.1016/j.tourman.2012.09.004.

Do Paço, A., Shiel, C., & Alves, H. (2019). A new model for testing green consumer behaviour. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *207*, 998–1006. doi: 10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.10.105.

Durif, F., Boivin, C., Rajaobelina, L., & François-Lecompte, A. (2011). Socially responsible consumers: Profile and implications for marketing strategy. *International Review of Business Research Papers*, *7*(6), 215–224. doi: 10.1177/0276146784000400203.

Eid, R., & El-Gohary, H. (2014). Muslim tourist perceived value in the hospitality and tourism industry. *Journal of Travel Research*, *54*(6), 774–787. doi: 10.1177/0047287514532367.

Eid, R., & El-Gohary, H. (2015). The role of Islamic religiosity on the relationship between perceived value and tourist satisfaction. *Tourism Management*, *46*, 477–488. doi: 10.1016/j.tourman.2014.08.003y.

Escobedo Portillo, M. T., Hernández Gómez, J. A., Estebané Ortega, V., & Martínez Moreno, G. (2016). *Structural equation models: Characteristics, phases, contruction, application and results*. *Ciencia & Trabajo*, *55*, 16–22. doi: 10.4067/S0718-24492016000100004.

Falk, R. F., & Miller, N. B. (1992). *A primer for soft modeling*. Akron: University of Akron Press.

Fassin, Y., de Colle, S., & Freeman, R. E. (2016). Intra-stakeholder alliances in plant-closing decisions: A stakeholder theory approach. *Business Ethics: A European Review*, *26*(2), 97–111. doi: 10.1111/beer.12136.

Font, X., Torres-Delgado, A., Crabolu, G., Palomo Martínez, J., Kantenbacher, J., & Miller, G. (2021). The impact of sustainable tourism indicators on destination competitiveness: The European Tourism Indicator System. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, *31*, 1608–1630. doi: 10.1080/09669582.2021.1910281.

Ford, E., Billing, S. L., & Hughes, A. D. (2022). The role of community and company identities in the social license to operate for fin-fish farming. *Aquaculture*, *553*, 738081. doi: 10.1016/j.aquaculture.2022.738081.

Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, *18*(1), 39–50.

François-Lecompte, A., & Roberts, J. A. (2006). Developing a measure of socially responsible consumption in France. *Marketing Management Journal*, *16*, 50–66.

François-Lecompte, A., & Valette-Florence, P. (2006). Getting to know the socially responsible consumer better. *Décisions Marketing*, *41*, 67–79.

Freeman, R. E. (1999). Divergent stakeholder theory. *Academy of Management Review*, *24*(2), 233–236. doi: 10.5465/amr.1999.1893932.

Gabor, M. R., & Oltean, F. D. (2019). Babymoon tourism between emotional well-being service for medical tourism and niche tourism. Development and awareness on Romanian educated women. *Tourism Management*, *70*, 170–175. doi: 10.1016/j.tourman.2018.08.006.

Gallardo-Vázquez, D., & Valdez Juárez, L. E. (2022). Strategic corporate social responsibility orientation: From gathering information to reporting initiatives. *Revista de Contabilidad / Spanish Accounting Review*, *25*(1), 89–106. doi: 10.6018/rcsar.406431.

García-Sánchez, I. M., Aibar-Guzmán, B., Aibar-Guzmán, C., & Rodríguez-Ariza, L. (2020). "Sell" recommendations by analysts in response to business communication strategies concerning the Sustainable Development Goals and the SDG compass. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *255*, 120194. doi: 10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.120194.

Gardiner, S., Vada, S., Ling Yang, E. C., Khoo, C., & Le, T. H. (2022). Recreating history: The evolving negotiation of staged authenticity in tourism experiences. *Tourism Management*, *91*, 104515. doi: 10.1016/j.tourman.2022.104515.

Geissdoerfer, M., Savaget, P., Bocken, N., & Hultink, E. J. (2017). The circular economy—A new sustainability paradigm? *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *143*, 757–768. doi: 10.1016/j.jclepro.2016.12.048.

Green, S. B. (1991). How many subjects does it take to do a regression analysis? *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, *26*(3), 499–510. doi: 10.1207/s15327906mbr2603_7.

Gupta, P., Jain, V. K., & Aggarwal, S. (2020). Exploring relationship between employees well-being and green lot using structural equation modeling. *Innovation*, *29*(9), 2590–2600.

Hair, J. F., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L., & Black, W. C. (1998). *Multivariate data analysis*. New York: Prentice Hall International.

Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2009). *Multivariate data analysis*. New York: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Hair, J. F., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2011). PLS-SEM: Indeed a silver bullet. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, *19*(2), 139–152. doi: 10.2753/MTP1069-6679190202.

Hair, J. F., Sarstedt, M., Ringle, C. M., & Mena, J. A. (2012). An assessment of the use of partial least squares structural equation modeling in marketing research. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, *40*(3), 414–433. doi: 10.1007/s11747-011-0261-6.

Haldar, S. (2019). Green entrepreneurship in the renewable energy sector—A case study of Gujarat. *Journal of Science and Technology Policy Management*, *10*(1), 234–250. doi: 10.1108/JSTPM-122017-0070.

Hallmann, K., Zehrer, A., & Müller, S. (2015). Perceived destination image: An image model for a winter sports destination and its effect on intention to revisit. *Journal of Travel Research*, *54*(1), 94–106. doi: 10.1177/0047287513513161.

Haque, A., Karunasena, G. G., & Pearson, D. (2021). Household food waste and pathways to responsible consumer behaviour: Evidence from Australia. *British Food Journal*, *124*(11), 3783–3802. doi: 10.1108/BFJ-05-2021-0517.

Harrison, J. S., Freeman, R. E., & Cavalcanti Sá de Abreu, M. (2015). Stakeholder theory as an ethical approach to effective management: Applying the theory to multiple contexts. *Revista Brasileira de Gestão de Negócios*, *55*(17), 858–69. doi: 10.7819/rbgn.v17i55.2647.

Henseler, J. (2017). Bridging design and behavioral research with variance-based structural equation modeling. *Journal of Advertising*, *46*, 178–192. doi: 10.1080/00913367.2017.1281780.

Henseler, J. (2018). Partial least squares path modeling: Quo vadis? *Quality & Quantity*, *52*(1), 1–8. doi: 10.1007/s11135-018-0689-6.

Henseler, J., Dijkstra, T. K., Sarstedt, M., Ringle, C. M., Diamantopoulos, A., Straub, D. W., Ketchen, D. J., Hair, J. F., Hult, T. M., & Calantone, R. J. (2014). Common beliefs and reality about PLS comments on Rönkkö and Evermann (2013). *Organizational Research Methods*, *17*(2), 182–209. doi: 10.1177/1094428114526928.

Henseler, J., Hubona, G., & Ray, P. A. (2016). Using PLS path modeling in new technology research: Updated guidelines. *Industrial Management & Data System*, *116*, 2–20. doi: 10.1108/IMDS-09-2015-0382.

Henseler, J., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2015). A new criterion for assessing discriminant validity in variance-based structural equation modeling. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, *43*(1), 115–135. doi: 10.1007/s11747-014-0403-8.

Hong, X., Xixi, Y., & Yuqing, L. (2019). Tourists' socially responsible consumption: Concept and scale development. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal*, *47*(11), 1–15. doi: 10.2224/sbp.8553.

Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1998). Fit indices in covariance structure modeling: Sensitivity to underparameterized model misspecification. *Psychological Methods*, *3*(4), 424–453. doi: 10.1037/1082-989X.3.4.424.

Hubacek, K., Feng, K., Chen, B., & Kagawa, S. (2016). Linking local consumption to global impacts. *Journal of Industrial Ecology*, *20*(3), 382–386. doi: 10.1111/jiec.12463.

Hwang, J., & Lee, J. (2019). A strategy for enhancing senior tourists' well-being perception: Focusing on the experience economy. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, *36*(3), 314–329. doi: 10.1080/10548408.2018.1541776.

Illescas-Manzano, M. D., Martinez-Puertas, S., Marin-Carrillo, G. M., & Marin-Carrillo, M. B. (2023). Dynamics of agglomeration and competition in the hotel industry: A geographically weighted regression analysis based on an analytical hierarchy process and geographic information systems (GIS) data. *Oeconomia Copernicana, 14*(1), 213–252. doi: 10.24136/oc.2023.006.

Ivanova, O., Flores-Zamora, J., Khelladi, I., & Ivanaj, S. (2019). The generational cohort effect in the context of responsible consumption. *Management Decision*, *57*(5), 1162–1183. doi: 10.1108/MD-12-2016-0915.

Jain, V. K., Dahiya, A., Tyagi, V., & Sharma, P. (2022). Development and validation of scale to measure responsible consumption. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Business Administration*. Advance online publication. doi: 10.1108/APJBA-12-2020-0460.

Jakubowska, D., & Radzymińska, M. (2019). Health and environmental attitudes and values in food choices: A comparative study for Poland and Czech Republic. *Oeconomia Copernicana, 10*(3), 433–452. doi: 10.24136/oc.2019.021.

Jaud, D. A., Gergaud, O., & Lunardo, R. (2022). Family and peer communication and wine consumption among young adults: Examining the role of responsible drinking practices. *British Food Journal*, *125*(6), 2070–2086. doi: 10.1108/BFJ-05-2022-0428.

Jiang, W., Rosati, F., Chai, H., & Feng, T. (2020). Market orientation practices enhancing corporate environmental performance via knowledge creation: Does environmental management system implementation matter? *Business Strategy and the Environment*, *29*(5), 1899–1924. doi: 10.1002/bse.2478.

Jogaratnam, G. (2017). How organizational culture influences market orientation and business performance in the restaurant industry. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, *31*, 211–219. doi: 10.1016/j.jhtm.2017.03.002.

Kachouie, R., Mavondo, F., & Sands, S. (2018). Dynamic marketing capabilities view on creating market change. *European Journal of Marketing*, *52*(5–6), 1007–1036. doi: 10.1108/EJM-10-2016-0588.

Kaiser, H. F. (1958). The varimax criterion for analytic rotation in factor analysis. *Psychometrika*, *23*, 187–200. doi: 10.1007/BF02289233.

Kaiser, H. F. (1960). The application of electronic computers to factor analysis. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *20*, 141–151. doi: 10.1177/001316446002000116.

Kajalo, S., & Lindblom, A. (2015). Market orientation, entrepreneurial orientation and business performance among small retailers. *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, *43*(7), 580–596. doi: 10.1108/IJRDM-04-2014-0044.

Kang, K. H., Stein, L., Heo, C. Y., & Lee, S. (2012). Consumers' willingness to pay for green initiatives of the hotel industry. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, *31*, 564–572. doi: 10.1016/j.ijhm.2011.08.001.

Kassai, Z., Káposzta, J., Ritter, K., Dávid, L., Nagy, H., & Farkas, T. (2016). The territorial significance of food Hungaricums: The case of Pálinka. *Romanian Journal of Regional Science*, *10*(2), 64–84.

Keiningham, T., Aksoy, L., Bruce, H. L., Cadet, F., Clennell, N., Hodgkinson, I. R., & Kearney, T. (2020). Customer experience driven business model innovation. *Journal of Business Research*, *116*, 431–440. doi: 10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.08.003.

Kholi, A., & Jaworski, B. (1990). Market orientation: The construct, research propositions and marketing management implications. *Journal of Marketing*, *54*(2), 1–18. doi: 10.1177/002224299005400201.

Kiessling, T., Isaksson, L., & Yasar, B. (2016). Market orientation and CSR: Performance implications. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *137*(2), 269–284. doi: 10.1007/s10551-015-2555-y.

Kim, Y. G., & Eves, A. (2012). Construction and validation of a scale to measure tourist motivation to consume local food. *Tourism Management*, *33*, 1458–1467. doi: 10.1016/j.tourman.2012.01.015.

Kim, Y. G., Eves, A., & Scarkes, C. (2009). Building a model of local food consumption on trips and holidays: A grounded theory approach. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, *28*(3), 423–431. doi: 10.1016/j.ijhm.2008.11.005.

Kivela, J., & Crotts, J. (2006). Tourism and gastronomy: Gastronomy's influence on how tourists experience a destination. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research*, *30*(3), 354–377. doi: 10.1177/1096348006286797.

Kline, P. (1986). *A handbook of test construction*. New York: Methuen.

Kline, P. (1994). *An easy guide to factor analysis*. Newbury Park: Sage.

Ledesma-Chaves, P., Arenas-Gaitan, J., & García-Cruz, R. (2020). International expansion: Mediation of dynamic capabilities. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, *38*(5), 637–652. doi: I 10.1108/MIP-05-2019-0269.

Lee, C., & Lee, T. (2001). World culture expo segment characteristics. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *28*(3), 812–816. doi: 10.1016/S0160-7383(00)00071-2.

Lee, J. S., Lee, C. K., & Choi, Y. (2011). Examining the role of emotional and functional values in festival evaluation. *Journal of Travel Research*, *50*(6), 685–696. doi: 10.1177/0047287510385465.

Liao, S.-H., Chang, W.-J., Wu, C.-C., & Katrichis, J. M. (2011). A survey of market orientation research (1995–2008). *Industrial Marketing Management*, *40*, 301–310. doi: 10.1016/j.indmarman.2010.09.003.

Lin, L. P., & Hsieh, W. K. (2022). Exploring how perceivede resilience and restoration affected the wellbeing of Matsu pilgrims during COVID-19. *Tourism Management*, *90*, 104473. doi: 10.1016/j.tourman.2021.104473.

Line, N. D., & Hanks. L. (2016). The effects of environmental and luxury beliefs on intention to patronize green hotels: The moderating effect of destination image. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, *24*(6), 904–925. doi: 10.1080/09669582.2015.1091467.

Lu, C. S., Lin, C. C., & Tu, C. J. (2009). Corporate social responsibility and organisational performance in container shipping. *International Journal of Logistics: Research and Applications*, *12*(2), 119–132. doi: 10.1080/13675560902749373.

Lunardo, R., Jaud, D. A., & Corsi, A. M. (2021). The narcissistic wine consumer: How social attractiveness associated with wine prompts narcissists to engage in wine consumption. *Food Quality and Preference*, *88*, 104107. doi: 10.1016/j.foodqual.2020.104107.

Luoh, H. F., Tsaur, S. H., & Lo, P. C. (2020). Cooking for fun: The sources of fun in cooking learning tourism. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*, *17*, 100442. doi: 10.1016/j.jdmm.2020.100442.

Martínez-Ferrero, J. (2014). Consequences of sustainability practices in capital costs and corporate reputation. *Spanish Accounting Review*, *17*(2), 153–162. doi: 10.1016/j.rcsar.2013.08.008.

McKercher, B., Hughes, K., & Mkono, M. (2023). Food preferences as a proxy for adventurousness. *Tourism Management*, *95*, 104682. doi: 10.1016/j.tourman.2022.104682.

Molina-Azorín, J. F., & Font, X. (2015). Mixed methods in sustainable tourism research: An analysis of prevalence, designs and application in *JOST* (2005–2014). *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, *24*(4), 549–573. doi: 10.1080/09669582.2015.1073739.

Mynttinen, S., Logrén, J., Särkkä-Tirkkonen, M., & Rautiainen, T. (2015). Perceptions of food and its locality among Russina tourists in the South Savo region of Finland. *Tourism Management*, *48*, 455–466. doi: 10.1016/j.tourman.2014.12.010.

Nair, B. B., Sinha, S., & Dileep, M. R. (2020). What makes inauthenticity dangerous: An explorative study of ethnic cuisine and tourism. *Tourism*, *68*(4), 371–388. doi: 10.37741/t.68.4.

Nam, J., Ekinci, Y., & Whyatt, G. (2011). Brand equity, brand loyalty and consumer satisfaction. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *38*(3), 1009–1030. doi: 10.1016/j.annals.2011.01.015.

Narver, J., & Slater, S. (1990). The effect of a market orientation on business profitability. *Journal of Marketing*, *54*(4), 20–35. doi: 10.2307/1251757.

Nunnally, J. (1978). *Psychometric methods.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric theory*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

O'Cass, A., & Sok, P. (2015). An exploratory study into managing value creation in tourism service firms: Understanding value creation phases at the intersection of the tourism service firm and their customers. *Tourism Management*, *51*, 186–200. doi: 10.1016/j.tourman.2015.05.024.

Ogutu, H., El Archi, Y., & Dénes Dávid, L. (2023). Current trends in sustainable organization management: A bibliometric analysis. *Oeconomia Copernicana, 14*(1), 11–45. doi: 10.24136/oc.2023.001.

Onuferová, E., Čabinová, V., & Dzurov Vargová, T. (2020). Analysis of modern methods for increasing and managing the financial prosperity of businesses in the context of performance: A case study of the tourism sector in Slovakia. *Oeconomia Copernicana, 11*(1), 95–116. doi: 10.24136/oc.2020.004.

Palacios-González, M. M., & Chamorro-Mera, A. (2022). Analysis of the predictive variables of socially responsable consumption. *Business Strategy and Development*, *5*, 187–196. doi: 10.1002/bsd2.189.

Patwary, A. K. (2023). Examining environmentally responsible behaviour, environmental beliefs and conservation commitment of tourists: A path towards responsible consumption and production in tourism. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, *30*, 5815–5824. doi: 10.1007/s11356-022-22577-w.

Phang, G., Balakrishnan, B. K., & Ting, H. (2021). Does sustainable consumption matter?: Consumer grocery shopping behaviour and the pandemic. *Journal of Social Marketing*, *11*(4), 507–522. doi: 10.1108/JSOCM-12-2020-0245.

Pierce, J. R., Barton, M. A., Tan, M. M. J., Oertel, G., Halder, M. D., Lopez-Guijosa, P. A., & Nuttall, R. (2020). Actions, indicators, and outputs in urban biodiversity plans: A multinational analysis of city practice. *PLoS ONE*, *15*(7), e0235773. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0235773.

Polat, E., & Özdemir, S. S. (2021). Food and beverage experience in tourism in the context of experience economy. *Journal of Gastronomy, Hospitality and Travel*, *4*(2), 409–420. doi: 10.33083/joghat.2021.83.

Popkova, E. G., Bogoviz, A. V., & Ragulina, J. V. (2018). Technological parks, "green economy", and sustainable development in Russia. In B. Sergi (Ed.). *Exploring the future of Russia's economy and markets* (pp. 143–159). Bingley: Emerald Publishing Limited. doi: 10.1108/978-1-78769-397-520181008.

Poria, Y., Reichel, A., & Biran, A. (2006). Heritage site management: Motivations and expectations. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *33*(1), 162–178. doi: 10.1016/j.annals.2005.08.001.

Prebensen, N., Woo, E., Chen, J., & Uysal, M. (2013). Motivation and involvements as antecedents of the perceived value of the destination experience. *Journal of Travel Research*, *52*(2), 253–264. doi: 10.1177/0047287512461181.

Quoquab, F., Mohammad, J., & Sukari, N. N. (2019). A multiple-item scale for measuring "sustainable consumption behaviour" construct: Development and psychometric evaluation. *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*, *31*(4), 791–816. doi: 10.1108/APJML-02-2018-0047.

Rasool, S., Cerchione, R., Salo, J., Ferraris, A., & Abbate, S. (2021). Measurement of consumer awareness of food waste: Construct development with a confirmatory factor analysis. *British Food Journal*, *123*(13), 337–361. doi: 10.1108/BFJ-02-2021-0160.

Rezapouraghdam, H., Akhshik, A., & Ramkissoon, H. (2021). Application of machine learning to predict visitors' green behavior in marine protected areas: Evidence from Cyprus. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*. Advance online publication. doi: 10.1080/09669582.2021.1887878.

Richter, U. H., & Dow, K. E. (2017). Stakeholder theory: A deliberative perspective. *Business Ethics: A European Review*, *26*(4), 428–442. doi: 10.1111/beer.12164.

Rodríguez del Bosque, L., & San Martin, H. (2008). Tourist satisfaction: A cognitive affective model. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *35*(2), 551–573. doi: 10.1016/j.annals.2008.02.006.

Roldán, J. L., & Sánchez-Franco, M. J. (2012). Variance-based structural equation modeling: Guidelines for using partial least squares in information systems research. In M. Mora, O. Gelman, A. Steenkamp & M. S. Raisinghani (Eds.). *Research methodologies, innovations and philosophies in software systems engineering and information systems* (pp. 193–221). Hershey: Information Science Reference.

Rust, R. T., & Oliver, R. L. (2000). Should we delight the customer? *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, *28*(1), 86–94. doi: 10.1177/0092070300281008.

Sadollah, A., Nasir, M., & Geem, Z. W. (2020). Sustainability and optimization: From conceptual fundamentals to applications. *Sustainability*, *12*(5), 2027. doi: 10.3390/su12052027.

Sandström, S., Edvardsson, B., Kristensson, P., & Magnusson, P. (2008). Value in use through service experience. *Managing Service Quality: An International Journal*, *18*(2), 112–126. doi: 10.1108/09604520810859184.

Sarkar, J. G., Sarkar, A., & Sreejesh, S. (2023). Developing responsible consumption behaviours through social media platforms: Sustainable brand practices as message cues. *Information Technology & People*, *36*(2), 532–563. doi: 10.1108/ITP-01-2021-0044.

Sarkar, S., Coelho, D. M., & Maroco, J. (2016). Strategic orientations, dynamic capabilities, and firm performance: An analysis for knowledge intensive business services. *Journal of the Knowledge Economy*, *7*(4), 1000–1020. doi: 10.1007/s13132-016-0415-3.

Scarpellini, S., Portillo-Tarragona, P., Aranda-Usón, A., & Llena-Macarulla, F. (2019). Definition and measurement of the circular economy's regional impact. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management*, *62*(13), 2211–2237. doi: 10.1080/09640568.2018.1537974.

Sirgy, M. J., Kruger, P. S., Lee, D. J., & Yu, G. B. (2011). How does a travel trip affect tourists' life satisfaction? *Journal of Travel Research*, *50*(3), 261–275. doi: 10.1177/0047287510362784.

Siu, N. Y. M., Zhang, T. J. F., Dong, P., & Kwan, H. Y. (2013). New service bonds and customer value in customer relationship management: The case of museum visitors. *Tourism Management*, *36*, 293–303. doi: 10.1016/j.tourman.2012.12.001.

Slater, S. F., & Narver, J. C. (2000). Intelligence generation and superior customer value. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, *28*(1), 120–127. doi: 10.1177/0092070300281011.

Sparks, B., Bowen, J., & Klag, S. (2003). Restaurant and the tourist market. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, *15*(1), 6–13. doi: 10.1108/09596110310458936.

Stefko, R., Fedorko, R., Bacik, R., Rigelsky, M., & Olearova, M. (2020). Effect of service quality assessment on perception of TOP hotels in terms of sentiment polarity in the Visegrad group countries. *Oeconomia Copernicana, 11*(4), 721–742. doi: 10.24136/oc.2020.029.

Steptoe, A., Pollard, T. M., & Wardle, J. (1995). Development of a measure of the motives underlying the selection of food: The food choice questionnaire. *Appetite*, *25*, 267–284. doi: 10.1006/appe.1995.0061.

Teece, D. J. (2007). Explicating dynamic capabilities: The nature and microfoundations of (sustainable) enterprise performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, *28*(13), 1319–1350. doi: 10.1002/smj.

Teece, D. J. (2018). Dynamic capabilities as (workable) management systems theory. *Journal of Management & Organization*, *24*(3), 359–368. doi: 10.1017/jmo.2017.75.

Theodoulidis, B., Díaz, D., Crotto, F., & Rancati, E. (2017). Exploring corporate social responsibility and financial performance through stakeholder theory in the tourism industries. *Tourism Management*, *62*, 173–88. doi: 10.1016/j.tourman.2017.03.018.

Ünal, E., Urbinati, A., & Chiaroni, D. (2018). Managerial practices for designing circular economy business models. *Journal of Manufacturing Technology Management*, *30*(3), 561–589. doi: 10.1108/JMTM-02-2018-0061.

Vaitoonkiat, E., & Charoensukmongkol, P. (2020). Stakeholder orientation's contribution to firm performance. The moderating effect of perceived market uncertainty. *Management Research Review*, *43*(7), 863–883. doi: 10.1108/MRR-07-2019-0296.

Van Wijk, J., Zietsma, C., Dorado, S., de Bakker, F. G. A., & Martí, I. (2019). Social innovation: Integrating micro, meso, and macro level insights from institutional theory. *Business & Society*, *58*(5), 887–918. doi: 10.1177/0007650318789104.

Varadarajan, R. (2020). Customer information resources advantage, marketing strategy and business performance: A market resources based view. *Industrial Marketing Management*, *89*, 89–97. doi: 10.1016/j.indmarman.2020.03.003.

Vlastelica, T., Kosti´c-Stankovic, M., Rajic, T., Krstic, J., & Obradovic, T. (2023). Determinants of young adult consumers' environmentally and socially responsible apparel consumption. *Sustainability*, *15*, 1057. doi: 10.3390/su15021057.

Wang, Q. J., & Spence, C. (2018). Wine complexity: An empirical investigation. *Food Quality and Preference*, *68*, 238–244. doi: 10.1016/j.foodqual.2018.03.011.

Wang, Y. J., Zhang, H. L., & Song, M. (2020). Pure or ambidextrous strategy? A study of responsive and proactive market orientations in industrial firms. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, *35*(6), 1001–1010. doi: 10.1108/JBIM-04-2019-0152.

Yan, J., & She, Q. (2011). Developing a trichotomy model to measure socially responsible behaviour in China. *International Journal of Market Research*, *53*, 253–274. doi: 10.2501/IJMR-53-2-253-274.

Yang, Y., Chen, L., Jia, F., & Xu, Z. (2019). Complementarity of circular economy practices: An empirical analysis of Chinese manufacturers. *International Journal of Production Research*, *57*, 6369–6384. doi: 10.1080/00207543.2019.1566664.

Yang, Y., Wang, S., Cai, Y., & Zhou, X. (2022). How and why does place identity affect residents' spontaneous culture conservation in ethnic tourism community? A value co-creation perspective. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 30(6), 1344–1363. doi: 10.1080/09669582.2021.1945070.

Yu, C. P., Chancellor, H. C., & Cole, S. T. (2011). Measuring residents' attitudes toward sustainable tourism: A reexamination of the sustainable tourism attitude scale. *Journal of Travel Research*, *50*(1), 57–63. doi: 10.1177/0047287509353189.

Yuriev, A., Dahmen, M., Paille, P., Boiral, O., & Guillaumie, L. (2020). Proenvironmental behaviors through the lens of the theory of planned behavior: A scoping review. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling*, *155*, 104660. doi: 10.1016/j.resconrec.2019.104660.

Ministry of Education and Science
Republic of Poland

The journal is co-financed in the years 2022–2024 by the Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Poland in the framework of the ministerial programme "Development of Scientific Journals" (RCN) on the basis of contract no. RCN/SN/0129/2021/1concluded on 29 September 2022 and being in force until 28 September 2024.

Annex

Table 1. Research data sheet

Study population	1,500 consumers contacted
Geographical region	Extremadura, Spain
Instrument used for data collection	Structured Google questionnaire administered to responsible consumers
Sample	229 consumers
Sampling procedure	Convenience sampling
Response collection period	2019
Type of population	Finite sample
Participation rate	15.27%
Sample error	5.96%
Confidence level	95%; $z = 1.96$; $p = q = 0.5$

Table 2. Sociodemographic profile of participants

Consumer sample information	%
Gender	
Male	43%
Female	57%
Age	
Under 35 years old	66%
Between 36 and 45 years old	20%
Between 46 and 55 years old	11%
Between 56 and 65 years old	3%
City	
Badajoz	64%
Other cities	36%
Education	
No formal schooling or primary school	14%
High school	42%
Undergraduate university	35%
Graduate school (master's or doctorate)	9%
Net income (euros [€])/month	
Less than €600	48%
Between €601 and €1,000	22%
Between €1,001 and €1,500	13%
Between €1,501 and €2,000	11%
More than €2,000	6%

Table 3. Indicators measuring model's construct and subconstructs

***RESER* measurement scale**
First-order subconstructs and indicators
Local food
LOCF1*: Trying local food gives me the opportunity to increase my knowledge about different cultures.[a]
LOCF2*: Tasting local food helps me see how other people live.
LOCF3*: Tasting local food makes me see things that I don't normally experience.
LOCF4*: Trying local food allows me to find out how this local food tastes.
LOCF5*: Tasting local food allows me to discover something new.
LOCF6*: Tasting local food in its original setting is an authentic experience.
LOCF7: Tasting local food in its traditional surroundings is a special experience.
LOCF8: It is important to me to try the local food in its original region or country.
LOCF9*: Tasting local food allows me to meet new people with similar interests.
LOCF10*: Tasting local food allows me to have a good time with friends and/or family.
Health-related services
HEALS1*: Tourist health and/or medical care facilities are available.
HEALS2: These services allow me to feel relaxed, rested, and stress-free.
HEALS3*: They help me to feel mentally recharged after the trip.
HEALS4*: I feel that my own health has improved because the trip requires physical activity.
HEALS5: These services help me learn to appreciate nature.
HEALS6: I have the opportunity to think about what is important in life.
Entertainment
ENTER1*: Recreational facilities are available.
ENTER2*: Additional sports activities are available.
ENTER3: I have the opportunity to do a fair amount of quiet reading.
ENTER4*: I can spend quality time with my family.
ENTER5*: I enjoy gathering the whole family together.
ENTER6*: A work-life balance can be achieved.
ENTER7: I enjoy visiting places considered romantic with close friends and/or family.
ENTER8*: I can learn about other cultures.
ENTER9*: Tourism in this community is developed in harmony with the natural environment.
First-order constructs and indicators
Consumer satisfaction
SAT1*: My choice to buy this tour option was a wise one.
SAT2*: I did the right thing when I bought this package tour.
SAT3*: This experience is exactly what I needed.
SAT4*: I feel good about my decision to buy this option.
SAT5*: The company has provided us with better service.
SAT6*: The company has provided us with more reliable service.
SAT7*: The company has provided us with services that meet the highest industry standards.
SAT8*: The establishment staff is available when we need information.
SAT9*: The establishment has provided us with appropriate information.
SAT10*: The establishment has responded to us faster than expected when we needed information.
SAT11*: We have a strong sense of being treated as important by the establishment.

Note: [a] Indicators with an asterisk: items for each scale validated for proposed model.

Source: Adapted from Crompton and McKay (1997), Eid and El-Gohary (2015), Hallmann *et al.* (2015), Kim *et al.* (2009), Lee and Lee (2001), O'Cass and Sok (2015), Poria *et al.* (2006), Sirgy *et al.* (2011), Steptoe *et al.* (1995), and Yu *et al.* (2011).

Table 4. Descriptive statistics of variables and items

Variables and items (number = 229)	Mean	SD	Skewness	Kurtosis
Local food				
LOCF1	5.70	1.291	–1.208	2.142
LOCF2	5.11	1.410	–0.683	0.551
LOCF3	5.33	1.377	–0.858	0.702
LOCF4	6.08	1.083	–1.528	3.472
LOCF5	6.00	1.084	–1.148	1.537
LOCF6	6.21	1.104	–1.803	4.072
LOCF7	6.09	1.155	–1.633	3.366
LOCF8	5.66	1.477	–1.258	1.590
LOCF9	4.78	1.532	–0.368	–0.338
LOCF10	5.97	1.195	–1.313	1.981
Health-related services				
HEALS1	5.41	1.450	–0.794	0.179
HEALS2	5.83	1.174	–0.907	0.787
HEALS3	5.63	1.265	–0.940	1.072
HEALS4	5.27	1.381	–0.698	0.175
HEALS5	5.62	1.291	–0.788	0.170
HEALS6	5.66	1.273	–1.032	1.106
Entertainment				
ENTER1	5.44	1.352	–0.832	0.618
ENTER2	5.41	1.317	–0.805	0.620
ENTER3	4.88	1.521	–0.354	–0.522
ENTER4	6.13	1.048	–1.196	1.115
ENTER5	6.15	1.060	–1.227	1.008
ENTER6	5.70	1.254	–1.005	1.007
ENTER7	5.66	1.229	–0.748	0.285
ENTER8	6.05	1.099	–1.169	1.165
ENTER9	5.86	1.152	–0.891	0.126
Tourist satisfaction				
SAT1	5.65	1.004	–0.406	–0.157
SAT2	5.57	1.041	–0.689	1.232
SAT3	5.62	1.041	–0.689	1.232
SAT4	5.72	1.015	–0.582	0.168
SAT5	5.43	1.145	–0.330	–0.254
SAT6	5.49	1.118	–0.465	–0.058
SAT7	5.37	1.134	–0.612	1.143
SAT8	5.58	1.131	–0.696	0.433
SAT9	5.63	1.169	–0.681	0.054
SAT10	5.56	1.140	–0.508	–0.219
SAT11	5.42	1.186	–0.379	–0.457

Note: SD = standard deviation.

Table 5. Rotated factor matrix (local food, health-related services, and entertainment) and component matrix (tourist satisfaction)

	Factor		
	1	**2**	**3**
LOCF1	0.851		
LOCF2	0.771		
LOCF3	0.694		
LOCF4	0.769		
LOCF5	0.837		
LOCF9	0.613		
LOCF10		0.884	
LOCF6			0.882
	Factor		
	1	**2**	
HEALS1	0.793		
HEALS4	0.814		
HEALS3		0.843	
	Factor		
	1	**2**	**3**
ENTER4	0.833		
ENTER6	0.792		
ENTER8	0.784		
ENTER1		0.589	
ENTER2		0.578	
ENTER5		0.698	
ENTER9			0.967
	Factor		
	1		
SAT1	0.988		
SAT2	0.879		
SAT3	0.989		
SAT4	0.819		
SAT5	0.901		
SAT6	0.990		
SAT7	0.990		
SAT8	0.989		
SAT9	0.990		
SAT10	0.799		
SAT11	0.691		

Note: Extraction method: principal axis factoring; rotation method: Kaiser varimax rotation and normalization; rotation converged on 5 iterations for local food, 6 for health-related services, and 4 for entertainment.

Table 6. Predictive power and model fit

Constructs	R^2 (explained variance)	Q^2 (1-SSE/SSO)	SRMR	d_ULS	d_G	NFI	RMStheta
Consumer satisfaction	0.397	0.242	0.074	0.577	0.378	0.93	0.109

Note: R^2 = coefficient of determination; SSE/SSO = sum of squared prediction errors/sum of squared observations; SRMR = standardized root mean square residual; d_ULS = unweighted least squares discrepancy; d_G = geodetic discrepancy; NFI = normalized fit index; RMStheta = mean square error correlation.

Table 7. Composite reliability and average variance extracted for first-order constructs

Construct	Cronbach's alpha	Composite reliability	Average variance extracted
Local food	0.899	0.922	0.665
Health-related services	0.846	0.891	0.622
Entertainment	0.881	0.910	0.629
Tourist satisfaction	0.941	0.950	0.632

Table 8. Composite reliability and average variance extracted for second-order constructs

Construct	Cronbach's alpha	Composite reliability	Average variance extracted
Consumer satisfaction	0.941	0.950	0.632
Responsible service	0.744	0.855	0.664

Table 9. Discriminant validity (first-order constructs)

Fornell and Larcker's criterion					HTMT				
	LOCF	*ENTER*	*SAT*	*HEALS*		*LOCF*	*ENTER*	*SAT*	*HEALS*
LOCF	**0.816**				*LOCF*				
ENTER	0.459	**0.793**			*ENTER*	0.505			
SAT	0.428	0.561	**0.795**		*SAT*	0.452	0.608		
HEALS	0.381	0.636	0.540	**0.788**	*HSER*	0.442	0.736	0.602	

Note. HTMT = heterotrait-monotrait ratio.

Table 10. Discriminant validity (second-order model)

Fornell and Larcker's criterion			HTMT		
	SAT	*RESPSERV*		*SAT*	*RESPSERV*
SAT	**0.795**		*SAT*		
RESER	0.630	0.815	*RESER*	0.744	

Note. HTMT = heterotrait-monotrait ratio.

Table 11. Hypothesis contrasted (correlation and variance explained) and percentile CI and/or bias corrected CI

Hypothesis	Path coefficient (β)	*P*-value	*T*-value (bootstrap)	Percentile CI 2.5%	Percentile CI 97.5%	Bias corrected CI 2.5%	Bias corrected CI 97.5%	Supported (yes/no)
H1: Responsible service (*RESER*) → Consumer satisfaction (*SAT*)	0.630***	0.000	11.976	0.525	0.730	0.512	0.722	Yes

Note. CI = confidence interval; *** $p < 0.001$; based on a Student's $t_{(4999)}$ one-tailed distribution; $t_{(0.05, 4999)} = 1.645$; $t_{(0.01, 4999)} = 2.327$; $t_{(0.001, 4999)} = 3.092$.

Figure 1. Conceptual model and hypotheses