sustainability

MDPI

Article

Environmentally and Socially Responsible Behavior of Women from Generation Z in the Context of Tourist Activity

Agata Balińska [1,*], Ewa Jaska [1] and Agnieszka Werenowska [2]

[1] Institute of Economics and Finance, Warsaw University of Life Sciences, 00-927 Warsaw, Poland; ewa_jaska@sggw.edu.pl
[2] Management Institute, Warsaw University of Life Sciences, 00-927 Warsaw, Poland; agnieszka_werenowska@sggw.edu.pl
* Correspondence: agata_balinska@sggw.edu.pl

Abstract: The aim of this research was to determine the scope of environmentally and socially responsible behavior related to tourist trips of women from Generation Z. The choice of this issue falls within the scientific discussion on the sustainable behavior of young consumers and the area of research on sustainable tourism. The presented research fills the research gap related to the sustainable behavior of young women in the context of tourist trips. This article reviews the literature justifying the choice of this research topic. The results of our own survey research were presented (a sample of 618 touristically active women from Generation Z). Quantitative and qualitative analyses of the obtained results were made. This research showed that respondents were most concerned about recreational space (not leaving garbage in the forest or on the beach, observing regulations in tourist regions and towns, and using only designated trails). They rated their behavior the lowest in terms of reduction in water consumption, use of ecological cosmetics while using water reservoirs, and choosing accommodation places where pro-ecological solutions are used. According to the respondents, the main reasons for the lack of responsible behavior are indifference and habits learned at home. The originality of the presented research results from its scope and concerns only women belonging to Generation Z.

Keywords: environmentally and socially responsible behavior; Generation Z; tourist activity women

Citation: Balińska, A.; Jaska, E.; Werenowska, A. Environmentally and Socially Responsible Behavior of Women from Generation Z in the Context of Tourist Activity. *Sustainability* **2024**, *16*, 5603. https://doi.org/10.3390/su16135603

Academic Editors: Zygmunt Kruczek, Katarzyna Gmyrek and Karolina Korbiel

Received: 24 April 2024
Revised: 25 June 2024
Accepted: 26 June 2024
Published: 29 June 2024

Copyright: © 2024 by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

1. Introduction

The adverse impact of tourism on the natural environment is obvious and subject to extensive scientific analysis [1]. The influence of tourism industry enterprises, governmental and non-governmental agencies, and tourism participants is verified. Recognizing consumer attitudes and behavior is very important from practical and scientific points of view. It would seem that this issue has been sufficiently recognized. Meanwhile, as of 8 March 2024, only 876 results in English were recorded in ProQuest (Database of scientific journals, business publications, and reports in the field of economics, social sciences, humanities, and medicine. World leader in the field of EdTech) under the heading "Responsible behavior of women during tourist trips for the last 5 years". Therefore, the authors undertook research on this issue. It is important not only in the context of the impact of broadly understood tourism on the natural environment but also as part of broadly understood human behavior and a manifestation of typical attitudes. Therefore, this research compared selected behaviors in everyday surroundings and during tourist trips. Ways of talking about climate change are largely gendered [2]. Climate change policy arguments that focus on science and business are more likely to be attributed to men than to women. Women are assigned arguments based on emotions.

The interest in environmentally and socially sustainable behavior during women's tourist trips results from the fact that according to the research by [3–8], women demonstrate environmentally responsible attitudes more often than men. Smerichevskyi et al. [9] indicate that the dominance of women among consumers of ecological goods and services results from the fact that they care about the health of their families. The reasons for women's responsible behavior are believed to be their high sensitivity and altruistic attitudes, which are more developed in women than in men [2,10,11]. Therefore, the aim of this study is not to search for differences in the sustainable behaviors of women and men. These differences have been and still are the subject of research interest of many authors, who are also cited in this text. In this research, the authors focused only on women. Researchers do not agree on the relationship between declarations regarding environmentally sustainable behavior and their actual behavior. Xiao and Hong [3,12] indicate that there is no gap between knowledge and pro-environmental behavior and emphasize that this is a result contrary to most Western studies.

Research carried out by Jaska et al. [6] and Balińska et al. [8] shows that declarations regarding the sustainable behavior of young consumers correspond to actual behavior only to a limited extent.

Many authors [13–15] indicate that women's participation in the formal decision-making process is necessary to achieve ecological goals. Brough et al. [5] even use the term "green femininity stereotype", and identity-related products are more often recycled than thrown away, and compliance with social norms regarding environmental behavior may depend on the degree to which individuals identify with a specific reference group. Pinho and Gomes [16] claim that the research topic regarding Generation Z's involvement in sustainable tourism development remains narrowly recognized by scientists. Continuing this thought, we can assume that an important research gap is the recognition of sustainable behavior in the context of tourist trips of women from Generation Z. Our research contributes to filling this gap and provides inspiration for other researchers. Therefore, the main aim of this research was to determine the scope of environmentally and socially responsible behaviors related to tourist trips of women from Generation Z.

The remaining part of the article is structured as follows. The first part includes a review of the scientific literature, which was the basis for formulating four research hypotheses. The next part is a presentation of the survey results that allowed us to verify the hypotheses. This part also refers to the research results of other authors. The last part of this article is a summary. Limitations of this research were also pointed out, and recommendations for further research were proposed.

2. Theoretical Foundations and Development of Hypotheses

A significant problem in tourist regions is waste left by both tourist enterprises and tourist participants themselves. This phenomenon is not only unfavorable for the natural environment but also unfavorable from the point of view of the attractiveness of tourist reception areas [17–20]. The negative impact of tourist activity became visible during the COVID-19 pandemic. At that time, the pressure on the environment from tourism enterprises and tourists themselves was much lower, which was noted by, among others, Soto et al. [21]. Excess garbage left by tourists is especially visible on beaches [22–24] and at tourist trails [25,26], i.e., places most popular among tourist participants. It is difficult to disagree with Vaske et al. [27], who point out that "[...] ecologically appropriate behaviors increase when individuals ascribe personal responsibility to protect the environment and are aware of the consequences of their actions". Following this line of reasoning, we can assume that littering the tourist space by tourists is the most easily identified manifestation of the negative impact of tourism on nature. While water, soil, and air pollution is difficult to measure or even notice without professional equipment, garbage lying on beaches and in the mountains along tourist trails is visible to the naked eye. Meanwhile, Esfandiar et al. [26] note that still "Few studies have examined binning behavior when people are away from home (i.e., on vacation)". This issue was taken into

account by Schönherr and Pikkemaat [28], but although these were studies carried out among representatives of Generation Z, they were of a qualitative nature (focus studies) and, as the authors themselves emphasize, it is necessary to carry out such studies taking into account the quantitative component. In response to this need, the presented research also took into account the issue of respondents' behavior in terms of leaving or not leaving garbage behind in tourist reception areas. This research adopted the following hypothesis:

H1. *Respondents do not leave garbage behind in tourist reception areas.*

Despite social and cultural changes, meal preparation and other related activities are still perceived as the domain of women. As Saboya de Aragão and Alfinito [14] emphasize, women are more sensitive to food waste issues. This is also reflected during tourist trips. F. Cullen [29] and Kim et al. [30] indicate that women most often decide where to eat a meal outside their home. The research of Scozzafava et al. [31] shows that approximately 30% of restaurant consumers are "locally oriented", i.e., they prefer establishments based on local (including ecological) primary products. As they emphasize, this is very important in tourist regions because it also gives agricultural producers a chance to sell their products [31]. Interestingly, local products are more important to tourists than regional decor [32]. Unfortunately, neither Scozzafava et al. [31] nor Chatzopoulou et al. [32] included gender as a differentiating variable in their research. In turn, research carried out among Romanian consumers shows that although women declare concern about the phenomenon of food waste, as people who more often buy food and prepare meals, they also make a significant contribution to its waste. Assigning women an important role in preventing food waste is quite typical and culturally determined. Women most often prepare meals at home and act as "teachers" and "advisors" for the younger generation. This is also reflected in the materials of the Slow FOOD organization [33]. The cited research results led to the formulation of another hypothesis:

H2. *During tourist trips, the respondents prefer to buy local food (in primary raw form and in the form of dishes in restaurants).*

From a cognitive and utilitarian point of view, it is interesting to determine the relationship between behavior in everyday surroundings and during tourist trips. Research carried out by Pinho and Gomes [16] shows that there is a relationship between sustainable behavior in everyday surroundings and during tourist trips. These behaviors may concern various aspects, including the use of transport [7,34,35], food consumption [36,37], or the use of water [38]. Therefore, the following hypothesis was put forward:

H3. *There is a positive correlation between environmentally and socially responsible behavior in everyday surroundings and during tourist trips.*

Generation Z are young people born between 1995 and 2010. They very often live in family homes with their parents and often siblings. This also applies to those who are adults and professionally active. This phenomenon also occurs in part of the Y generation. Statistical data show that 51% of Poles aged 25–34 still live with their parents [39]. This also influences their behavior. Pinho and Gomes [16] even claim that in the case of Generation Z, pro-ecological behavior is concerned only with household activities, i.e., recycling and reducing water and energy consumption. A possible explanation for such pro-environmental behavior may be parental influence. The older generation sees long-term economic benefits from lower energy and water costs and, therefore, lower living costs [16]. Savings in this area have become more important in recent years due to the deepening climate crisis, the war in Ukraine, as well as changes in the fuel market. In countries such as Poland, where the climate requires heating rooms for about 6 months a

year, the anxiety about the fuel market and the increase in energy prices are felt very strongly by consumers. Therefore, the following hypothesis was formulated:

H4. *The main reason for the lack of environmentally and socially responsible behavior is habits learned in the family home.*

3. Methods and Organization of Research

This research used a survey. This research method allowed us to learn the respondents' opinions in a structured way [40]. This survey questionnaire was prepared on the Forms platform. The electronic version of the questionnaire allows for a wide and efficient reach of potential respondents, shortens the research implementation process, and is preferred by Generation Z, which is emphasized by, among others, Dolot [41], Prakash Yadav and Rai [42], and Vieira et al. [43]. The questionnaire was fully anonymous, and respondents could refrain from completing the questionnaire at any stage of this study. The questionnaire consisted of 19 questions. Due to the objectives of this research, the criteria for selecting the sample were whether the respondents belonged to Generation Z and their tourist activity. Questions about the ages and tourist activities of respondents were the basis for filtering the sample. The survey was opened by 980 respondents, and 950 completed it and met the sample selection criteria. Of the 30 remaining respondents, 8 did not complete the form, and the remaining 22 were rejected at the stage of filtering questions (they did not belong to Generation Z or were not active in tourism). However, as many as 65.1% of respondents were women, and only their answers were taken into account in the analysis.

The survey questionnaire was prepared on the Forms platform. The actual research, preceded by a pilot study, was carried out between March and October 2023. In order to obtain the most reliable answers possible, various question structures were used, which impelled respondents to be attentive [44,45]. The questionnaire included questions about responsible behavior in everyday surroundings (one question with a 5-point scale of importance and one question with a four-point scale of the frequency of responsible behaviors carried out in everyday surroundings, i.e., at home, work, or university), several questions about tourist activity (buffer questions), and questions verifying sustainable behavior during tourist trips (similarly, one question with a 5-point scale of importance and one question with a four-point scale of the frequency of responsible behaviors carried out during tourist trips). A closed question with a multiple-choice option was also included, in which respondents indicated what, in their opinion, were the reasons for the lack of environmentally and socially sustainable behavior among people.

A convenient selection of respondents was used [46], and the snowball method was used to send a link to the questionnaire [47]. The link to the questionnaire was shared through online channels, mainly travel profiles on social media, which was related to the research issue. The correctness of the questionnaire was verified using Cronbach's Alpha test, and its value was 0.715, which means that the test is reliable.

The questionnaire was addressed to both men and women and non-heteronormative people. The questionnaire also included questions typical for social research that allowed for determining the socio-demographic profile of the respondents.

The obtained material was subjected to quantitative and qualitative analyses. The starting point for searching for relationships and differences was the research issues detailed in the hypotheses. The Pearson correlation coefficient and the non-parametric Mann–Whitney and Kruskal–Wallis tests were used. The r Person correlation coefficient was used to verify the relationship between selected behaviors in everyday surroundings and during tourist trips (verification of hypothesis H3). The Mann–Whitney U test is a popular test used as an alternative to the Student's *t*-test, used when the assumptions related to the parametricity of the test (equivalence of groups, normality of distribution, homogeneity of variances) are not met. The Kruskal–Willis test was also used, which is a non-parametric equivalent of unifactorial analysis of variance (ANOVA) for independent

samples and to determine differences between independent groups when there are three or more groups. These tests were used to verify H1, H2, and H4. The statistically significant result is when $p < 0.05$

4. Research Results and Discussion

A total of 618 women took part in this research. The basic variables describing the respondents are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Socio-demographic characteristics of respondents.

	Specification	%, N = 618
Professional status	I study	48.7
	I study and work	44.9
	I work	6.4
Place of residence	cities with over 500 thousand inhabitants	43.9
	cities with 100–500 thousand inhabitants	7.3
	towns with 50–100 thousand inhabitants	8.6
	towns with up to 50 thousand inhabitants	14.6
	village	25.5
Amount of money available	Up to PLN 1500 (up to EUR 347)	45.2
	PLN 1500–3000 (EUR 348–694)	34.1
	over PLN 3000 (over 694 Euro)	20.7
Form of residence	block of flats	49.7
	single-family house	37.6
	dormitory	12.7
Household shared with:	parents	52.2
	a roommate	7.3
	no one (I live alone)	32.5
	with partner/husband	8.0
Education level	higher	29.3
	medium	66.9

Source: own research.

More than half of the respondents were active in the job market, and most of them combined work with studying. More than half lived with their parents, almost half in an apartment in a block of flats. The respondents lived mainly in large cities.

All respondents were active in tourism, but this activity varied. About 15.9% traveled most often, i.e., at least four times a year. Almost half (49.7%) traveled two–three times a year, every fourth (25.2%) once a year, and 9.2% once every few years.

Interestingly, the main direction of domestic trips is cities, followed by coastal areas (Table 2). The same directions, although in a different order, were also preferred on trips abroad.

Table 2. Tourist destinations preferred by respondents (in %).

Direction	Domestic	Abroad
Seaside	57.3	58.0
Mountains	46.2	15.9
Lakes	32.5	7.6
Cities	62.7	55.1
Countryside	17.8	2.2
I do not travel in this direction	3.8	16.9

Respondents could select more than one answer. Source: own research.

The vast majority of respondents in the presented research declared that they have never left garbage behind in public spaces. This attitude is confirmed by studies by other authors, including Sibleyi and Liu [48], Schultz et al. [49], Al-Khatib et al. [50], Torgler et al. [51], and Schönherr and Pikkemaat [28]. This may be related to the emotional attitude to nature, as pointed out by Xu and Hu [18]. Compliance with regulations in the visited places was also verified. This is important because the regulations also include littering bans. Most respondents admitted that they complied with these regulations. The first hypothesis was, therefore, confirmed. To verify whether there was a statistically significant difference between the frequency of responsible behavior declared by the respondents (Table 3) and the frequency of tourist trips, the Kruskal–Wallis test was used. Statistically significant differences were noted for the following behaviors:

- choice of accommodation services in facilities that use pro-ecological solutions: H = 8.2152, p = 0.042 (respondents traveling once every few years and once a year paid attention to this aspect when choosing a facility accommodation significantly less often than respondents traveling at least four times a year);
- purchase of food produced by local producers: H = 8.890, p = 0.031 (respondents traveling at least four times a year bought food produced by local producers significantly more often than those traveling less than once a year);
- giving up well-known gastronomic chains in favor of local restaurants: H = 8.629, p = 0.0347 (respondents traveling at least four times a year used local restaurants significantly more often than women traveling once a year or less often, giving up chain restaurants). In the case of the remaining behaviors listed in Table 3, no differences occurred.

Table 3. Declared frequency of selected behaviors during tourist trips (in %).

Specification	Frequency			
	Very Often	**Often**	**Occasionally**	**Never**
Compliance with the regulations of protected places and tourist facilities in visited places	65.0	22.7	10.0	2.3
Resignation from well-known food chains in favor of local restaurants	23.9	40.5	34.3	1.3
Purchase of food produced by local producers	8.4	35.0	48.9	7.8
Using a means of transport that emits less CO_2	6.5	28.8	48.9	15.9
Use of disposable packaging	5.5	28.5	61.8	4.2
Use of ecological cosmetics (mainly when using water reservoirs)	7.4	22.7	50.8	19.1
Selection of accommodation services in facilities that use pro-ecological solutions	4.5	19.4	51.5	24.6
Leaving garbage behind in tourist areas	2.9	3.6	2.9	90.6

Source: own research.

The accommodation facilities used by the respondents during their tourist trips were hotels, motels, guesthouses (57.0% of respondents), apartments for rent (31.8%), and hostels (6.7%). Other facilities (campsites, holiday homes belonging to family and friends) had a very small share. There was no statistically significant difference between respondents choosing particular types of accommodation facilities and the frequency of behavior defined as "choosing accommodation services in facilities that use pro-ecological solutions" (Table 3), which was verified by the Kruskal–Wallis test (H = 0.623, p = 0.730).

In accordance with hypothesis 2, the respondents' behavior regarding food, including local food products and local restaurants, was verified. Only every fourth of

them indicated that during a tourist trip, they very often chose local restaurants instead of establishments of well-known catering chains, and over 40% made that choice often (Table 3). For comparison, most respondents rarely, and almost every fifth never, use natural cosmetics that do not release harmful substances into water reservoirs. This is probably due to the fact that such a choice is determined by functional reasons, which was confirmed by the research of Syahrul and Mayangsari [52].

Not wasting food was also included in another question of the questionnaire in which respondents rated their behavior on a scale of 1–5 (Table 4).

Table 4. Assessment of respondents' own behavior during tourist trips (scale 1–5, with 5 being the highest).

Activities Regarding:	M	Me	SD
Use only designated trails and paths in tourist reception areas	4.2	5	1.06
Limiting noise (observing night silence)	4.0	4	1.06
Reducing food waste	4.0	4	1.06
Preparing for a tourist trip by gaining knowledge about the place visited	3.9	4	1.03
Reducing water consumption	3.5	4	1.10

Source: own research.

The respondents rated the broadly understood activities aimed at not wasting food as good but lower than the behavior related to the use of tourist trails and paths in the visited region (Table 4). This issue was also the subject of research interests of other authors. Cantaragiu [53] points out that although women declare concern about the phenomenon of food waste, as people who more often buy food and prepare meals, they also make a significant contribution to its waste. Research also shows that there is a positive relationship between women's age and their behavior in not wasting food [53]. A positive relationship between age and environmentally sustainable activities is also indicated by Cavagnaro and Staffieri [10] and Lindenberg and Steg [11]. A similar conclusion was formulated by Jungowska in [54]. In our research, such a relationship did not occur (Pearson's r correlation coefficient 0.0703), but due to the main research problem, the respondents in the research sample we analyzed were close in age. In turn, research by Sharma et al. [55] shows that Generation Z tourists avoid wasting food to a greater extent than older generations.

Verification with the Kruskal–Willis test showed that the respondents' assessment of their own behavior in terms of food waste did not differ significantly depending on the frequency of tourist trips ($H = 1.075$, $p = 0.783$).

Research by Jungowska et al. [54] also shows that women living in larger households wasted food to a greater extent than women living alone. In our research, no such difference occurred, which was verified by the Mann–Whitney Z test ($p = 0.976$, significant result if $p < 0.05$). Similarly, there was no difference between women living in rural areas and cities, where, due to greater trade and service links, access to groceries and ready-made meals is wider (verification with the Mann–Whitney Z test, $p = 0.519$). The obtained research results do not allow for unambiguous confirmation or rejection of hypothesis H2. These results indicate the need for further research in this area. It should also be emphasized that the direction of tourist trips shown in Table 2 did not differentiate either the frequency or the assessment of the respondents' own balanced behavior. Perhaps this is due to the fact that the respondents are quite active in tourism and choose different tourist destinations for their next trips.

Hypothesis H3 assumes that there is a positive relationship between sustainable behavior in everyday surroundings and during a tourist trip.

In this case, the analysis was made in relation to two behaviors, i.e., saving water and not wasting food. The respondents rated their behavior (on a scale of 1–5, with 5 being the highest) in everyday surroundings (at home, at work, at university) at the level of 3.5 (average). In the case of saving water and not wasting food, the average was 3.6. The Pearson correlation coefficient for saving water was 0.450, and for saving food, 0.393. Due to the fact that the correlation coefficient was slightly higher in the case of water-saving behaviors, it was verified whether there was a statistically significant difference in reducing water consumption during tourist trips between respondents who often used water filters on a daily basis and, therefore, did not buy drinks in disposable bottles and those who rarely used these filters or never used them. Verification with the Mann–Whitney U test ($p = 0.01314$) showed that respondents who used filters rated their water-saving behavior during tourist trips higher (average rank 128.37) than those who did not use these filters (average rank 105.67).

Zamparini et al. [56] also point to a high correlation between patterns and behaviors at home and those adopted during holidays in tourist destinations. Such relationships also apply to the consumption of food [37] and water [38]. Gabarda-Mallorquí et al. [38] also point out that in order to motivate tourists to save water, economic elements (additional fees) should be introduced in tourist destinations. In turn, research conducted by Carneiro et al. [57] shows that Generation Z tourists are more environmentally responsible at home than on tourist trips. In turn, Qiu et al. [58] even claim that less concern for the environment on tourist trips than in the place of residence is typical of all generations, not only Generation Z.

In accordance with hypothesis H4, it was verified whether, in the respondents' opinion, the reasons for the lack of environmentally and socially responsible behavior are habits acquired at home.

In the multiple-choice question, respondents were asked to indicate a maximum of two reasons that, in their opinion, had the greatest impact on not taking environmentally and socially responsible actions [59]. The results are presented in Table 5.

Table 5. Reasons for the lack of environmentally and socially sustainable behavior.

Specification	%
Not enough information on this subject in the media	5.4
Insufficient number of pro-environmental topics in school education	9.6
Rush in everyday life	12.4
Insufficient financial possibilities	23.9
Lack of knowledge about the negative impact of humans on the environment	38.5
Habits and attitudes learned at home	42.4
Lack of reflection (sensitivity) about the environmental and social effects of human behavior	59.2

Source: own research.

The presented research shows that habits learned at home were a common, but not the most common, reason for the lack of environmentally and socially sustainable behavior. This is consistent with the results of Buhalis et al. [1] and Schönherr and Pikkemaat [28], which show that environmental pressure plays an important role in creating the behavior of Generation Z. The main reason for this was the lack of reflection on the impact of human activities on the environment. Interesting research in this area is presented by Ji et al. [20]. It shows that an effective way to stimulate the responsible behavior of tourists is to introduce an element of humor. Our research shows that the respondents, on the one hand, declare knowledge of the regulations, but at the same time, indicate that the lack of reflection is the main limitation of responsible behavior. Perhaps the official language of the regulations does not have as significant an impact as their

creators think, and Ji et al. [20] are right that the language of humor and fun has a greater effect and greater impact on attitudes and behavior.

Only a few respondents indicated an information deficit in the media on this topic, which was confirmed by the research of Gulati [60]. But Gulati [60] also emphasizes that environmentally friendly behavior on vacation is influenced by personal norms (i.e., rules of conduct shaped, among others, by family members) and environmental sensitivity. Taking into account rational, and not only emotional, arguments in actions should stimulate environmentally responsible behavior to a greater extent [27]. Also, Xiao et al. [3] note that tourists are reluctant to change their travel behavior due to a lack of environmental awareness. Using the Mann–Whitney U test, it was checked whether there was a statistically significant difference in the assessment of the behaviors listed in Table 4, depending on whether the respondents lived with their parents or not at the time of this research. There was no such difference in any of these behaviors (p-value ranged from 0.197 to 0.697).

5. Conclusions

The presented research results complement the broad trend of research on women's sustainable behavior in the area of tourist activity. This research shows that respondents are most concerned about recreational space in terms of simple but important activities, i.e., not leaving garbage behind in the forest and on the beach, following regulations in tourist regions and towns, and using only designated trails. They rated their behavior lowest in terms of reducing water consumption, using ecological cosmetics when using water reservoirs, and choosing accommodation places where pro-ecological solutions were used. There was also a limited relationship between behaviors in everyday surroundings (home, work, university) and during tourist trips. According to the respondents, the main reasons for the lack of responsible behavior are indifference and habits learned at home.

To the best of the authors' knowledge, research on the sustainable behavior of Generation Z women during tourist trips is at the forefront of social research.

This research provides inspiration for formulating the following implications:

1. Theoretical implications of research on the environmentally and socially responsible behavior of Generation Z women in the context of tourism activity can be considered at several levels:
    - can contribute to a deeper understanding of how sustainable tourism is perceived and implemented by young women, which can lead to the development of existing theories of sustainable development in tourism;
    - analysis of consumption behavior in the context of tourism may contribute to the development of the theory of responsible consumption;
    - research enriches the theory of behavior in the area of the impact of mobile technologies on the promotion and implementation of pro-ecological and pro-social tourist behaviors;
    - research contributes to the development of theory regarding the functions of media in the area of sustainable tourism;
    - the research results complement the research trend on sustainable women's behavior in the area of tourist activity.
2. Practical implications:
    - analysis of research results can help in the preparation of educational programs and information campaigns that increase public awareness in the researched area;
    - research results can help in better provision of tourist offers for women while promoting sustainable behavior not only in the tourist space but also in everyday surroundings (home, university, work);

- continuing such research may be an inspiration for the tourism industry and local communities in the development of sustainable tourism.

Limitations:

- Limiting the sample to Polish women only. Research that would include young women from different countries and cultural backgrounds would be valuable. Although the carrier of information and social and consumer trends are, to a large extent, new media, which means that attitudes can be unified (an example is the youth climate strike as an international trend); however, as the respondents point out, habits learned at home have an important influence in creating behavior;
- The limited scope of sustainable behavior was verified. In the future, this list should be expanded to include, for example, various forms of sharing, especially in the field of transport or the use of sports equipment.

Future research directions on the environmentally and socially responsible behavior of Generation Z women in the context of tourism activities may include the following areas:

- determining the motivation of women from Generation Z to choose environmentally and socially responsible tourism;
- identifying the values and beliefs that guide women's travel decisions;
- conducting comparative research in other European countries.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, A.B., E.J. and A.W.; methodology, A.B., E.J. and A.W.; software A.B., E.J. and A.W.; validation, A.B., E.J. and A.W.; formal analysis, A.B.; investigation, A.B., E.J. and A.W.; resources, A.B., E.J. and A.W.; data curation, A.B., E.J. and A.W.; writing—original draft preparation, A.B., E.J. and A.W.; writing—review and editing, A.B., E.J. and A.W.; visualization, A.B., E.J. and A.W.; supervision, A.B.; project administration, A.B.; funding acquisition, A.B., E.J. and A.W. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: Research subsidized from the state budget under the program of the Ministry of Education and Science called "Science for Society" NdS/545437/2022/2022 960.00 CHF, total value of the project 321,632.00 zł.

Institutional Review Board Statement: Ethical review and approval were waived for this study. The study was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki, which is applied in Polish universities, including WULS. Re-spondents were assured of anonymity. They took part in the survey voluntarily. They could resign from the survey at any time. They were not asked for personal or sensitive data.

Informed Consent Statement: Consent was waived due to the fact that the study used an anonymous survey questionnaire sent through publicly available online channels. Respondents completed the questionnaire voluntarily and were able to opt out of participating in this study at any stage. The questionnaire complied with the RODO rules of the European Union countries.

Data Availability Statement: The data presented in this study are available on request from the corresponding author.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

1. Buhalis, D.; Leung, X.Y.; Fan, D.; Darcy, S.; Chen, G.; Xu, F.; Wei-Han Tan, G.; Nunkoo, R.; Farmaki, A. Editorial: Tourism 2030 and the contribution to the sustainable development goals: The tourism review viewpoint. *Tour. Rev.* **2023**, *78*, 293–313. https://doi.org/10.1108/TR-04-2023-620.
2. Swim, J.K.; Vescio, T.K.; Dahl, J.L.; Zawadzki, S.J. Gendered discourse about climate change policies. *Glob. Environ. Chang.* **2018**, *48*, 216–225. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2017.12.005.
3. Xiao, C.; Hong, D. Gender differences in environmental behaviors in China. *Popul. Environ.* **2010**, *32*, 88–104. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11111-010-0115-z.
4. Antonetti, P.; Maklan, S. Feelings that make a difference: How guilt and pride convince consumers of the effectiveness of sustainable consumption choices. *J. Bus. Ethics* **2014**, *124*, 117–134. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-013-1841-9.
5. Brough, A.R.; Wilkie, J.E.B.; Ma, J.; Isaac, M.S.; Gal, D. Is Eco-Friendly Unmanly? The Green-Feminine Stereotype and Its Effect on Sustainable Consumption. *J. Consum. Res.* **2016**, *43*, 567–582. https://doi.org/10.1093/jcr/ucw044.

6. Jaska, E.; Werenowska, A.; Balińska, A. Environmentally and Socially Sustainable Behaviors of Generation Z in Poland Stimulated by Mobile Applications. *Energies* **2022**, *15*, 7904. https://doi.org/10.3390/en15217904.
7. Balińska, A. Pro-Environmental Forms of Transport in the Experience and Perception of Tourists Visiting Warsaw. *J. Environ. Manag. Tour.* **2020**, *11*, 645–652. https://doi.org/10.14505//jemt.11.3(43).18.
8. Balińska, A.; Jaska, E.; Werenowska, A. Environmentally and Socially Sustainable Behavior of Generation Z in the Context of Tourist Trips. *Eur. Res. Stud. J. Univ. Piraeus Int. Strateg. Manag. Assoc.* **2023**, *XXVI*, 945–959. https://doi.org/10.35808/ersj/3338.
9. Smerichevskyi, S.; Kniazieva, T.; Kolbushkin, Y.; Reshetnikova, I.; Olejniczuk-Merta, A. Environmental orientation of consumer behavior: Motivational component. *Probl. Perspect. Manag.* **2018**, *16*, 424–437. https://doi.org/10.21511/ppm.16(2).2018.38.
10. Cavagnaro, E.; Staffieri, S. A study of students' travellers values and needs in order to establish futures patterns and insights. *J. Tour. Futures* **2015**, *1*, 94–107. https://doi.org/10.1108/JTF-12-2014-0013.
11. Lindenberg, S.; Steg, L. Normative, gain and hedonic goal frames guiding environmental behavior. *J. Soc. Issues* **2007**, *65*, 117–137. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.2007.00499.x.
12. Wasaya, A.; Prentice, C.; Hsiao, A. Norms and consumer behaviors in tourism: A systematic literature review. *Tour. Rev.* **2024**, *79*, 923–938. https://doi.org/10.1108/TR-03-2023-0151.
13. Brécard, D.; Hlaimi, B.; Lucas, S.; Perraudeau, Y.; Salladarré, F. Determinants of demand for green products: An application to eco-label demand for fish in Europe. *Ecol. Econ.* **2009**, *69*, 115–125. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2009.07.017.
14. Saboya de Aragão, B.; Alfinito, S. The relationship between human values and conscious ecological behavior among consumers: Evidence from Brazil. *Clean. Responsible Consum.* **2021**, *3*, 100024. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clrc.2021.100024.
15. Kahsay, G.A.; Nordén, A.; Bulte, E. Women participation in formal decision-making: Empirical evidence from participatory forest management in Ethiopia. *Glob. Environ. Chang.* **2021**, *70*, 102363. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2021.102363.
16. Pinho, M.; Gomes, S. Generation Z as a critical question mark for sustainable tourism—An exploratory study in Portugal. *J. Tour. Futures* **2023**, 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1108/JTF-07-2022-0171.
17. Siano, A.; Siglioccolo, M. Rubbish emergency impact on in-bound tourism demand and on the number of visitors to museums. *Int. J. Cult. Tour. Hosp. Res.* **2011**, *5*, 69–79. https://doi.org/10.1108/17506181111111771.
18. Xu, S.; Hu, Y. Nature-inspired awe toward tourists' environmentally responsible behavior intention. *Tour. Rev.* **2024**, *79*, 1000–1016. https://doi.org/10.1108/TR-12-2022-0617.
19. Xiong, W.; Huang, M.; Leung, X.Y.; Zhang, Y.; Cai, X. How environmental emotions link to responsible consumption behavior: Tourism Agenda 2030. *Tour. Rev.* **2023**, *78*, 517–530. https://doi.org/10.1108/TR-01-2022-0010.
20. Ji, J.-C.; Li, Y.-Q.; Ruan, W.-Q.; Zhang, S.-N.; Deng, F. The persuasive effect of humorous prompts on tourists' heritage responsible behaviors. *Tour. Rev.* **2024**, *79*, 903–922. https://doi.org/10.1108/TR-02-2023-0091.
21. Soto, E.H.; Botero, C.M.; Milanés, C.B.; Rodríguez-Santiago, A.; Palacios-Moreno, M.; Díaz-Ferguson, E.; Souza Filho, J.R. How does the beach ecosystem change without tourists during COVID-19 lockdown? *Biol. Conserv.* **2021**, *255*, 108972. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2021.108972.
22. Atmanti, H.D.; Purwanti, E.Y. The Impact of Waste on Domestic Tourist Visits to Pengaradan Beach, Banten Province. *Int. J. Econ. Bus. Account. Res.* **2021**, *5*, 399–406. Available online: https://jurnal.stie-aas.ac.id/index.php/IJEBAR (accessed on 10 March 2024).
23. Ryan, P.G.; Swanepoel, D. Cleaning beaches: Sweeping the rubbish under the carpet. *South Afr. J. Sci.* **1996**, *92*, 275–276.
24. Krelling, A.P.; Williams, A.T.; Turra, A. Differences in perception and reaction of tourist groups to beach marine debris that can influence a loss of tourism revenue in coastal areas. *Mar. Policy* **2017**, *85*, 87–99. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2017.08.021.
25. Religa, P.; Adach, S. The problem of solid waste on the tourist trails of Tatra National Park, Poland. *Eco. Mont-J. Prot. Mt. Areas Res. Manag.* **2020**, *12*, 35–42. https://doi.org/10.1553/eco.mont-12-1s35.
26. Esfandiar, K.; Dowling, R.; Pearce, J.; Goh, E. What a load of rubbish! The efficacy of theory of planned behaviour and norm activation model in predicting visitors' binning behaviour in national parks. *J. Hosp. Tour. Manag.* **2021**, *46*, 304–315. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2021.01.001.
27. Vaske, J.J.; Jacobs, M.H.; Espinosa, T.K. Carbon footprint mitigation on vacation: A norm activation model. *J. Outdoor Recreat. Tour.* **2015**, *11*, 80–86. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jort.2015.05.002.
28. Schönherr, S.; Pikkemaat, B. Young peoples' environmentally sustainable tourism attitude and responsible behavioral intention. *Tour. Rev.* **2024**, *79*, 939–952. https://doi.org/10.1108/TR-01-2023-0022.
29. Cullen, F. Women are the Dominant Decision Makers when Selecting Restaurants to Dine. *Sch. Culin. Arts Food Technol.* **2012**. https://doi.org/10.21427/d7mj22.
30. Kim, Y.G.; Eves, A.; Scarles, C. Building a model of local food consumption on trips and holidays: A grounded theory approach. *Int. J. Hosp. Manag.* **2009**, *28*, 423–431. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2008.11.005.
31. Scozzafava, G.; Contini, C.; Romano, C.; Casini, L. Eating out: Which restaurant to choose? *Br. Food J.* **2017**, *119*, 1870–1883. https://doi.org/10.1108/BFJ-12-2016-0591.
32. Chatzopoulou, E.; Matthew, G.; Heather, S. Perceptions of localness and authenticity regarding restaurant choice in tourism settings. *J. Travel Tour. Mark.* **2020**, *37*, 155–168. https://doi.org/10.1080/10548408.2020.1722785.
33. Available online: https://www.slowfood.com/ (accessed on 1 March 2024).
34. Cerutti, P.S.; Martins, R.D.; Macke, J.; Sarate, J.A.R. Green, but not as green as that": An analysis of a Brazilian bike-sharing system. *J. Clean. Prod.* **2019**, *217*, 185–193. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.01.240.

35. Hsu, C.C.; Liou, J.J.H.; Lo, H.W.; Wang, Y.C. Using a hybrid method for evaluating and improving the service quality of public bike-sharing systems. *J. Clean. Prod.* **2018**, *202*, 1131–1144. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.08.193.
36. Balińska, A. Food-Sharing Economy: Analysis of Selected Solutions in the Warsaw Agglomeration. In *Sustainable Logistics. How to Address and Overcome the Major Issues and Challenges*; Domagała, J., Górecka, A., Roman, M., Eds.; Routledge: London, UK, 2023; pp. 303–326. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003304364-17.
37. Yun, D.; Hennessey, S.M.; MacDonald, R. Understanding culinary tourists: Segmentations based on past culinary experiences and attitudes toward food-related behavior. In Proceedings of the International CHRIE Conference-Refereed Track, Denver, CO, USA, 27–30 July 2011.
38. Gabarda-Mallorquí, A.; Garcia, X.; Fraguell, R.M.; Ribas, A. How guest profile and tourist segment explain acceptance of economic-based water-saving measures. A mediterranean destination case study. *J. Hosp. Tour. Manag.* **2022**, *52*, 382–391. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2022.07.019.
39. Available online: https://stat.gov.pl (accessed on 2 March 2024).
40. Szreder, M. *Metody i Techniki Sondażowych Badań Opinii*; PWE: Warszawa, Poland, 2010; pp. 167–169.
41. Dolot, A. The characteristics of Generation Z. *E-Mentor* **2018**, *74*, 44–50. Available online: https://www.e-mentor.edu.pl/artykul/index/numer/74/id/1351 (accessed on 5 June 2024).
42. Prakash Yadav, G.; Rai, J. The Generation Z and their social media usage: A review and a research outline. *Glob. J. Enterp. Inf. Syst.* **2017**, *9*, 110–116. Available online: https://www.gjeis.com/index.php/GJEIS/article/view/222 (accessed on 2 June 2024).
43. Vieira, J.; Frade, R.; Ascenso, R.; Prates, I.; Martinho, F. Generation Z and Key-Factors on E-Commerce: A Study on the Portuguese Tourism Sector. *Adm. Sci.* **2020**, *10*, 103. https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci10040103.
44. Krok, E. Survey questionnaire structure and its impact on the research results. *Zesz. Naukowe. Stud. Inform.* **2015**, *37*, 55–73. https://doi.org/10.18276/si.2015.37-05.
45. Burgess, T.F. *A General Introduction to the Design of Questionnaires for Survey Research*; University of Leeds: Leeds, UK, 2001.
46. Etikan, I. Comparison of Convenience Sampling and Purposive Sampling. *Am. J. Theor. Appl. Stat.* **2016**, *5*, 1–4. https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ajtas.20160501.11.
47. Jabłońska, K.; Sobieraj, A. Dobór próby badawczej czynnikiem sukcesu w prowadzonych badaniach empirycznych [Selection of a Research Sample as a Success Factor in Empirical Research]. *Obron. Zesz. Nauk. Wydziału Zarządzania I Dowodzenia Akad. Obrony Nar.* **2013**, *2*, 40–48.
48. Sibley, C.G.; Liu, J.H. Differentiating active and passive littering: A two-stage process model of littering behavior in public spaces. *Environ. Behav.* **2003**, *35*, 415–433. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013916503035003006.
49. Schultz, P.W.; Bator, R.J.; Large, L.B.; Bruni, C.M.; Tabanico, J.J. Littering in context: Personal and environmental predictors of littering behavior. *Environ. Behav.* **2013**, *45*, 35–59. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013916511412179.
50. Al-Khatib, I.A.; Arafat, H.A.; Daoud, R.; Shwahneh, H. Enhanced solid waste management by understanding the effects of gender, income, marital status, and religious convictions on attitudes and practices related to street littering in Nablus–Palestinian territory. *Waste Manag.* **2009**, *29*, 449–455. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wasman.2008.02.004.
51. Torgler, B.; García-Valiñas, M.A.; Macintyre, A. Justifiability of littering: An empirical investigation. *Environ. Values* **2012**, *21*, 209–231. https://doi.org/10.3197/096327112X13303670567378.
52. Syahrul, S.A.; Mayangsari, L. A Study of Motives in Choosing Natural Cosmetics Among Indonesian Women. *Malays. J. Soc. Sci. Humanit.* **2020**, *5*, 60–71. https://doi.org/10.47405/mjssh.v5i8.464.
53. Cantaragiu, R. The Impact of Gender on Food Waste at the Consumer Level. *Stud. Univ. "Vasile Goldis" Arad. Econ. Ser.* **2019**, *29*, 41–57. https://doi.org/10.2478/sues-2019-0017.
54. Jungowska, J.; Kulczyński, B.; Sidor, A.; Gramza-Michałowska, A. Assessment of Factors Affecting the Amount of Food Waste in Households Run by Polish Women Aware of Well-Being. *Sustainability* **2021**, *13*, 976. https://doi.org/10.3390/su13020976.
55. Sharma, N.; Goel, P.; Nunkoo, R.; Sharma, A.; Rana, N.P. Food waste avoidance behavior: How different are generation Z travelers? *J. Sustain. Tour.* **2024**, *31*, 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2023.2187741.
56. Zamparini, L.; Domènech, A.; Miravet, D.; Gutiérrez, A. Green mobility at home, green mobility at tourism destinations: A cross-country study of transport modal choices of educated young adults. *J. Transp. Geogr.* **2022**, *103*, 103412. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtrangeo.2022.103412.
57. Carneiro, M.J.; Eusébio, C.; Rodrigues, V.; Margarita, R.; Mara, M.; Gama, C.; Monteiro, A. Pro-environmental behaviors at home and during a tourism trip: A generational perspective. In *Advances in Tourism, Technology and Systems, Smart Innovation, Systems and Technologies*; Abreu, A., Liberato, D., Garcia Ojeda, J.C., Eds.; Springer Nature: Singapore, 2022; Volume 293, pp. 49–64.
58. Qiu, H.; Wang, X.; Morrison, A.M.; Kelly, C.; Wei, W. From ownership to responsibility: Extending the theory of planned behavior to predict tourist environmentally responsible behavioral intentions. *J. Sustain. Tour.* **2022**, *30*, 1–24. https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2022.2116643.

59. Kruszelnicki, W. Transformacja czy transmisja? Edukacja humanistyczna wobec problemów "przeniesienia" w relacji pedagogicznej [Transformation or Transmission? Humanities Education Facing the Problems of "Displacement" in Pedagogical Relation]. *Kult. I Eduk.* **2013**, *1*, 42–61. Available online: https://cejsh.icm.edu.pl/cejsh/element/bwmeta1.element.ojs-doi-10_15804_kie_2013_01_03 (accessed on 10 March 2024).
60. Gulati, S. Social and sustainable: Exploring social media use for promoting sustainable behaviour and demand amongst Indian tourists. *Int. Hosp. Rev.* **2022**, *36*, 373–393. https://doi.org/10.1108/IHR-12-2020-0072.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.