The unappreciated slowness of conventional tourism

A subestimada *slowness* do turismo convencional

Gunvor Riber Larsen

Department of Architecture, Design and Media Technology, Aalborg University, Denmark
grla@create.aau.dk

Abstract

Most tourists are not consciously engaging in 'slow travel', but a number of travel behaviours displayed by conventional tourists can be interpreted as slow travel behaviour. Based on Danish tourists' engagement with the distances they travel across to reach their holiday destination, this paper explores unintended slow travel behaviours displayed by these tourists. None of the tourists participating in this research were consciously doing 'slow travel', and yet some of their most valued holiday memories are linked to slow travel behaviours. Based on the analysis of these unintended slow travel behaviours, this paper will discuss the potential this insight might hold for promotion of slow travel. If unappreciated and unintentional slow travel behaviours could be utilised in the deliberate effort of encouraging more people to travel slow, 'slow travel' will be in a better position to become integrated into conventional travel behaviour.

Keywords: tourism; environment; transport mode; transit; slowness; travel behaviour.

Resumo

A maior parte dos turistas não pratica *slow tourism* de forma consciente, mas existem alguns comportamentos por parte de turistas convencionais que podem ser interpretados como práticas de *slow travel*. Considerando as distâncias que os turistas dinamarqueses estão dispostos a percorrer para chegar ao seu destino de férias, este artigo explora as práticas de *slow tourism* não-intencionais destes turistas. Nenhum dos turistas que participou neste estudo estava a praticar o *slow tourism* de forma consciente, e contudo algumas das suas mais valiosas memórias de férias estão ligadas a práticas de *slow tourism*. Partindo da análise destes comportamentos não-intencionais, o artigo discute o potencial que esta perspetiva poderá trazer para a promoção do *slow tourism*. Se comportamentos de *slow travel* não-intencionais e não-valorizados puderem ser aplicados a um esforço deliberado para encorajar mais pessoas a viajar devagar, o *slow tourism* ficará numa posição mais vantajosa para ser integrado nas práticas turísticas convencionais.

Palavras-chaves: turismo; ambiente; modo de transporte; trânsito; lentidão; comportamento do viajante.

1. Introduction

Tourism has several environmental problems, related primarily to the freighting of tourists to and from their chosen destinations by the use of transportation modes that burn fossil fuels, particularly by air (Gössling, Hall, Peeters and Scott, 2010; Scott, Hall and Gössling, 2012), but there are also negative effects of tourism on destinations in terms of resource use and impact on the environment (Rutty, Gössling, Scott and Hall, 2015; Dickinson and Lumsdon, 2010; Gössling, Hansson, Hörstmeier and Saggel, 2002). Such environmental problems are likely to increase (Peeters, 2007, Dubois, Peeters, Ceron and Gössling, 2011), and there is not currently any viable technological fix to the problems on the horizon (Gössling *et al.,* 2010). Thus, argues Cohen, Higham, Gössling and Peeters (2014), the environmental challenges of tourism have to be met through a behavioural change, partly and preferably, say Ceron and Dubois (2007), through tourists engaging in slow tourism and slow travel behaviours such as taking longer, but fewer holiday breaks (as opposed to the current trend of numerous short breaks annually), and being mindful of the distances travelled. To this list of environmentally friendlier tourism behaviours Dickinson, Lumsdon and Robbins (2011) add avoiding airplanes, cars and other fuel heavy transport modes. The reason for this is that slow tourism is hailed as a tool for making tourism more environmentally friendly, because slow tourism does not result in as many pollutants as conventional tourism, and does not impact the destinations as much in terms of resource use (Dickinson and Lumsdon, 2010). Further, slow tourism is argued to give the tourist a better holiday experience (Fullagar, Wilson and Markwell, 2012). But efforts to make people travel slowly and engage in slow tourism based on environmental arguments have not to date been successful at a necessary scale (Hares, Dickinson and Wilkes, 2010), partly because of a significant attitude-behaviour gap (Hibbert, Dickinson, Gössling and Curtin*,* 2013), where people say that they do, or would like to, consider the environment when they plan and conduct their trips, but when it comes to actually performing environmentally friendly tourism, i.e. slow tourism, most people do not (Becken, 2007).

The argument in this paper is that if it could be shown that elements of slow travel already exist in conventional, non-slow tourism, and it could be substantiated that the tourism experiences that tourists value the most are the ones where they engage in

behaviours that are akin to slow travel, this might be a tool that can be utilised in efforts to make contemporary tourism both more environmentally friendly, and provide better holiday experiences at the same time. The new insight to be had from this paper is that slow travel behaviours are more widespread than maybe previously thought. Although not fully deliberate, many tourists do, in fact, engage in activities and performances that fall within the academic understanding of slow travel; they just do not do it consciously, and might not do it throughout their holiday. This insight will in this paper be documented through an analysis of 30 Danish tourists' travel and holiday accounts, given in qualitative semi-structured interviews.

2. Slow travel behaviours

Conventional tourism[1] is often associated with fast travel modes, and is the way of holidaying that constitutes the majority of global tourism (Oh, Assaf and Baloglu, 2014; Peeters, 2012). An on-going discussion, unfolded by Weaver (2012) and Peeters (2012), focuses on the potential for mass tourism to become more environmentally sustainable, and it is into that discussion that this paper is contributing. The analysis and discussion in this paper thus takes its point of departure in slow tourism and travel, as elements of such behaviours could be part of a more sustainable conventional mass tourism.

Slow tourism and slow travel are of course two associated, albeit in certain areas differing concepts (Conway and Timms, 2012). Definitions of each of the two concepts are, as with most concepts in social studies, not universally agreed upon, and seem to vary depending on the context and purpose for which they are employed. Generally, however, slow tourism has a focus on both the demand and supply side of the tourism industry, while slow travel primarily focuses on the tourists and their journeys to, from and within tourist destinations (Fullagar *et al.*, 2012; Hall, 2012). Dickinson and Lumsdon (2010) identify three academic starting points for the current discussions of slow tourism: the attempt to define some core elements of the phenomenon; the discussion of tourism's nature and the need for better tourism experiences, especially for urban dwellers; and, lastly, the discussion of to what extent the actual transport between

---

[1] In this paper conventional tourism is defined as the type of tourism and holidaying that does not result from a conscious decision by the tourist to travel in an environmentally sustainable manner.

places constitutes a tourism experience. Based on these observations in the literature, Dickinson and Lumsdon (2010) proceed to suggest four defining characteristics of slow travel:

- *Low carbon*: as also illustrated by Peeters (2007), tourism has a significant impact on the environment, and the majority of the greenhouse gas emissions from tourism come from the transport element, with accommodation and holiday activities emitting far less greenhouse gasses. Low carbon tourism is thus a result of slow travel, because slower transportation modes cause fewer emissions. Dickinson and Lumsdon (2010), with reference to Dickinson, Robbins and Lumsdon (2010) and Guiver, Lumsdon and Morris (2007), group slow travellers into two groups: the "hard" slow travellers, who choose their holiday destinations and travel modes based on an environmental concern, and the "soft" slow travellers, who happen to enjoy travelling slowly, and thereby by default become slow travellers who cause fewer greenhouse gas emissions.

- *Mode of transport:* Car and air travel are not compatible with slow travel, as they are too carbon intensive in use. Rail and coach travel is less carbon intensive, and cycling and walking are carbon neutral. However, many tourists use one mode of transport to reach their holiday destination, and another at the destination, and a theoretical question remains as to whether a tourist who flies to the destination, but while at the destination only walks, can be labelled a slow traveller. From a destination point of view, yes, but from an overall holiday point of view, no (Dickinson and Lumsdon, 2010). The different transport modes also allow different scales of engagement with the local community and landscape, where the slower and shared transport modes yield high interaction, while fast and more independent modes do not facilitate interaction to the same degree.

- *The travel and destination experience:* Within slow travel, the journey to and from the destination is an integrated part of the overall holiday experience, and thus cannot be separated from the experiences at the destination. This is partly due to the better opportunity for engaging with the scenery and travel

companions during the journey when you travel slowly (Pine and Gilmore 1999; Larsen, 2001).

- *Environmental concerns:* The level of emissions is a result of both the choice of transport mode, as well as the distances travelled across. The further the distance between home and holiday destination, and the faster this is travelled across, the more greenhouse gasses are emitted in order to transcend that distance. Part of practicing slow travel is to favour slower transportation modes and shorter travel distances when planning and conducting a holiday.

Based on a review of literature on slow tourism and travel, and a subsequent discussion of the viewpoints on slow tourism and travel by practitioners, writers and academics, Lumsdon and McGrath (2011) take Dickinson and Lumsdon's (2010) discussion of what slow travel is a step further, and establish a conceptual framework for slow travel. In this framework they identify three factors that together make up the core components of a slow travel holiday: slowness, the travel experience and environmental consciousness, with slowness having a pivotal role:

> The main defining category identified can be described as slowness, a slowing down of the holiday process in relation to travel, distance, and the activities pursued en route and at a destination. Slowness is related to a perception of time and a way of doing things. Respondents, for example, referred to the experience of slow travel as being unhurried, tranquil, serene, chilled out, seeking simplicity and switching off from everyday life. (Lumsdon and McGrath, 2011: 271)

The second core category of the slow travel conceptual framework is the travel experience, described as "travel with meaning rather than travel just because you have to" (*idem*: 272), with a central element being to travel across land instead of being aeromobile, as this enables engagement with the places travelled through. Pace and time here emerge as two important concepts in the discussion of what slow travel is. According to Germann Molz (2009: 273), drawing on reflections on mobilities made by Cresswell (2006), pace, in a mobilities context, "is made meaningful in much the same way that mobility is made meaningful, through practices, discourses and representational strategies that imbue it with ideological, ethical and political significance". The travel experience is important, and it is through its pacing that it facilitates and yields different types of experiences, and the argument is that the slower

the pace, the better the travel experience. The third core component of a slow travel conceptual framework, as suggested by Lumsdon and McGrath (2011) is environmental consciousness, where emphasis is placed on low energy consumption for the purpose of travelling and holidaying. There were, however, differing views among the experts interviewed by Lumsdon and McGrath, on whether environmental concerns should be a primary motivation for slow travellers, or 'just' an added environmental benefit resulting from a preferred way of travelling, echoing the above distinction between hard and soft slow travellers.

Based on the conceptual framework for slow travel developed by Lumsdon and McGrath (2011) and the similar discussion of core elements of slow travel by Dickinson and Lumsdon (2010), this paper will explore to what extent the interviewed tourists, who all are conventional, or mass, tourists, do, in fact, display slow travel behaviours, without consciously meaning to do so. Combining what Dickinson and Lumsdon (2010) and Lumsdon and McGrath (2011) have found to be the core elements of slow travel, the following analysis of the slowness of conventional travel will thus be structured around four categories: low carbon and environmental consciousness, travel mode, travel experience and slowness.

3. Methodology

The data that forms the empirical basis for this exploration of unappreciated slowness of conventional tourism was collected in 2010-2011, as part of an exploration of tourists' perception of distance (see Larsen, 2013). Qualitative interviews were conducted with thirty Danish tourists aged between 26 and 67, based on their international holiday travels. Because of the lack of previous studies into tourists' perception of the distances they travel across, an abductive (Reichertz, 2007) research approach was adopted, which yielded information on a wide range of factors affecting the tourists' travel behaviour, including the tourists' reflection upon their own travel behaviour. The Danish tourists participating in the research were chosen through theoretical sampling (Corbin and Strauss, 2008), with each tourist being chosen based on an assessment of whether they would be able to bring any new knowledge to the inquiry. The sample was not chosen in an attempt to make it a statistically representative study, but rather in order to scope the topic of tourist distance

perceptions for themes. The recruitment of participants was organised through snowballing, and a wide range of socio-economic backgrounds were represented in the sample. Each interview lasted between one and two hours, and was recorded and transcribed.

For the purpose of the analysis of the unappreciated slowness of conventional tourism *a priori* themes of slow tourism behaviours were established through the review of literature, and thus the analysis is structured around the four categories of slow travel identified above. The data was analysed according to these themes, in order to explore to what degree each type of behaviour was present in the data. This was done through the process of open coding (Corbin and Strauss, 2008) of the data, in order to identify and organise the relevant data into various concepts, while "at the same time qualifying those concepts in terms of their properties and dimensions" (Corbin and Strauss, 2008: 195).

4. Findings and discussion

This section presents the findings from the analysis of the interviews with thirty Danish tourists. The analysis was, as stated above, conducted within the theoretical framework of four slow travel categories: low carbon and environmental concerns, transport mode, travel experience, and slowness.

4.1 Low carbon and environmental consciousness

Highlighted as an important element of slow travel by both Lumsdon and McGrath (2011) and Dickinson and Lumsdon (2010), environmental considerations and the deliberate choice of low carbon activities and transport modes based on emissions concerns does not feature in the interviews with the Danish tourists, and none of them can rightfully be said to be 'hard' slow travellers. During the reflections upon their travel behaviours and motivations, concerns for the environmental impact of their holidays are not mentioned by a single traveller, and only when prompted during the interviews about the potential environmental consequences of their holidaying, do the interviewees consider this matter:

> I have to be honest and say that I don't really know much about what actually pollutes the most…I mean, it would probably be more polluting if everybody on a plane were to drive the same distance. So no [she does not consider the environment when she flies]…but maybe that is also because I choose not to consider it, because if you start to think about it, it is polluting, just for your pleasure. So I deliberately close my eyes (female, 30).

Overwhelmingly they reach the conclusion that environmentally friendly behaviours are a feature of their everyday lifestyle, but not when they travel on holiday. The following quote is representative of the views expressed in the interviews:

> [I]n principle I do consider the environment a lot, but when it comes to travel I have double standards. Because I know that it is better to transport myself in other ways [than flying], but my laziness comes first (female, 27).

In terms of furthering environmentally friendly travel, this attitude does not bode well, especially as it appears to echo what other investigations into the matter have also found (for example Hares *et al*., 2010; Dickinson and Lumsdon, 2010). However, some optimistic points can be drawn from this. Firstly most of the interviewees acknowledge (when specifically asked about the environment in relation to their holidays) that travelling is not good for the environment: "I think that [my travel behaviour] could be more environmentally friendly" (female, 26), showing that they are not in denial about the issue, and this must be viewed as an important element of eventually altering travel behaviours on the grounds of environmental concerns. Secondly, the analysis also shows that the slow travel behaviour that it is possible to detect in the interviews is a result of intrinsic reasons for conducting slow travel:

> Our cycling trip, to move along on a bicycle, it was really good fun. It's not fast, but [the journey] becomes part of the holiday (male, 29).

This means that slow travel behaviours are a positive and voluntary performance, rather than a result of a negative concern that causes the tourists to feel forced to change their behaviour. So while it might not be possible to make the tourists change their travel behaviour based on an environmental argument, tendencies in their current travel behaviour might suggest that it is possible to convince them through the argument of enhanced holiday experiences through slow travel.

4.2 Transport mode

As stated above, the travelling to and from the destination represents the largest part of tourism's overall environmental impact by far, with air travel again resulting in the largest proportion of tourism transportation emissions, followed by car travel (Rutty *et al.,* 2015). The Danish tourists in this study add to this statistic, as their most widely used holiday transportation mode is the plane. This is hardly surprising (for a number of reasons, one being that they were asked to reflect on their international holidaying, where flying is likely to be more prominent), and is problematic in relation to furthering more environmentally sustainable travel, given that the slow travel framework specifically states that air travel is not compatible with slow travel. Aeromobility is, however, a central element of contemporary tourism, and therefore also needs to be part of a discussion of possible behaviour change towards slow travel. An analytically interesting finding in the interviews was that when the Danish tourists were asked about their travel habits, the plane always seemed to be the *default* holiday transport mode. In their reflections upon the issue of getting from home to the holiday destination, the plane was the transport mode that they subconsciously used as their reference transport mode. Not that the plane was the *only* transport mode they used in their holiday travels, far from it, but it lies implicitly in the reflections on holiday transit that it is the plane that is used.

This is problematic in relation to the theoretical understanding of slow travel presented above, and in order for slow travel to be promoted, the status of the aeroplane as the default transportation mode needs to change, which will be a challenge if its current status includes it being picked off the shelf as transportation mode of choice without even considering other modes. Such a change of status requires an enquiry into how this status has come about, and the interviews give an answer to this. The plane is the most widely used holiday transport mode by the Danish tourists, but for two reasons only: it is fast and it is cheap, compared to other relevant modes of transport:

> My preferred holiday transport mode is probably flying, because it is fast. The price is important too, but it is also speed (female, 29).

A majority of the holiday journeys referred to in the interviews would have been possible with other modes of transport, as many of the destinations were located in continental Europe (cf. Conway and Timms (2012) for a discussion of how Europe is better suited for slow travel and slow tourism than other parts of the world), but still flying was the transportation mode of choice. But at the same time, air travel was also the least favoured or enjoyed, for a number of reasons ("you are tied to your seat" (female, 29), "your co-passengers can be annoying, and you can't get away from them" (male, 34), "a long air journey will never be a pleasure" (female, 29)) and this is interesting from a slow travel point of view. The major complaint against air travel that surfaces in the interviews with the Danish tourists is that it de-couples the traveller from the context of the lands they travel across and in a way laser-beams the tourist into the destination:

> When you fly to a place you don't really have any sense of where in the world you are. After bicycling for a while, you start to get a sense of a line that you have travelled along. You see how things change along that line (male, 30).

This is an example of how travelling slow enhances the holiday experience, in spite of the slow travel behaviour not being a result of environmental concerns.

Another issue that was frequently raised in the interviews about air travel is the boredom of flying: "There is not really much to do while you fly, you can just sit there and wait" (male, 63). This could be interpreted as the lack of opportunities to equip airtime (see Jain and Lyons (2008) for a discussion of equipping travel time: how to fill the time spent in transit with other activities such as reading, watching films, knitting, socialising, etc.). Flying was recognised as an uncomfortable experience compared to what would have been possible to have had with other transportation modes, and yet it was chosen based on a time and cost benefit analysis. The tourists are well aware of the experiential benefits of using other transport modes: "Ferry rides and cycle trips can become part of the holiday experience" (male, 29), and:

> [O]n a plane you are able to look out the window, but can't really see anything, but on a train you can see the landscape change. So on a train and in a car you get more experiences along the way, changes in nature, other travellers and things like that (female, 34).

From the interviews it is clear that the slower the transport mode used, the more interesting the journey became for the tourist, with cycling holidays and trekking journeys being the journeys that were spoken about most fondly. This gives hope to the idea behind slow travel, and weight to the argument that slower, and thereby less environmentally harmful, to-and-from destination journeys themselves are more valued elements of the overall holiday and a holiday experience in their own right. The challenge for the promotion of slow travel then emerges as one where slower travel modes need to be competitive on cost and time, as the experiential and environmental benefits of travelling slower are already known to many tourists.

4.3 Travel experience

In line with the observation above that even though travelling by air is the most widely used form of holiday transit, slower modes are more desired because of the opportunity to interact with landscape and people(s) along the way, and to equip the travel time, the interviews also reveal that the experience of travelling from home to destination is often valued transition time, that in itself counts as a holiday experience. But again, it is often traded off for the opportunity to arrive at the chosen destination in as little time as possible, as cheaply as possible. However, the transit is framed as a valued necessity by the Danish tourists, and asked if they would like to be able to press a button and magically appear at the destination, most of them reflected that the period of travelling had other purposes than just the corporeal transport, and that the mental transition was also an important part of a holiday. The following quote sums up the majority of the interviewees' reflections on the matter:

> My father has always said that he loved it when he had time to adapt, he had time to think those last work related things through, that he had time to readjust his mind and body, so that when we reached the camp site he was in holiday mode. And I understand where he comes from, but when you fly, you spend time on flying and waiting for your luggage and maybe driving afterwards. So I probably don't feel exactly the same [as her father], but I think that if you could just press a button and then you were in Spain that would be too weird. The transition does have a function (female, 29).

The time spent in transit becomes a result of a time prioritisation exercise that most tourists will have to do when they decide on their holiday destination and transportation

mode. There is a yearly annual leave time frame that holidaying must fit within, and there is a desire to stay at a destination for as long as possible, and then there is the time spent in transit between home and destination. Here the transit time is often short changed, because most of the interviewees do actually acknowledge the experience value and the opportunity of a mental transition that the transit period offers, but it is not prioritised to such a degree that it makes a difference in relation to the issues raised in the slow travel discussion (environmental concerns and enhanced travel experience), and thus less time is allocated to the transit, which results in the choice of a fast(er) transportation mode. The implicit argument made by many of the interviewees is that the more time spent on transit, the less 'proper' holiday time is left, as both transit and destination time will have to fit within the time limitations of the annual leave. This also leads to the issue of frequency, where long transit times can be viewed as a problem in relation to how frequent it is possible to go away on holidays and short breaks. If holidays are temporally shorter and relatively frequent, long transit journeys are not viewed as favourable by the interviewees, as transit time somehow has to be justified by the time spent at the destination. What emerges is that the tourists do acknowledge the value of the transit period, and that it itself holds, or has the potential to hold, experiences that qualify as proper and good holiday experiences, but they are traded off for in-destination-time, in a mechanism that almost seems as if they don't dare to gamble with experiences at the destination for the potential of experiences en route.

4.4 Slowness

Slowness is highlighted by Lumsdon and McGrath (2011) as the main category of slow travel: the slowing down of all the activities associated with travel, and a focus on time spent unhurriedly. When the Danish tourists talk about their favoured holiday memories or most enjoyable journeys, as for example this woman: "My best holiday was a bicycle trip twelve years ago, I'd love to do that again" (female, 31), they are primarily linked, in one way or another, to slowness, and especially to occasions where the pace was slowed down, and they actually had time to engage either with the countryside they were passing through, with the people they were travelling with or with the culture and people at their chosen destination. Here it is possible to detect a desire, though

unknown, to be a slow traveller (albeit a soft one), and the insight that it is actually the slow travel behaviours that seem to be the most valued by the tourists holds potential for the advancement of slow travel.

There is, however, an issue with distance. According to slow travel theory, the tourist should be mindful of the distances they travel across in order to reach their holiday destination, and preferably travel across shorter distances. In the interviews a desire can be identified that would suggest that the distance-limitation might not be popular. Asked what influence it would have on their travel habits, if time and money did not place limits on their holidays, most of the tourist participants stated that they would be likely to travel more often, further and for longer time periods: "I would probably travel more often and further away" (female, 28), essentially scaling their holiday up, which, seen from an environmental perspective, is not an ideal scenario. However, one interviewed tourist replies the following to the question of how his travel behaviour would change if he had unlimited time and money funds: "I actually like the idea of moving slowly, so maybe a boat journey, where you are moving, but at the same time have the opportunity to see the surroundings" (male, 29). A furthering of slow travel will need to have more tourists thinking like this.

5. Conclusion

This paper set out to explore the unappreciated slowness of conventional tourism, and for that purpose a theoretical framework was established through the review of literature on slow travel. Four categories were chosen as basis for the analysis: low carbon and environmental concerns, transport mode, travel experience and slowness. Interviews with 30 Danish tourists were analysed for the purpose of identifying examples of slow travel behaviours, based on these categories.

The analysis shows that flying is, for the interviewed tourists, the default holiday travel mode, because it is the fastest and the cheapest way of getting from home to destination. This does not mean they enjoy flying, and they acknowledge that better travel experiences are to be had if slower transportation modes are used. Essentially the choice of the airplane boils down to prioritising fast transit over experience-rich transit, and this leads to a discussion of the role the journey to a destination holds for the

traveller: is it a necessary evil, is it intrinsic and a fully integrated part of the holiday, or is it something in between (Lumsdon and Page 2004)? The findings from this present research suggest, not surprisingly, that the journey to the destination is something in-between, with most of the tourists valuing the experiences in transit, but choosing the mode that facilitates such experiences the least, based on a price and pace argument.

On a brighter note, in the context of identifying slow travel behaviours onto which to pin an effort of promoting slow travel, slow travel is actually performed by the Danish tourists, even if they are not aware of it. Most noticeable is the fact that the holiday memories they seem to value the most are the ones that are results of slow travel behaviours: when they give themselves the time to engage in the place they are holidaying at, the people they are with and when they are not hurried or placed under a time schedule decided upon by others. This corresponds with the core element of slow travel identified by Lumsdon and McGrath (2011): the slowness of the travel and holiday experience. Taking the time to immerse into the experiences as they present themselves is valued by the tourists as well as being theoretically important for slow travel, and this convergence should be used actively in efforts to make more tourists deliberately engage in slow tourism.

Table 1 below sums up the analysis findings in relation to the four slow travel categories condensed from the literature:

Table 1: Slow travel behaviours in the interviews

Slow travel category	*Slow travel behaviours in the interviews.*
Low carbon and environmental consciousness	None unless prompted. Acknowledgement of the environmental issued relating to tourism.
Transport mode	Aeromobile by default. Enjoy other modes of transport more, but choose to travel by air because it is faster and cheaper.
Travel experience	Value the transition. Place importance on the transition period from home to destination, but do not prioritise it.
Slowness	The most valued holiday experiences result from slowing down and taking the time to engage.

Source: Author.

5.1 The speed and cost trade-off: The biggest challenge for slow travel behaviour

So tourists do engage in, and value, slow travel practices, and quite enjoy their holiday memories that are based on slow travel behaviours. The question then is why don't they engage more in slow travel behaviours than statistics suggest they currently

do? The short answer from this piece of research is, that slow travel benefits are traded off for speed and cost, where the urge to get to a desired destination quickly and cheaply overrides the potential slow travel benefits. This mechanism is not an explicit and deliberate one, as the link between positive and desired holiday experiences and slow travel behaviours is probably not fully realised by the tourists. In opposition to this is the very much-realised link between spending as little time as possible in cheap transit and spending more holiday time and money at the destination. It is obvious that the tourists are under temporal restrictions, and in the urge to maximise the experience output in as little time as possible, environmental concerns relating to transport mode choice are not acted upon, even though they are realised by the individual tourist. One way of countering this, suggested by Larsen and Guiver (2013) and Scott and Becken (2010) is to make the annual leave framework more flexible, in order to allow more time for holidaying, and then not holidaying as frequently. But what this piece of research also shows is that, given the chance to be freed from temporal restrictions in relation to their holidays, many tourists envisage themselves utilising this to the maximum, probably resulting in more holidays, to further away destinations – not exactly a desired outcome from an environmental point of view.

Other prominent slow travel behaviours identified in the interviews are in relation to the modal choice and the experiences the tourists get from the journey to and from the destination. The factors that are the most hindering for the interviewed tourists fully engaging in slow travel practices in relation to the two factors, in spite of the interviews showing that ideally they would choose slower transport modes and engage more in the transit experience, are again the time limitations of their holidays, and the price they pay for holiday transit. Time and money are the two factors the Danish tourists say influence their holiday decisions the most, and the desire to get away in a hurry for little money overwrites the manifestation of otherwise enjoyed and valued slow travel behaviours.

5.2 Final remarks

As this paper outlined in the beginning, one of the on-going discussions in relation to the environmental impact of tourism is how to change tourist behaviours towards

more environmentally friendly practices (cf. Peeters, 2007, Hares *et al*., 2010, Hibbert *et. al.* 2013). Academia is reasonably clear about what needs to happen (fewer kilometres travelled by transportation modes that emit fewer greenhouse gasses), but a behavioural shift is still to be seen, and by the look of it (United Nations World Tourism Organisation (UNWTO), 2015), is not really on the cards yet.

This analysis is based on the argument that unintended slow travel behaviours by conventional tourists could become a vehicle for more tourists to engage in slow travel, for the benefit of the environment as well as resulting in better tourist experiences. A range of reflections made by the Danish tourists show some of them to already be soft slow travellers, and others having potential to become soft slow travellers, but if we want to encourage slow tourism behaviours in conventional tourists, there are some behaviours that it is more likely that tourists will engage in than others, and some prohibiting factors that need to be addressed.

For the interviewed tourists, engaging in slow travel practices and deliberately choosing slowness is traded off for faster and cheaper air travel. If slower transport modes were cheaper, and preferably cheaper than air fares, it is likely that more tourists would choose such transportation modes. Also the speed with which aeroplanes bring tourists to their destination is valued by the tourists, but at the same time this analysis also shows a potential in making holiday transit intrinsic to the holiday. Therefore it might be possible to persuade some tourists to travel slower, if the journey then becomes integral to their holiday – which is not the case when the journey is undertaken by air. This could be done through the promotion of slow journey narratives, as suggested by Caletrió (2015), and reflects a behaviour change that already has momentum and is performed by a number of the tourists interviewed for this study.

References

Becken, S. (2007). Tourists' perception of international air travel's impact on the global climate and potential climate change policies. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 15* (4), 351-368. doi: 10.2167/jost710.0

Caletrio, J. (2015). *What makes a slow tourist?* Mobile Lives Forum. Retrieved from http://en.forumviesmobiles.org/admin/blog/2016/01/04/what-makes-slow-tourist-3052. 9th November 2015.

Ceron, J.-P. & Dubois, G. (2007). Limits to tourism? A backcasting scenario for sustainable tourism mobility in 2050. *Tourism and Hospitality Planning & Development, 4* (3), 191-209. doi: 10.1080/14790530701736598

Cohen, S., Higham, J., Gössling, S. & Peeters, P. (2014). Why tourism mobility behaviours must change. In S. Cohen, J. Higham, S. Gössling & P. Peeters (Eds.), *Understanding and governing sustainable tourism mobility: Psychological and behavioural approaches* (pp. 1-11). London: Routledge.

Conway, D. & Timms, B.F. (2012). Are slow travel and slow tourism misfits, *compadres* or different genres? *Tourism Recreation Research, 37* (1), 71-76. doi: 10.1080/02508281.2012.11081689

Corbin, J. & Strauss, A. (2008). *Basics of qualitative research* (3rd ed.). London: Sage.

Cresswell, T. (2006). *On the move: Mobility in the modern western world*. London: Routledge.

Dickinson, J.E. & Lumsdon, L.M. (2010). *Slow travel and tourism*. London: Earthscan.

Dickinson, J.E., Lumsdon, L.M. & Robbins, D. (2011). Slow travel: Issues for tourism and climate change. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 19* (3), 281-300. doi: 10.1080/09669582.2010.524704

Dickinson, J.E., Robbins, D. & Lumsdon, L.M. (2010). *Slow travel*. (Working Paper). Bournemouth University.

Dubois, G., Peeters, P., Ceron, J.-P. & Gössling, S. (2011). The future tourism mobility of the world population: Emission growth versus climate policy. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practive, 45* (10), 1031-1042. doi: 10.1016/j.tra.2009.11.004

Fullagar, S., Wilson, E. & Markwell, K. (2012). Starting slow: Thinking through slow mobilities and experiences. In S. Fullagar, K. Markwell & E. Wilson (Eds.), *Slow tourism: Experiences and mobilities* (pp. 1-10). Bristol: Channel View Publications.

Germann Molz, J. (2009). Representing pace in tourism mobilities: Staycations, slow travel and the amazing race. *Journal of Tourism and Cultural Change, 7* (4), 270-286. doi: 10.1080/14766820903464242

Gössling, S., Hall, C.M., Peeters, P. & Scott, D. (2010). The future of tourism: Can tourism growth and climate policy be reconciled? A mitigation perspective. *Tourism Recreation Research, 35* (2), 119-130. doi: 10.1080/02508281.2010.11081628

Gössling, S., Hansson, C.B., Hörstmeier, O. & Saggel, S. (2002). Ecological footprint analysis as a tool to assess tourism sustainability. *Ecological Economics, 43* (2-3), 199-211. doi: 10.1016/S0921-8009(02)00211-2

Guiver, J.W., Lumsdon, L.M. & Morris, K. (2007). The role of scheduled busses in reducing car journeys in tourist areas. In P. Peeters (Ed.), *Tourism and climate change mitigation: Methods, greenhouse gas reduction and policies* (pp. 119-131). Breda: Stichting NHTV Breda.

Hall, C.M. (2012). The contradictions and paradoxes of slow food: Environmental change, sustainability and the conservation of taste. In S. Fullagar, K. Markwell & E. Wilson (Eds.), *Slow tourism: Experiences and mobilities* (pp. 53-68). Bristol: Channel View Publications.

Hares, A., Dickinson, J.E. & Wilkes, K. (2010). Climate change and the air travel decisions of UK tourists. *Journal of Transport Geography, 18* (3), 466-473. doi: 10.1016/j.jtrangeo.2009.06.018

Hibbert, J.F., Dickinson, J.E., Gössling, S. & Curtin, S. (2013). Identity and tourism mobility: An exploration of the attitude-behaviour gap. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 21* (7), 999-1016. doi: 10.1080/09669582.2013.826232

Jain, J. & Lyons, G. (2008). The gift of travel time. *Journal of Transport Geography, 16* (2), 81–89. doi: 10.1016/j.jtrangeo.2007.05.001

Larsen, G.R. & Guiver, J.W. (2013). Understanding tourists' perceptions of distance: A key to reducing the environmental impacts of tourism mobility. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 21* (7), 968-981. doi: 10.1080/09669582.2013.819878

Larsen, G.R. (2013). *Consumption of distance: An exploratory investigation of understandings of distance of Danish tourists* (Unpublished PhD thesis). University of Central Lancashire: Preston.

Larsen, J. (2001). Tourism mobilities and the travel glance: Experiences of being on the move. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism, 1* (2), 80-98. doi: 10.1080/150222501317244010

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

Lumsdon, L.M. & Page, S. (2004). Progress in transport and tourism research: Reformulating the transport-tourism interface and future research agendas. In L.M. Lumsdon & S. Page (Eds.), *Tourism and transport. Issues and agenda for the new millennium* (pp. 1-27). London: Elsevier.

Oh, H., Assaf, A.G. & Baloglu, S. (2016). Motivations and goals of slow tourism. *Journal of Travel Research, 55* (2), 205-219. doi: 10.1177/0047287514546228

Peeters, P. (2007). Mitigating tourism's contribution to climate change: An introduction. In P. Peeters (Ed.), *Tourism and climate change mitigation: Methods, greenhouse gas reductions and policies* (pp.11-28). Breda: Stichting NHTV Breda.

Peeters, P. (2012). A clear path towards sustainable mass tourism? Rejoinder to the paper 'Organic, incremental and induced paths to sustainable mass tourism convergence' by David B. Weaver. *Tourism Management*, 33 (5), 1038-1041. doi: 10.1016/j.tourman.2012.01.013

Pine, B. & Gilmore, J. (1999). *The Experience Economy*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Reichertz, J. (2007). Abduction: The logic of discovery of grounded theory. In A. Bryant & K. Charmaz (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of grounded theory* (pp. 214-228). London: Sage.

Rutty, M., Gössling, S., Scott, D. & Hall, C.M. (2015). The global effects and impacts of tourism. An overview. In C.M. Hall, S. Gössling & D. Scott (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of tourism and sustainability* (pp. 36-63). London: Routledge.

Scott, D. & Becken, S. (2010). Editorial introduction: Adapting to climate change and climate policy: Progress, problems and potentials. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 18* (3), 283–295. doi: 10.1080/09669581003668540

Scott, D., Hall, C.M. & Gössling, S. (2012). *Tourism, and climate change: Impacts, adaptation and mitigation*. London: Routledge.

United Nations World Tourism Organisation (2015). *UNWTO Tourism Highlights, 2015 Edition*. Madrid: UNWTO. doi: 10.18111/9789284416899

Weaver, D.B. (2012). Organic, incremental and induced paths to sustainable mass tourism convergence. *Tourism Management, 33* (5), 1030-1037. doi: 10.1016/j.tourman.2011.08.011

GUNVOR RIBER LARSEN is Assistant Professor in Mobilities and Urban Studies at the Department of Architecture, Design and Media Technology, Aalborg University, Denmark. This position is a business assistant professorship in collaboration with Hjørring Municipality, Denmark, for whom research into mobilities and urban development is conducted. Gunvor Riber Larsen's PhD research focused on Danish tourists' perception of distance in relation to their holiday travels. Currently Gunvor Riber Larsen is conducting research into aeromobilities and airports, experienced and spatial mobilities, urban and rural development and tourism mobilities. Institutional address: Aalborg Universitet, Institut for Arkitektur, Design og Medieteknologi Rendsburggade 14, rum 5.353, 9000 Aalborg, Danmark.