

The impact of economic crisis on holidays of young people

Xanthippi Chapsa

Lecturer, Department of Business Administration,
TEI of Central Macedonia, Serres, Greece

Persefoni Polychronidou

Assistant Professor, Department of Accounting and Finance,
TEI of Central Macedonia, Serres, Greece

ABSTRACT

Purpose - This work was carried out to investigate the effects of the economic crisis in leisure travel and holidays for young people in Central Macedonia. **Methodology** - Semi-structured questionnaire was used, combining closed and partially closed questions.

Approach - We examined the way in which gender, family situation, and the employment situation affect the travel frequency, the amount spent on travel, the choice and the characteristics of the tourist destination, e.t.c.. **Findings** - The results show that the answers regarding the travel frequency, the amounts spent on travel, the way in which young people prefer to book their travel, the transportation means, the people they prefer to travel with, the needed time to organize the travel, but also the preferences of the touristic destination and its nightlife, significantly differ between the two genders. Also, marital status seems to be an important differentiating factor of the amounts spent, and preferences regarding the mode of transport, type of accommodation and nightlife.

Keywords: tourism, young people, statistical analysis

Classification codes: Z39

INTRODUCTION

Tourism is one of the main pillars of the Greek economy over time. It is a sector that draws the interest of investors and it could play an important role to the growth of Greek economy (Eeckels, Filis, Leon, 2012). In times of economic crisis, there is an increase in Tourism industry (Foundation for Economic and Industrial Research -IOBE, 2016). In 2015, Greece welcomed almost 23.6 million tourists from abroad and received nearly 13.7 billion euro; the direct contribution of tourism to the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) was 10.0% (INSETE, 2017). Thus, tourism is almost exclusively an export activity, since almost ninety percent of tourism revenues come from abroad. Regarding domestic tourism, a decrease of more than sixty percent has occurred in 2015, since less domestic tourists stay for more than one night and spent less money (Hellenic Statistical Authority-ELSTAT, 2016).

Tourism has been affected by the economic crisis, but has relatively quickly recovered (Galanos, 2013; Du, Kamakura, 2012; Guduraš, 2014). Predictions for the year 2027 show that tourism will support 1,273,000 jobs and Greece will welcome 39,920,000 visitors from abroad (World travel and tourism council, 2017). Similarly, domestic travel has been affected by the economic crisis (Hellenic Statistical Authority- ELSTAT, 2016; INSETE, 2017). Expenditures in business and leisure trips by the Greeks generated 37.5% of direct travel and tourism GDP in 2016 compared with 62.5% for foreign tourists, while in 2017, the corresponding numbers are expected to grow by 2.1% and 10.0%, relatively (World travel and tourism council, 2017).

It must be noted that Greece is mainly a summer destination for holidays and efforts are made to expand tourism both during the year and the alternative kinds of tourism (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development-OECD, nd). However, Chung (2009) has concluded in his research that seasonality does not have always negative effects on destinations. In the report of Dr. Andreadis (European Committee of Regions, 2014) the development of touristic products is indicated, as well as the trend to further enable alternative tourism. Tsartas (2003) studied tourism development, Iakovidou et al. (2002) studied the development of rural tourism in Greece. Tsourgiannis et al. (2015) studied the preferences and the profile of tourists in a specific region of Greece. Papatheodorou and Arvanitis (2014) aimed to study the impact of the economic crisis of Greek tourism, emphasizing on domestic tourism over the period 2005-2012. They concluded that areas specialized in domestic tourism have shown decrease in tourism population comparing to tourism destinations specialized in foreign tourists.

Thus, it is of crucial importance to study the preference of domestic tourists. In our paper we study the effects of the economic crisis in leisure travel and holidays for young people in Central Macedonia. The goal of this paper is to examine the way in which demographic characteristics affect the travel preferences of young Greeks as tourists.

RESEARCH METHOD AND THE PROFILE OF RESPONDENTS

A structured questionnaire was used as the research instrument. It consisted of five major sections, incorporating questions regarding sociodemographic characteristics, personal values, and trip preferences of travelers.

The questionnaire was pilot-tested to determine if the questions could be well understood by respondents. The actual full-scale survey was conducted in the period of April to June 2017. As the main purpose of the research was the impact of the current economic crisis on leisure travel and holiday of young people, and because of time and cost constraints, the convenience sampling procedure was employed. Potential respondents were intercepted in Technological Institute of Central Macedonia. At the end of the survey period, 200 questionnaires were collected. The profiles of the respondents are presented in Table 1.

The sample consists of 118 men and 82 women (59% and 41%, respectively). Almost one out of three (30.0% and 28.0%) of the respondents belong to the "18-19" and "more than 23" age group. A percentage of 26.0% and 16.0% belong to the "20-21" and "22-23" age groups, respectively. As it concerns the two genders, the majority of women (51.2%) belong to the "20-21" age group, while the majority of men (40.7%) are "18-19" years old. As it was expected, there was significantly higher percentage of single persons (77.0%) compared to married (23.0%). Regarding the "working status", one out of three respondents (32.0%) of the full sample is working, while across the two genders, the respective percentage is 40.7% for men and only 19.5% for women.

Concerning vacation destination, gender does not appear as a significant differentiating factor. In fact, almost one out of two respondents marginally prefers "Greece" comparatively to "Abroad" (52% and 48%, respectively). A slightly higher percentage of males (52.5%) compared to females (51.2%) would choose to take a vacation in Greece with men appearing to prefer travelling by "Bus" (39.0%) and women by train (31.7%). Spring appears as the preferred season, principally for women (48.8%). Finally, the majority (57%) of the respondents has not been on vacation in the last two years, while, the respective percentage was higher for women (63%) compared to men (53%).

Table 1. Profile of respondents

	Male	Female	Total sample
<u>Age group</u>	%	%	%
18-19	40.7	14.6	30.0
20-21	8.5	51.2	26.0
21-22	23.7	4.9	16.0
>23	27.1	29.3	28.0
<u>Marital status</u>			
Married	28.8	14.6	23.0
Single	71.2	85.4	77.0
<u>Working status</u>			
Yes	40.7	19.5	32.0
No	59.3	80.5	68.0
<u>Do you like to go on vacation*</u>			
Yes	83.1	73.2	79.0
No	16.9	26.8	21.0
<u>Preferred destination</u>			
Greece	52.5	51.2	52.0
Abroad	47.5	48.8	48.0
<u>Means of transport</u>			
Bus	39.0	17.1	30.0
Train	10.2	31.7	19.0
Airplane	25.4	22.0	24.0
Ship	8.5	12.2	10.0
Car	16.9	17.1	17.0
<u>Preferred season</u>			
Summer	23.7	19.5	22.0
Spring	33.9	48.8	40.0
Autumn	25.4	17.1	22.0
Winter	16.9	14.6	16.0
<u>Vacation in the last two years</u>			
Yes	47.5	36.6	43.0
No	52.5	63.4	57.0
Total			
Count	118	82	200
%	59.0	41.0	100%

EMPIRICAL RESULTS

In this section, the main findings of this study are discussed. Apart from descriptive statistics, we use Chi-Square Tests to examine whether the demographic characteristics of the respondents are significant differentiating factors for the preferences, personal values and the decisions concerning leisure trips and holidays of young people.

Gender and vacation preferences

The 35.6% of males prefer to take vacations with “Friends” or with their “Companion”, while the majority of females (61%) prefer to take vacation with their “Family” (Table 2). This finding is also supported by the Chi-Square test¹.

¹ Since the significance value of the Chi-square statistic is lower than 0.01, the hypothesis of independence is rejected at the 0.01 level. Thus, “holidays companion” and “gender” are related, meaning that the frequency of “the persons which the respondents prefer to take vacation with”, differ significantly between two genders.

Table 2. Gender * You prefer to take a vacation with. Crosstabulation

		You prefer to take a vacation with:				Total	
		Friends	Family	Companion	Alone		
Gender	Male	Count	42	24	42	10	118
		%	35.6%	20.3%	35.6%	8.5%	100.0%
	Female	Count	14	50	16	2	82
		%	17.1%	61.0%	19.5%	2.4%	100.0%
Total		Count	56	74	58	12	200
		%	28.0%	37.0%	29.0%	6.0%	100.0%
		Chi-Square Test					
		Value	p-value				
Pearson Chi-Square		34.770	.000				
N of Valid Cases		200					

Answers of the respondents regarding the type of tourist destination don't differ significantly (around 30%) (Table 3). However, the gender appears as a significant differentiating factor (p-value < .01). More specifically, although the full sample consists of an almost equal percentage of males and females (35.6% and 31.7%) preferring "Non popular tourist destination", women seem to prefer places with only "Some tourism" (56.1%), while men prefer "Popular tourist destination" (42.4%).

Table 3. Gender * What type of tourist destination do you choose on your vacation? Crosstabulation

		What type of tourist destination do you choose on your vacation?				Total
		Non popular tourist destination	Some tourism	Popular tourist destination		
Gender	Male	Count	42	26	50	118
		%	35.6%	22.0%	42.4%	100.0%
	Female	Count	26	46	10	82
		%	31.7%	56.1%	12.2%	100.0%
Total		Count	68	72	60	200
		%	34.0%	36.0%	30.0%	100.0%
		Chi-Square Test				
		Value	p-value			
Pearson Chi-Square		30.495	.000			
N of Valid Cases		200				

Similarly, more than fifty percent (54.2%) of men prefer tourist destination with "Bustling nightlife" (Table 4), with the respective percentage (29.3%) for women to be significantly lower (p-value < .05).

Table 4. Gender * Would you choose a tourist destination with bustling nightlife?

		Crosstabulation			
		Would you choose a tourist destination with bustling nightlife?			
			Yes	No	Total
Gender	Male	Count	64	54	118
		%	54.2%	45.8%	100.0%
	Female	Count	24	58	82
		%	29.3%	70.7%	100.0%
Total		Count	88	112	200
		%	44.0%	56.0%	100.0%
		Chi-Square Tests			
			Value	p-value	
		Pearson Chi-Square	12.241	.000	
		Fisher's Exact Test		.001	
		N of Valid Cases	200		

During the recent crisis, more than nine out of ten (or 92%) of the respondents spend less than 300 euro on their holiday (Table 5), with men appearing to spend more comparatively to women (p-value < .01). More specifically, 59.3% of them spend "100-300" euro, while the respective percentage for women is significantly lower (39%).

Table 5. Gender * What amount do you spend on your holiday now?

		Crosstabulation					
		What amount do you spend on your holiday now?					
			<100	100-300	301-500	>500	Total
Gender	Male	Count	40	70	8	0	118
		%	33.9%	59.3%	6.8%	0.0%	100.0%
	Female	Count	42	32	2	6	82
		%	51.2%	39.0%	.4%	7.3%	100.0%
Total		Count	82	102	10	6	200
		%	41.0%	51.0%	5.0%	3.0%	100.0%
		Chi-Square Test					
			Value	p-value			
		Pearson Chi-Square	17,906	.000			
		N of Valid Cases	200				

Regarding the different types of accommodation, the preferences of the aggregate sample appear to be similar (around 25%). However, about three out of ten men prefer "Free camping" (30.5%) while women would choose "Organized camping" (29.3%) (Table 6). As it concerns the other types of accommodation, the preferences of the two genders present only marginal differences (p-value > .01).

**Table 6. Gender * Where do you prefer to stay on vacation?
Crosstabulation**

		Where do you prefer to stay on vacation?				
		Free camping	Organized camping	Cheap hotel	Expensive hotel	Total
Gender	Male	Count 36	24	30	28	118
		% 30.5%	20.3%	25.4%	23.7%	100.0%
	Female	Count 16	24	20	22	82
		% 19.5%	29.3%	24.4%	26.8%	100.0%
Total		Count 52	48	50	50	200
		% 26.0%	24.0%	25.0%	25.0%	100.0%
		Chi-Square Test				
		Value	p-value			
Pearson Chi-Square		4.064	.255			
N of Valid Cases		200				

Only 18% of the respondents prefer booking their holidays “On the spot”. Contrary, the majority (51.0%) of the aggregate sample and principally women (about 66%), prefer booking by “Internet” (Table 7). Once again, the gender seems to be a significant differentiating factor for the preferences concerning booking (p-value < .01).

**Table 7. Gender * Which way do you prefer to book you holidays?
Crosstabulation**

		Which way do you prefer to book you holidays?			
		Tourist agency	Internet	On the spot	Total
Gender	Male	Count 46	48	24	118
		% 39.0%	40.7%	20.3%	100.0%
	Female	Count 16	54	12	82
		% 19.5%	65.9%	14.6%	100.0%
Total		Count 62	102	36	200
		% 31.0%	51.0%	18.0%	100.0%
		Chi-Square Tests			
		Value	p-value		
Pearson Chi-Square		12.804	.002		
N of Valid Cases		200			

Finally, almost eight out of ten (or 78%) of the respondents plan their vacation at least “One month in advance”, and close to 20% plan their vacation at the “Last minute”. Answers differ between two genders (p-value = .000), with the 42.4% of males planning their vacation “Many months in advance” and the 61% of females “A month in advance” (Table 8).

**Table 8. Gender * When do you plan your vacation?
Crosstabulation**

			When do you plan your vacation?				
			Many months in advance	A month in advance	Some days in advance	Last minute	Total
Gender	Male	Count	50	30	6	32	118
		%	42.4%	25.4%	5.1%	27.1%	100.0%
	Female	Count	26	50	0	6	82
		%	31.7%	61.0%	0.0%	7.3%	100.0%
Total	Count	76	80	6	38	200	
	%	38.0%	40.0%	3.0%	19.0%	100.0%	
			Chi-Square Test				
			Value	p-value			
Pearson Chi-Square			30.889	.000			
N of Valid Cases			200				

Marital status and vacation preferences

Marital status seems to play a significant role for the accommodation preferences ($p < .01$). More than five out of ten (or 52.2%) married respondents prefer “Free camping” and only 8.7% of them prefer “Expensive hotels” (Table 9), while the respective percentages for the single respondents differ significantly (18.2% and 29.9%).

**Table 9. Marital status * Where do you prefer to stay on vacation?
Crosstabulation**

			Where do you prefer to stay on vacation?				
			Free camping	Organized camping	Cheap hotel	Expensive hotel	Total
Marital status	Married	Count	24	10	8	4	46
		%	52.2%	21.7%	17.4%	8.7%	100.0%
	Single	Count	28	38	42	46	154
		%	18.2%	24.7%	27.3%	29.9%	100.0%
Total	Count	52	48	50	50	200	
	%	26.0%	24.0%	25.0%	25.0%	100.0%	
			Chi-Square Test				
			Value	p-value			
Pearson Chi-Square			23.604	.000			
N of Valid Cases			200				

Almost 58% of single respondents prefer booking by “Internet” (59.7%), while married respondents prefer “Tourist agency” (56.5%) (see, Table 10). Once again, marital status seems to consist a crucial characteristic affecting preferences ($p\text{-value}=.000$).

Table 10. Marital status * Which way do you prefer to book you holidays Crosstabulation

		Which way do you prefer to book you holidays				Total
		Tourist agency	Internet	On the spot		
Marital status	Married	Count	26	10	10	46
		%	56.5%	21.7%	21.7%	100.0%
	Single	Count	36	92	26	154
		%	23.4%	59.7%	16.9%	100.0%
Total		Count	62	102	36	200
		%	31.0%	51.0%	18.0%	100.0%
		Chi-Square Test				
		Value	p-value			
Pearson Chi-Square		23.046	.000			
N of Valid Cases		200				

In contrast, marital status does not seem to affect significantly preferences concerning preferred season, travelling in “Greece” or “Abroad”, tourist destination, time of planning vacation and finally, money spent on holiday before crisis (p-value > .10).

Working status and vacation preferences

As it regards the effect of working status on vacation preferences, we found that it affects significantly (p-value < .10) tourist destination (more or less popular), accommodation, and preferences about nightlife. More specifically, almost five out of ten (or 46.9%) of working respondents prefer tourist destination with “Some tourism”, while non-working respondents prefer “Non-popular tourist destinations” (Table 11).

Table 11. Working status * What type of tourist destination do you choose on your vacation? Crosstabulation

		What type of tourist destination do you choose on your vacation?				Total
		Non popular tourist destination	Some tourism	Popular tourist destination		
Working status	Yes	Count	18	30	16	64
		%	28.1%	46.9%	25.0%	100.0%
	No	Count	50	42	44	136
		%	36.8%	30.9%	32.4%	100.0%
Total		Count	68	72	60	200
		%	34.0%	36.0%	30.0%	100.0%
		Chi-Square Test				
		Value	p-value			
Pearson Chi-Square		4.832	.089			
N of Valid Cases		200				

Also, the 37.5% of working people would choose a “Free camping” to stay on vacation, while non-working respondents prefer “Cheap” or “Expensive” hotels.

Table 12. Working status * Where do you prefer to stay on vacation?

			Where do you prefer to stay on vacation?				
			Free camping	Organized camping	Cheap hotel	Expensive hotel	Total
Working status	Yes	Count	24	18	12	10	64
		%	37.5%	28.1%	18.8%	15.6%	100.0%
	No	Count	28	38	42	40	136
		%	20.6%	22.1%	27.3%	29.4%	100.0%
Total	Count	52	48	50	50	200	
	%	26.0%	24.0%	25.0%	25.0%	100.0%	
			Chi-Square Test				
			Value	p-value			
Pearson Chi-Square			10.234	.017			
N of Valid Cases			200				

Finally, working status seems to affect significantly preferences about nightlife. The majority (or 62.5%) of working people prefer “A tourist destination with bustling nightlife”, while the respective percentage for the non-working respondents is only 35.3%.

Table 13. Working status * Would you choose a tourist destination with bustling nightlife?

			Would you choose a tourist destination with bustling nightlife?		
			Yes	No	Total
Are you working	Yes	Count	40	24	64
		%	62.5%	37.5%	100.0%
	No	Count	48	88	136
		%	35.3%	64.7%	100.0%
Total	Count	88	112	200	
	%	44.0%	56.0%	100.0%	
			Chi-Square Tests		
			Value	p-value	
Pearson Chi-Square			13.073	.000	
Fisher's Exact Test				.000	
N of Valid Cases			200		

Working status appears as a factor affecting time and money spent on vacation (p-value < .10). In contrast, working status does not appear as a differentiating factor for the preferred season or means of transport used on leisure trips, taking a vacation in “Greece” or “Abroad”, the companion with the respondents choose to take their vacation with, and the time in advance they plan their vacation.

The effect of crisis on vacation preferences

Of great interest are the results appearing in Tables 11 and 12. Before financial crisis, 57.6% of the respondents used to spend “Two weeks” on holidays and only 23.2% “A week”. In the period of recent crisis more than five out of ten (or 50.5%) spend only “One week” on holidays. Furthermore, before the crisis 15.2% of the sample used to spend “Three weeks”, while the respective percentage during the crisis is significantly lower (5.1%) (Table14).

Table 14. How long did you spend, on your holidays a year, before the financial crisis and during the crisis??

		Before financial crisis		During financial crisis	
		Valid	Cumulative	Valid	Cumulative
		Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent
Valid	A week	23.2	23.2	50.5	50.5
	Two weeks	57.6	80.8	43.4	93.9
	Three weeks	15.2	96.0	5.1	99.0
	> Three weeks	4.0	100.0	1.0	100.0
Total		100		100	

Also, the current crisis seems to have affected significantly the money that people spend on their holidays. More specifically, before crisis, only 22% of the respondents used to spend “<100” euro, while 17% used to spend “More than 500” euro. Now the respective percentages are 41% and 3% (Table 15).

Table 15. How much money did you spend, on your holidays, before the financial crisis and during the crisis?

		Before the financial crisis		During the financial crisis	
		Percent	Cumulative	Percent	Cumulative
			Percent		Percent
Valid	<100	22.0	22.0	41.0	41.0
	100-300	56.0	78.0	51.0	92.0
	301-500	5.0	83.0	5.0	97.0
	>500	17.0	100.0	3.0	100.0
	Total	100.0			

CONCLUSIONS

Tourism is one of the main drivers of growth of the Greek economy, over time. The Tourism industry presented an increase in 2015, and Greece welcomed almost 23.6 million tourists from abroad. However in times of economic crisis, tourism seems to be, almost exclusively, an export activity. More specifically, around ninety percent of tourism revenues come from abroad, while domestic tourism, presented a decrease of more than sixty percent in 2015 (Hellenic Statistical Authority-ELSTAT, 2016).

This research effort aimed at investigating in which way socio-demographic characteristics, as gender, marital and working status, as well as the recent economic crisis, affect leisure travel and vacation preferences of young people.

Our empirical results showed that 57% of the respondents have not been on vacation in the last two years. Gender appears as a significant differentiating factor for the preferences concerning the persons with which the respondents prefer to take vacation, type of tourist destination (more or less popular), nightlife, amount spent, way of booking and finally, time of planning holidays.

Respectively, marital status seems to play a significant role for the accommodation preferences and the way of booking holidays, while working status affects tourist destination, accommodation and preferences about nightlife.

Of great interest are the results concerning the time and money that the respondents spent on holidays. More specifically, in the period of recent crisis, five out of ten (or 50.5%) spend only

"One week" on holidays, while, the respective percentage before crisis was only 23.2%. Also, people spend much less money on their holiday. Before crisis 22% of the respondents used to spend "<100" euro, and 17% ">500". Now the respective percentages are 41% and 3%.

This study is only an exploratory attempt to describe the way that different characteristics of young people affect leisure travel and holiday preferences. Several limitations are worth noting. First, the sample was collected on a convenience basis and the sample size was small. Second, statistical analysis was limited to descriptive statistics and Chi-Square tests. Future research should attempt to describe young tourist behavior using a tourist typology, in order to classify the aggregate sample in to distinct segments.

References

- Chung, J.Y. (2009) "Seasonality in tourism: A review", e-Review of Tourism Research, Vol. 7, No. 5, pp. 82-96.
- Du, R.Y., Kamakura, A.W. (2012) "How Economic Contractions and Expansions Affect Expenditure Patterns", Journal of Consumer Research, Vol. 39, No. 2, pp. 229-247.
- Eeckels, B., Filis, G., Leon, C. (2012) "Tourism income and economic growth in Greece: empirical evidence from their cyclical components", Tourism Economics, Vol. 18, No. 4, pp. 817-834 available at: http://eprints.bournemouth.ac.uk/20577/1/Tourism%20Economics_GF.pdf (accessed on 5 July 2017).
- European Committee of Regions (2014) "Greek Tourism Strategic Plan: 2021 Growth Roadmap", Andreadis, A.A., available at: http://cor.europa.eu/en/events/summits/Documents/athens_andreadis.pdf (accessed on 5 July 2017).
- Foundation for Economic and Industrial Research (IOBE) (2016) "Quarterly Report for the Greek Economy 4 – 2015", available at: http://iobe.gr/docs/economy/en/ECO_Q4_15_PRE_EN.pdf (accessed on 5 July 2017).
- Galanos, G. (2013) "The Greek Tourism Industry and the Challenge of the Economic Crisis" in Sklias, V.P. & Tzifakis, N. (ur.), Greece's Horizons. Reflecting on the Country's Assets and Capabilities (str. 131-145), Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer.
- Guduraš, D. (2014) "Economic crisis and tourism: Case of the Greek tourism sector", Economic Thought and Practice, Vo. 9, No. 2, pp. 613-632.
- Hellenic Statistical Authority (ELSTAT) (2016) "Domestic Tourism", available at: <http://www.statistics.gr/en/statistics/-/publication/STO15/> (accessed on 5 July 2017).
- Iakovidou, O., Koutsouris, A., Partalidou, M. (2002) "The Development of Rural Tourism in Greece", Through the Initiative LEADER II: the Case of Northern and Central Chalkidiki, New Medit, Vol. 4, pp. 32-38.
- INSETE (2017) "The contribution of Tourism to the Greek economy in 2015" 2nd edition - January 2017, Ikkos A., Koutsos S., available at: http://www.insete.gr/portals/0/meletes-INSETE/01/2017_Simasia_Tourismou_2015_Revised_EN.pdf (accessed on 5 July 2017).
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development-OECD (nd) "Administration of Tourism and Policy for Alternative Forms in Greece", available at: <http://www.oecd.org/industry/tourism/40241726.pdf> (accessed on 5 July 2017).
- Papatheodorou, A. and Arvanitis, P. (2014) "Tourism and the economic crisis in Greece - Regional perspectives", Région et Développement, Vol. 39, pp. 183-203.
- Tsartas, P. (2003) "Tourism Development in Greek Insular and Coastal Areas: Sociocultural Changes and Crucial Policy Issues", Journal of sustainable tourism, Vol. 11, No. 2&3, pp. 116-132.
- Tsourgianis L., Delias P., Polychronidou P., Karasavvoglou A. and Valsamidis S. (2015) "Profiling Tourists who have Holidays in the Region of Eastern Macedonia and Thrace in Greece", in Procedia Economics and Finance, Elsevier, 33, pp. 450-460.
- World travel and tourism council (2017) "Travel & tourism economic impact 2017 - Greece", available at: <https://www.wttc.org/-/media/files/reports/economic-impact-research/countries-2017/greece2017.pdf> (accessed on 5 July 2017).