

UNIVERSITY OF LJUBLJANA
FACULTY OF ECONOMICS

MASTER'S THESIS

**AN ANALYSIS OF POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE IMPACTS OF
SOCIAL TOURISM IN THE CASE OF FAMILIES IN SLOVENIA**

Ljubljana, February 2017

BRIGITA ZIHERL

AUTHORSHIP STATEMENT

The undersigned Brigita Ziherl, a student at the University of Ljubljana, Faculty of Economics, (hereinafter: FELU), author of this written final work of studies with the title An analysis of positive and negative impacts of social tourism in the case of families in Slovenia, prepared under supervision of izr. prof. dr. Ljubica Knežević Cvelbar

DECLARE

1. this written final work of studies to be based on the results of my own research;
2. the printed form of this written final work of studies to be identical to its electronic form;
3. the text of this written final work of studies to be language-edited and technically in adherence with the FELU's Technical Guidelines for Written Works, which means that I cited and / or quoted works and opinions of other authors in this written final work of studies in accordance with the FELU's Technical Guidelines for Written Works;
4. to be aware of the fact that plagiarism (in written or graphical form) is a criminal offence and can be prosecuted in accordance with the Criminal Code of the Republic of Slovenia;
5. to be aware of the consequences a proven plagiarism charge based on the this written final work could have for my status at the FELU in accordance with the relevant FELU Rules;
6. to have obtained all the necessary permits to use the data and works of other authors which are (in written or graphical form) referred to in this written final work of studies and to have clearly marked them;
7. to have acted in accordance with ethical principles during the preparation of this written final work of studies and to have, where necessary, obtained permission of the Ethics Committee;
8. my consent to use the electronic form of this written final work of studies for the detection of content similarity with other written works, using similarity detection software that is connected with the FELU Study Information System;
9. to transfer to the University of Ljubljana free of charge, non-exclusively, geographically and time-wise unlimited the right of saving this written final work of studies in the electronic form, the right of its reproduction, as well as the right of making this written final work of studies available to the public on the World Wide Web via the Repository of the University of Ljubljana;
10. my consent to publication of my personal data that are included in this written final work of studies and in this declaration, when this written final work of studies is published.

Ljubljana, February 10th 2017

Author's signature: _____

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
1 DEFINITION OF SOCIAL TOURISM	4
1.1 Definition of social tourism	4
1.1.1 Host-related social tourism	6
1.1.2 Visitor-related social tourism	7
1.2 Target groups of social tourism	8
1.2.1 Adults with disabilities	8
1.2.2 Low income or socially excluded groups	10
1.2.2.1 Families facing difficult circumstances	10
1.2.2.2 Children and young people	11
1.2.2.3 Senior citizens	12
1.3 Development, players and assessment of the volume dimension in European Union and Slovenia	13
1.3.1 Development of social tourism	13
1.3.2 Social tourism players and their roles	14
1.3.3 Calypso initiative: tourism for all	16
1.3.4 Share of citizens who travel/do not travel	16
1.3.5 Reasons for tourist abstinence	17
1.3.6 Planned trips	18
1.3.7 The link between the current economic situation and intensity of travel	19
2 SOCIAL TOURISM IN SLOVENIA	20
2.1 Analysis of the tourism sector in Slovenia	20
2.1.1 Market trends	20
2.1.2 Feasibility of social tourism	22
2.2 Structures and players	23
2.2.1 Ministry of Economic development and Technology	23
2.2.2 Slovenian Tourist Board	25
2.2.3 Office of the Republic of Slovenia for Youth (Ministry of Education and Sport)	26
2.2.4 Ministry of Labour, Family, Social Affairs and Equal opportunities	27
2.2.5 Zveza prijateljev mladine Slovenije	27
2.2.6 Šent Slovenian Association for Mental Health	28
2.2.7 Trade unions	29
2.2.8 Other stakeholders	29
2.3 Demand drivers	30
2.4 Social tourism for families	31
3 FAMILY HOLIDAYS AS A SOCIAL RIGHT	33
3.1 Development of vacation rights	33
3.2 Entitlement (right) or desert (luxury)	35

3.3	Support of international agreements.....	35
3.3.1	UNWTO Global Code of Ethics for Tourism	36
4	RESULTS OF NON-PARTICIPATION IN TOURISM.....	36
4.1	Parents under stress as a result of non-participation.....	36
4.1.1	Financial stressors	37
4.1.2	Housing of families in poor environments	37
4.1.3	Family structure.....	37
4.1.4	Social support to parents in poor environments	38
4.1.4.1	Informal support	38
4.1.4.2	Semi-formal support	39
4.1.4.3	Formal support.....	39
4.2	Social deprivation, social ills and social exclusion	40
4.2.1	Missing out.....	40
4.2.2	Social exclusion.....	41
5	POSITIVE IMPACTS OF SOCIAL TOURISM FOR FAMILIES	42
5.1	Family holiday as a source of well being	42
5.1.1	Relief and renewal.....	42
5.1.2	Health and mental health benefits	43
5.2	Increase in social capital.....	44
5.2.1	Social interaction and inclusion	44
5.2.2	Social integration.....	45
5.3	Increase in family capital.....	45
5.3.1	Stability of the family.....	46
5.3.2	Cohesion, communication and satisfaction	46
5.3.3	Strengthening family relationships.....	47
5.4	Aspect of quality of life	48
5.4.1	Recharging batteries	49
5.4.2	Vacations as a psychological need	49
5.4.3	Importance of vacations to quality of life	50
5.4.4	Social tourism and subjective well-being.....	51
5.5	Potential form of learning.....	53
6	NEGATIVE IMPACTS OF SOCIAL TOURISM FOR FAMILIES.....	54
6.1	Uncertainty and anxiety.....	54
6.2	Social stigma.....	54
6.3	Return home and negative reflections	55
6.4	Costs to residents	55
6.4.1	Economic impacts	56
6.4.2	Socio-cultural impacts.....	56
6.4.3	Environmental impacts.....	57
6.4.4	Unsustainability of tourism structures.....	57
7	EXISTING SOCIAL TOURISM PROGRAMMES IN THE EU.....	58

7.1	National Holiday Vouchers Agency (France).....	58
7.2	IMSERSO social tourism programme (Spain)	58
7.3	Other examples	59
7.4	Existing provision of holidays for families in need	59
7.4.1	The Holiday Participation Centre (Tourism Flanders & Brussels)	59
7.4.2	UK Family Holiday Association and the European Holiday Experience	59
7.4.3	Family Card Niederösterreich-Vysocina (Austria).....	60
7.4.4	TYPET bilateral exchange programme between Portugal and Greece	60
7.4.5	Holidays for Latvian low-income families to Czech Republic, Slovakia and Hungary	61
8	CASE OF FAMILIES IN SLOVENIA.....	62
8.1	Conceptual model and empirical research	62
8.2	Identification of the problem and survey's purpose	63
8.3	Developing of hypotheses.....	64
8.4	Methodology.....	65
8.4.1	Design of the questionnaire	66
8.4.2	Data collection.....	66
8.4.3	Reliability and Validity	67
8.5	Analysis and results of empirical research.....	68
8.5.1	Sample description	68
8.5.2	Frequency of travel and reasons for tourist abstinence	70
8.6	Results of the analysis, interpretation and hypotheses testing.....	74
8.6.1	Results on results of non-participation	74
8.6.1.1	Question 7: Social deprivation.....	74
8.6.1.2	Question 8: Social exclusion.....	76
8.6.2	Results on positive impacts	77
8.6.2.1	Question 9: Source of well-being	77
8.6.2.2	Question 10: Social capital	79
8.6.2.3	Question 11: Family capital.....	80
8.6.2.4	Question 12: Quality of life	83
8.6.3	Results on negative impacts	84
8.6.3.1	Question 13: Uncertainty and anxiety	84
8.6.3.2	Question 14: Social stigma	86
8.6.3.3	Question 15: Essay question.....	87
8.6.3.4	Question 16: Returning home and negative reflections.....	89
8.7	Research limitations, recommendations for development and future research	90
	CONCLUSION	92
	SLOVENIAN SUMMARY	93
	REFERENCE LIST	103
	APPENDIXES	

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Cronbach's alpha	67
Table 2. Sample description	69
Table 3. Family size	70
Table 4. Age of children.....	70
Table 5. Frequency of travel	71
Table 6. Last time on holidays/trip.....	72
Table 7. Giving up holidays	73
Table 8. Reasons for tourist abstinence.....	73
Table 9. Results of non-participation (social deprivation)	74
Table 10. Results of non-participation (social exclusion).....	76
Table 11. Positive impacts (source of well-being).....	78
Table 12. Positive impacts (social capital).....	79
Table 13. Positive impacts (family capital).....	81
Table 14. Positive impacts (quality of life)	83
Table 15. Negative impacts (uncertainty and anxiety).....	85
Table 16. Negative impacts (social stigma)	86
Table 17. Negative impacts (returning home and negative reflections)	89

INTRODUCTION

Social tourism refers to initiatives that aim to include groups into tourism that would otherwise be excluded from it. It encompasses a variety of different initiatives, commercial and non-commercial, governmental and private, that aim to offer holiday experiences to groups that would not otherwise have them (Minnaert, 2014; Minnaert, Maitland, & Miller, 2006). Social tourism target groups are families, young people and seniors facing difficult financial circumstances, who are often socially excluded, as they do not have access to the commercial holiday circuit. Social tourism studies clearly evidence its positive impacts, especially for families – but many families (and senior citizens) still fall by the wayside when it comes to experiencing holidays away from home (Tourism Flanders & Brussels, 2009). Another target group are people with physical disabilities that in addition to much greater economic constraints have other major constraints to travel. The culmination of these constraints is a loss of enjoyment of the tourism experience (Darcy & Daruvalla, 1999).

In Slovenia it is estimated that at least 25% families are facing difficult circumstances and they hardly participate in tourism due to low income. After an in-depth theoretical and analytical review of scientific literature, scientific papers and research articles, mainly from foreign experts in the field of social tourism, I recognized various positive and also some negative impacts of social tourism for families. The main focus of this master's thesis are therefore families in Slovenia, facing difficulties due to low income or are otherwise socially excluded. The target group is not organised or covered by any existing non-governmental organisations but it is instead targeted by various measures and by many institutions. Social tourism in Slovenia as a concept and as a system is not developed or in place yet, however the interest for it among various stakeholders is high (Švigelj & Cvetek, 2010).

Study of London families living in poverty highlighted the role of tourism participation in social inclusion (Sedgley, Pritchard, & Morgan, 2012). Many of the parents expressed guilt that their children are missing out on opportunities to create happy childhood memories. Children's awareness of their limited opportunities is concerning, particularly as children, even from a young age, can be highly aware of their own poverty in a way which can negatively impact on their attitudes and behaviour, even leading to lower expectations of life (Field, 2010). Moreover, the impact of such social exclusion is keenly felt by families with children when they cannot afford holidays, which are widely recognised to enhance quality of life and well-being (Sedgley et al., 2012). Holidays can bring contact with new communities of practice, which in turn can lead to increases in social capital and behaviour change (Lesser & Storck, 2001). Furthermore, holidays significantly contribute to increases in family capital, which is based on the stability of the family on the one hand,

and the social contacts of the parents on the other hand. Holiday can contribute to both (Parcel & Dufur, 2001).

Some researchers caution that, contrary to studies that identify pre-holiday anticipation as a wholly positive aspect of the tourism experience (Gilbert & Abdullah, 2002), social tourism trips can be wrought with uncertainty (Minnaert, 2014), whilst the return home from any holiday can generate negative reflections on lives and relationships (Hall & Brown, 2006). Alongside the need for clear definition, there are doubts that exist on whether the term “social tourism” itself is appropriate for further promotion of the concept. There is a need for clarity to avoid stigmatisation of the concept and of those who benefit from it (All Party Parliamentary Group on Social Tourism, 2011).

With that in mind, the main purpose of this master’s thesis is to analyze positive and negative impacts of social tourism, specifically in case of families in Slovenia, facing financial difficulties. To this end I am going to examine the concept of social tourism through scientific literature, scientific papers and research articles, mainly from foreign experts in topics discussed. In order to critically evaluate positive and negative impacts of social tourism in the case of families in Slovenia I am going to summarize the basic findings based on empirical research results and studies of other authors. Through primary empirical research and publicly available secondary data I am going to explain the situation and functioning of social tourism in Slovenia. Based on an in-depth theoretical and analytical review of Slovenian and European reports on social tourism I am going to highlight some successful practices in European Union. With empirical research and gathering of primary data I am going to present positive and negative impacts of social tourism highlighted by families in Slovenia, along with comparing differences in perceptions of those impacts of tourism between families that rarely travel and the ones that travel frequently.

In order to achieve the said purpose of master’s thesis, the main objectives are to:

- define social tourism and its target groups;
- investigate development of social tourism and its volume dimension in Slovenia;
- analyze social tourism in Slovenia (particularly for families);
- identify successful practices of social tourism in European Union;
- present results of non-participation in tourism;
- analyze positive impacts of social tourism for families in Slovenia, based on empirical research results and studies of other authors;
- analyze negative impacts of social tourism for families in Slovenia, based on empirical research results and studies of other authors;
- compare my research findings with the findings of existing foreign researches;

- compare differences in perceptions of positive and negative impacts of tourism between families that rarely travel and the ones that travel frequently, based on empirical research results;
- introduce proposals for further research;
- recommend ways for a better and faster development of social tourism in Slovenia.

The master's thesis is based on theoretical and empirical methodological concept. Theoretical part is based on secondary data collection methods and contains an in-depth theoretical and analytical review of scientific literature, scientific papers and research articles, mainly from foreign experts in the field of topics discussed. This part of master's thesis is analyzed using descriptive and compilation method, bringing together the knowledge of many authors in the field of social tourism and related topics. Based on theoretical platform thesis defines social tourism, present situation in Slovenia, discussed family holidays as a social right, presented results of non-participation in tourism, positive and negative impacts of social tourism for families and successful practices in European Union. These findings form the basis for the study of positive and negative impacts of social tourism for families in Slovenia.

Secondly, the empirical part of master's thesis is based on primary research containing gathering of primary data through the method of quantitative research by interviewing with internet questionnaire. In this survey I tried to determine whether the results of previously mentioned authors also apply in Slovenia. I conducted a survey in which I examined perception of positive and negative impacts of participation in tourism and social tourism in the case of families in Slovenia. The majority of the questionnaire questions are based on the evaluation of level of agreement or disagreement with given statements (based on 5-point Likert scale). Families (respondents) were divided into 2 groups; therefore I also compared the differences in perception of positive and negative impacts between families that rarely travel and the ones that travel frequently.

I then compared the differences in experience of results of non-participation, positive impacts and negative impacts of social tourism between these 2 groups of families. In regard to that I wanted to determine whether or not frequency of family travelling has any significant impact on respondents perception and experience of selected categories, I developed 9 hypotheses. I want to prove that respondents that rarely travel have a higher feeling/level of social deprivation, social exclusion, family holidays as a source of well-being, social capital, family capital, quality of life, uncertainty and anxiety, social stigma and negative reflections upon returning home than respondents that travel frequently.

The content of this master's thesis consists of nine chapters, each of them in further divided into subchapters. Conceptually it consists of two parts – theoretical and empirical. In the first chapter social tourism is defined, its target groups are identified along with its development, players, and volume dimension in the European Union and Slovenia. The

second chapter is dedicated to social tourism in Slovenia which includes analysis of the tourism sector in Slovenia, structures and players, demand drivers and condition of social tourism for families. In the third chapter I discuss family holidays as a social right and understanding of tourism as entitlement (right) or dessert (luxury). The fourth chapter includes a discussion of results of non-participation in tourism.

The fifth chapter covers a review of current literature and research that examined positive impacts of social tourism for families. Thereby it follows – family holiday as a source of well-being, increase in social and family capital, aspect of quality of life and tourism as potential form of learning. The sixth chapter covers a review of current literature and research that examined negative impacts of social tourism for families, which includes uncertainty, anxiety, social stigma for participants, returning home and negative reflections, some costs to residents such as economic, socio-cultural and environmental impacts. In addition, due to easier understanding, existing successful practices of social tourism programmes in European Union are presented in chapter 7. This concludes the theoretical part of master's thesis and overview of the current situation.

The eighth chapter covers the empirical part of the master's thesis. Based on the theoretical background of existing literature, empirical research results and studies of other authors, this chapter focuses on the primary research itself. It presents developing of hypotheses, methodology and results of the analysis. It concludes with hypotheses testing, main findings and recommendations for future research. The quantitative research gives the input of positive and negative impacts of social tourism in case of families in Slovenia, facing financial difficulties. The results have been reached through a survey, conducted among 261 families in Slovenia, comparing differences in perceptions of those impacts between families that rarely travel and the ones that travel frequently. At the end the thesis reveals research limitations, and recommends possible solutions and ideas for future research. Chapter 9 provides conclusion of the whole thesis in which I delivered the main findings of theoretical and empirical part and compared my research findings with the findings of existing foreign researches. At the end, a review of used literature and sources is provided along with appendixes that provide necessary supporting materials.

1 DEFINITION OF SOCIAL TOURISM

1.1 Definition of social tourism

Social tourism refers to initiatives that aim to include groups into tourism that would otherwise be excluded from it (Minnaert, 2014). Hunziker (1951) describes Social Tourism as the relationships and phenomena in the field of tourism resulting from participation in travel by economically weak or otherwise disadvantaged elements in society. Minnaert et al. (2006) explain further, that social tourism encompasses a variety of different initiatives,

commercial and non-commercial, governmental and private, that aim to offer holiday experiences to groups that would not otherwise have them.

According to the International Bureau of Social Tourism (fr. *Bureau Internationale du Tourisme Sociale*, hereinafter: BITS), social tourism is all the concepts and phenomena resulting from the participation in tourism of low-income sectors of the population, made possible through well-defined social measures. In the future BITS wants to expand the definition and include the contribution tourism makes to development and solidarity. European Commission states, that social tourism is organised in some countries by associations, cooperatives and trade unions and is designed to make travel accessible to the highest number of people, particularly the most underprivileged sectors of the population. The European Economic and Social Committee (hereinafter: EESC), does not believe that either definition is precise enough. However, as is often the case in the social sciences, an exact definition is less important than the identification of specific features (European Economic and Social Committee, 2006).

Consequently, according to EESC, we can say that an activity constitutes social tourism, whenever three conditions are met (European Economic and Social Committee, 2006):

- Real-life circumstances are such, that it is totally or partially impossible to fully exercise the right to tourism. This may be due to economic conditions, physical or mental disability, personal or family isolation, reduced mobility, geographical difficulties, and a wide variety of causes which ultimately constitute a real obstacle.
- Someone (e.g. a public or private institution, a company, a trade union, or simply an organised group of people), decides to take action to overcome or reduce the obstacle which prevents a person from exercising their right to tourism.
- This action is effective and actually helps a group of people to participate in tourism in a manner which respects the values of sustainability, accessibility and solidarity.

Focusing on tourism demand, Haukeland (1990) describes how in Scandinavian countries the concept of social tourism means that everybody, regardless of economic or social situation, should have the opportunity to go on vacation. Even World tourism organisation (1999) in its Global Code of Ethics for Tourism, emphasizes the universal right to tourism and importance for the development of social tourism, particularly associative tourism, which facilitates widespread access to leisure, travel and holidays. Furthermore, it highlights that family, youth, student and senior tourism and tourism for people with disabilities should be encouraged and facilitated.

As Joppe (1989) pointed out, if the intention is to bring certain disadvantaged groups into the market for tourism, government can increase basic income through minimum wage legislation, family, rent, child allowances, and so on, as well as providing direct subsidy to

holidays. If incomes are increased, disadvantaged groups are brought into the tourism market and have the opportunity to go on vacation in the sense that they can now afford a holiday, but there is no expectation that this is how they should use their additional funds – they might choose to spend them on clothing, consumer durables etc. Minnaert et al. (2006) use a very basic definition of social tourism as a starting point for a deeper analysis: “tourism with an added moral value, which aims to benefit either the host or the visitor in the tourism exchange”. In contrast with the rest of the tourism industry, social tourism sees holidays not simply as a product, but as an expression of a certain moral belief. Holidays can be seen either as a universal right or as a tool to achieve aims that lie outside of commercial tourism: for example equality, social inclusion, increase in independence, or economic development for disadvantaged areas.

EESC presents whole set of values that social tourism brings to European society. Together with the successes that social tourism has already achieved, the prospects for growth, and the research into and introduction of new products, all make for a highly positive general assessment of social tourism in European Union (hereinafter: EU) from all angles. The values include (European Economic and Social Committee, 2006):

- satisfaction for beneficiaries, not just through the direct activity of taking a holiday, but also through the "special" nature of this leisure activity;
- the human dimension and values of the activity;
- improvement in the well-being and personal development of beneficiaries and the hosting community;
- profitability and economic gain for the tourist industry, particularly by extending the high season;
- benefits from the creation of stable, high-quality employment year-round;
- maintenance of sustainability in host areas;
- enhancement of the local environment and its natural, social and cultural resources and heritage;
- boosting of knowledge and exchange between EU countries.

1.1.1 Host-related social tourism

Social tourism can be used to describe the effect on the supply side of tourism, the destination. Hence, Seabrook (1995) writes, that there is emerging a more convivial and interactive form of travel, a kind of social tourism, designed specifically to enhance and offer insight into the lives of people, which figures neither in the glossy brochures, nor in the media coverage of the third-world countries. Furthermore, Deakin, Davis and Thomas (1995) explain, that where the hosts are concerned, tourism can be seen as a factor that could introduce greater equality in different parts of the world through investments and the development of tourism facilities. Socialized views of society are compatible with this type

of social tourism because it can offer a means toward greater economic equality, and a chance for the weaker strata to benefit more from the opportunities of tourism. This type of social tourism is also compatible with individualized perspectives, provided it does not require a reduction in the utility of visitors.

Social tourism can provide many communities with an escape route from underdevelopment or industrial crisis and the collapse of mining, industrial or farming activities. The conditions required for the development of social tourism are the same as those needed for an area and its inhabitants to see tourist activity as a driver of development. Communities can earn their livelihood from tourist activity, the local economy and social stability will be strengthened. As recommended by many international bodies, tourist activity is a good antidote to wars and disasters of all types. Tourism signifies welcome, exchange, the enhancement of local assets, friendship and communication between people, as opposed to war, which represents aggression, invasion and the destruction of nature. If one only loves what one knows, then tourism can encourage people to become closer and learn about each other, thus promoting peace, harmony and development. Social tourism can and should be reinforced, and should help to promote the conditions of equality, justice, democracy and well-being that enable the mutually-supportive development of all people around the world. Only businesses which are competitive and profitable in the broadest sense can operate effectively, safely and with guarantees for consumers. The varying situation of social tourism today shows that the businesses and organisations devoted to this activity are profitable once they have established their structure and have the right market and appropriate prices. Social tourism organisations create jobs both throughout the year and during low-occupancy periods, thus helping to provide employment for the workers affected (European Economic and Social Committee, 2006).

On the other side, the negative effects of tourism have shown over the last years that commercial tourism can be a far from perfect weapon to battle social inequality, as the facilities are often in the hands of foreign investors, whereas the local population can often be employed in low-paid and seasonal jobs. The effects on the environment have sometimes been disastrous for local ecosystems, and local cultures exploited as cheap tourist attractions. As a reaction to these effects of tourism, new tourism forms have developed that can be seen to be part of social tourism (e.g. ecotourism) (Minnaert et al., 2006).

1.1.2 Visitor-related social tourism

Examples of social tourism range from holiday initiatives for people with disabilities and charity holidays for children from disadvantaged backgrounds to the development of community-based tourism in economically underdeveloped areas (Minnaert, Maitland, &

Miller, 2009). Therefore, when it comes to visitor-related social tourism, initiatives are mainly targeted at two, rather different, disadvantaged groups (Minnaert et al., 2006):

- One set of tourism initiatives are aimed at travellers with disabilities, and strive for equal opportunities for this group to enjoy a holiday in the commercial tourism sector.
- The second set is initiatives for low-income or socially excluded groups, for people who cannot afford a holiday in the commercial tourism circuit.

Persons with disabilities are largely excluded today because they cannot access tourist facilities, not because they cannot afford them. Improving accessibility increases opportunity for disabled people, but is also an investment that can be financially worthwhile, so the nondisabled members in society do not have to sacrifice their own utility, and there are likely to be net social benefits, and ones that are increasingly widely perceived. By contrast, low-income groups cannot afford a holiday, and the wider benefits for society of offering them one are largely uncertain, as there is very limited academic research around this subject. If visitor related social tourism can bring about changes in the target groups that in turn generate net social benefits, then it may be plausibly seen as not just charity, but a merit good and an investment, a sort of social policy with benefits for every citizen. In the case of low-income or socially excluded groups, the target could be reintegration through tourism, improvements in family relations, and parenting skills, creating a greater willingness to travel (thus improving job search) or an improvement in mental or physical health (Minnaert et al., 2006).

Social tourism can facilitate considerable changes in the lives of the participants. Although these changes may seem small, for the participants they are often fundamental and a stepping stone for further development. The changes can be achieved for a relatively modest investment in terms of time and money. The participants can often go away only for a week, with fairly basic accommodation in holiday parks during the low season – to be positively affected in one or more areas of daily life after the holiday (Minnaert et al., 2009).

1.2 Target groups of social tourism

1.2.1 Adults with disabilities

Disability is a part of the diversity of human communities, rather than a deviation from an objective norm. All communities contain individuals with disabilities, estimating that an average 10% of the population have a disability. This equates to 650 million people with disabilities living in the world today. World Health Organization forecasts that there will be one billion people with disabilities living in the world by 2050 (World Health Organization, 1997). In addition, Darcy and Dickson (2009) established with a “whole of-life approach” that at any time 30% of the community has some form of disability or

access need – this includes families with young children and those experiencing temporary disabling sporting injuries and other medical conditions. In Slovenia it is estimated, that about 8% of population are persons with disabilities. They travel through organisations and associations for people with disabilities, about 50% of their members are travelling every year, mostly with family and friends, because they need companion when taking holidays. The main segments of people with disabilities according to which specialised associations offer support are: people with intellectual disabilities, people with accidental head injuries, people with motion disability (paraplegics, tetraplegics, multiple sclerosis), deaf and hard of hearing, blind and visually impaired, students with disabilities and the disabled veterans. It is expected that the percentage of disabilities will increase due to population getting old and medical care getting better – more people survive after accidents, but they have serious injuries and stay disabled (Švigelj & Cvetek, 2010).

Eichhorn, Miller and Tribe (2013) highlight the importance of tourism for resistance of individuals with disability. It provides individuals with the opportunity to act for themselves and make sense of the world (Crouch & Coles, 2007). Resistance can be also seen as a counter-mechanism to overcome unequal power structures affecting not only individuals with a disability but for example also women, poor people etc. (Tribe, 2007). The concept of identity is intrinsically interrelated with the social world and represents the fundamental link between an individual and the socio-cultural context (Burkitt, 2008; Hammack, 2008).

In addition to much greater economic constraints (e.g. attendant costs, equipment hire, lack of budget accommodation, low employment rates etc.), there are other major constraints to travel faced by people with physical disabilities (e.g. access to physical infrastructure needs, accessible accommodation, access at destination and to the attractions, and the lack of accurate information etc.). The culmination of these constraints is a loss of enjoyment of the tourism experience. Apart from the economic constraints, most of these constraints can be adequately addressed within current environmental planning frameworks (Darcy & Daruvalla, 1999). Making holidays possible for the disabled therefore implies providing the requisite supporting initiatives that principally concern the quality of the accommodation infrastructure. This adaptation of the infrastructure also increases the accessibility of the accommodation for all (Tourism Flanders & Brussels, 2009). It is also important to note, that people with disabilities do not cite their impairment as a reason for non-participation, but instead a series of structural constraints (Darcy, 2003).

In Slovenia there are different organisations responsible for support of disabled people on holidays. Disability directorate (at the Ministry of Labour, Social affairs and Families) deals with matters concerning the position of disabled people, their integration into society, training and employment, and participation in employment programmes (Disabled, war veterans, victims of war, 2016). Health Insurance Institute of Slovenia (slo. *Zavod za*

zdravstveno zavarovanje Slovenije) provides insured persons with the opportunity to participate in group and tailored rehabilitation. Those are provided with co-financing of physiotherapy and accommodation costs. The institute also co-finances holiday in an organized and professionally managed health colony for children who were repeatedly hospitalized or sick more often (Švigelj & Cvetek, 2010). Paraplegics Association (slo. *Zveza paraplegikov Slovenije*) co-finances stay in their accommodation units for their members (Tourism – reservations, 2016). Deaf and Hard of Hearing Clubs Association of Slovenia (slo. *Zveza društev gluhih in naglušnih Slovenije*) organises health programmes for their members in their units, co-financing provided by them, with no public funds. Pensioners with supplementing allowance, recipients of social help, disabled pensioners, single parents with kids and unemployed can spend their holidays free of charge. Interest for such assistance among their members is extremely high, as their social and economical status is worse than of other disabled (Ohranjevanje zdravja, 2016; Švigelj & Cvetek, 2010). Associations for people with disabilities report that their members spend 1 or 2 weeks in their accommodations, some also have a rule that maximum stay is 1 week, so that majority of the members can get a chance of participation (Švigelj & Cvetek, 2010).

1.2.2 Low income or socially excluded groups

Often, persons living in poverty do not have access to the commercial holiday circuit. This target group is directly supported by the organisations that organise holidays for and with them (Tourism Flanders & Brussels, 2009). Families facing difficult circumstances, young people and seniors facing difficult financial circumstances are presented below.

1.2.2.1 Families facing difficult circumstances

Social tourism studies clearly evidence its positive impacts, especially for families – but many families (and senior citizens) still fall by the wayside when it comes to experiencing holidays away from home. The existing social vacation centres continue to play a very important role in support of this target group (Tourism Flanders & Brussels, 2009). Minnaert et al. (2009) argue that social tourism helps deprived families increase their family and social capital and widen their social networks and fosters positive behaviour and self-esteem. Social tourism offered them moments for reflection, assessment and aspiration. At the same time, participants saw holidays as opportunities to escape from routine, a time to leave worries and financial problems at home, and concentrate on more positive things.

The ability to participate in tourism is increasingly seen by supranational bodies such as the United Nations and the EU, by state governments and by non-governmental agencies and charities as a human right and an entitlement of citizenship (Sedgley et al., 2012). Low income is only one indicator of poverty and it can also be measured subjectively by one's own perceptions, consumption needs, relationships and levels of social interaction and

political engagement. The UNICEF report recognised that child poverty is about more than poverty of income. It is also about poverty of opportunity and expectation, of cultural and educational resources, of housing and neighbourhoods, of parental care and time, of local services and community resources (UNICEF, 2010). To this many add the inability to take a holiday as an indicator of poverty, also because a holiday is regarded as an integral part of everyday lifestyles in affluent societies (Sedgley et al., 2012). In Slovenia it is estimated that at least 25% families are facing difficult circumstances and they hardly participate in tourism due to low income (Švigelj & Cvetek, 2010). Positive and negative impacts of social tourism on families are thoroughly presented in the following chapters.

1.2.2.2 Children and young people

Children and young people are another social tourism target group. In Slovenia young people between 18 and 30 years represent almost 20% of population, about 80% of them go on holidays. Average age of getting the first employment is increasing, therefore the proportion of young people living below the poverty line in Slovenia is almost 10%. Other trends for young people in Slovenia are: fewer marriages, higher average age of women having first child, increased education level, speaking more foreign languages and often studying abroad. Considering duration of stay, young people in average spend 6 nights when abroad and about 3 when travelling in Slovenia. The average daily expenditure on holiday is about €50 per day for travelling abroad and about €30 per day for travelling in Slovenia, which doesn't lag behind the average tourist expenditure a lot. They spend most of their budget inside local community (entertainment, museums, etc.) and not much for accommodation. The main reasons young people in Slovenia don't participate in tourism are the lack of spare time and financial reasons (Švigelj & Cvetek, 2010).

In France, a national study showed that the non-departure rate of this target group is the second highest after the elderly group. That is mainly because before 18, they usually go on holiday with their family and have a correct average departure rate, and after 25 this departure rate increases again. Their project "Holiday gift box for young people France" aims to maintain the accessibility to holidays of the target group, inform and initiate dynamics. The package takes the form of a gift box, which includes accommodation, a specific activity such as sports, without transportation. Transport is excluded because a national study showed that young people mainly use their car (or their parent's car) for their holiday, and only 25% use the train. Also, the product doesn't concern specifically off-season holidays (HAMS, 2010).

Accommodations that are rented for youth holidays during the summer or other holidays must fulfil basic quality norms. The goal is to provide sufficient capacity, diversity and basic quality within the youth tourism sector, so that the youth work sector has a sufficiently extensive and diverse offerings at its disposal to develop its activity (Tourism Flanders & Brussels, 2009). Research showed, that substantial increase in self-esteem and

self-confidence was identified amongst deprived young people, evidencing how social tourism experiences diversify the routines of young people from “limited spatial worlds” (Quinn & Stacey, 2010).

1.2.2.3 Senior citizens

Studies of social tourism have concentrated on the benefits for young families and people with disabilities, but we can't forget its wellbeing value for economically disadvantaged older people (Morgan, Pritchard, & Sedgley, 2015). In the EU, 17% of population are already over 65. These older people have been recognised as a vital tourism market, contributing a growing share of spending. Economic and demographic developments are contracting retirement income systems across economically developed economies and threatening to impoverish significant numbers of their upcoming older generations (Ellis, Munnell, & Eschtruth, 2014). Many European and North American workers retiring after 2020 will face hardship in old age, making holidays less and not more affordable for them. In this context, tourism researchers must pay greater attention to the experiences of the growing numbers of older people already living in poverty in these societies and better understand the relationships between tourism and later-life wellbeing (Casey, 2012).

At present, seniors represent about one quarter of Slovenian population, about 30% of them go on holidays. The number of retired persons is constantly growing. Most of pensioners live with a partner (57%), their financial position is therefore better than that of pensioners in single person households. The proportion of pensioners living below the poverty line in Slovenia is about 20%. For most pensioners pension revenue is the only or dominant income. A growing ratio of retired persons to active tax payers and an increasing ratio between the average pension and average salary are reflected in increasing contributions. The number of retired persons is expected to keep growing for the next 30 years, while the number of those who contribute for pension funds is not expected to increase for the next 15 years (Švigelj & Cvetek, 2010).

In Slovenia, organisation responsible for support of seniors on holidays is Slovenian federation of pensioners' organisations (slo. *Zveza društev upokojencev Slovenije*, hereinafter: ZDUS), a non-profit, non-governmental umbrella pensioner's organisation. Its fundamental concern is quality of life for elderly citizens in Slovenia and intergenerational harmony and solidarity among citizens of Slovenia. Their objective is encouraging active, productive, creative and independent life for older people as long as possible, by recognizing the potential, knowledge and experiences of older people for the faster development of the society (About ZDUS, 2016; Švigelj & Cvetek, 2010). They are active on national level, local level and projects, with over 1,300 volunteers helping and visiting elderly people. The average number of overnight stays for seniors in Slovenia is about 4 overnight stays in Slovenia (domestic tourism) and about 7 overnight stays abroad. Tourists aged 65 and over spend the least money during holidays, average daily

expenditure is about €30 per day. The main reasons senior in Slovenia don't participate in tourism are financial problems, lack of time, no interest, age and illness (Švigelj & Cvetek, 2010).

Social tourism presents older individuals with occasions for escape, respite, companionship, and reminiscence and for renegotiation of self-identity following spousal bereavement, but these trips can be anxiously anticipated (Morgan et al., 2015). Studies have expressly highlighted that tourism can enhance seniors' wellbeing and imbue them with a renewed sense of purpose, easing their work-retirement transition (Hawes, 1988). Tourism has been seen to exert a positive psychological impact on older people, on their subjective wellbeing, quality of life, self-assessed health and life satisfaction, regardless of type or duration of trip (Hagger & Murray, 2013; Hunter-Jones & Blackburn, 2007). It similarly plays a role in creating and sharing memories and is recognized as promoting and maintaining older people's mental wellbeing as it engages memory and fosters social interaction (Marschall, 2012; Sellick, 2004). The most common later-life mental health problem is depression, often severe enough to impair their quality of life and older people frequently have to deal with often interconnecting life transitions such as bereavement, physiological change, increased ill-health and reduced socio-economic circumstances (Naef, Ward, Mahrer-Imhof, & Grande, 2013). Such concerns can predispose them to poor sleep and create a downward spiral of mental and physical health, seriously impacting their wellbeing (Hislop & Arber, 2006).

1.3 Development, players and assessment of the volume dimension in European Union and Slovenia

1.3.1 Development of social tourism

Some people tend to think that the origin of social tourism dates back to 1844, when Cook organized the very first group tours, but it really started in 1936-1937 when many countries in Europe passed legislation on paid holidays. In fact, the right to annual legal holiday without loss of salary, which was granted to all workers, brought them within reach of the joys of travel, which were to date known only to a privileged few. But it is not enough simply to recognize a right. Its beneficiaries must be given the chance to enjoy it to the fullest. It was for this very reason that the pioneer associations in the field of social tourism set to work. They obtained special reduced fares for holiday makers and created a network of holiday centres specifically for them, not forgetting the vast program of information and education which they launched for public, which was not yet sufficiently aware of the tremendous advantages that this new acquisition had to offer. Although this movement was suspended during the Second World War, it started up again with renewed enthusiasm as soon as the hostilities ceased (Haulot, 1983). The term "Social tourism" has a long and honoured pedigree. In 1956, Arthur Haulot (a former prisoner of Dachau), initiated a movement that subsequently led to the BITS, which has a large number of organizations

scattered around the world. The Bureau seeks to establish a right to a paid vacation, and to provide those on low income with subsidised travel. For example, in Spain the Spanish government has aided its pensioners to enjoy holidays in off peak periods in areas like Majorca – a policy that benefits pensioners and enables hotels to retain trained staff and some income over otherwise slow periods of the year. The Bureau promotes the concepts of low-cost “vacation villages”, of camping sites, and a form of tourism that benefits the vacationer and the host, and the environment within which both meet (Ryan, 2002).

Elsewhere, within the UK, there have been past initiatives to aid single parents and disabled groups. The Gingerbread Group is a pressure group that provides advice and practical support for single parents (About us, 2016). In the 1980s they negotiated, with one of the major holiday camp/resort chains, Butlins, an early season holiday for single parents. This takes place before the main season commences at Easter. This way Butlins charges “off peak” prices, and uses the occasion as a means of training new staff prior to the main season commencing. It provides a break for both single mothers and their children, and provides a “real life” training scenario for newly appointed seasonal staff for the company. In 1998 the Deptford branch of Gingerbread alone ran 15 trips to theme parks and seaside resorts for its membership of solo parents (Ryan, 2002).

The precise methods of provision of social tourism for families has varied from country to country. Some western European governments have subsidised holidays directly through grants to disadvantaged groups (e.g. *Cheques-vacances* in France). There have also been holiday savings schemes with contributions by employers and the tourist industry. Alternatively, some have subsidised the supply side, by providing state supported holidays centres and camps aimed at families. Holidays have also typically been provided through employers and unions, particularly in Eastern Europe (Hughes, 1991).

1.3.2 Social tourism players and their roles

The social tourism players that regulate and deal with social tourism are (European Economic and Social Committee, 2006):

- The European institutions: they are displaying a growing interest in social tourism, as illustrated by the various studies, opinions, reports and conferences being organised, promoted or coordinated by the Parliament, the Commission and the EESC. Their activities are essentially focused on gathering, classifying and circulating the wide range of experiences acquired by European countries. The role being played by the Commission is to promote new experiences in each country, and to bring together those responsible in the various countries with a view to cooperating on transnational initiatives. It does not seem unfeasible that the Commission might one day take on the role of general coordinator for a social tourism platform at European level. This role

would not necessarily call for financial contributions from the European institutions in order to develop such a joint transnational platform.

- Member States' governments: as pointed out above, the involvement of Member States' governments in social tourism activities varies greatly for historical, ideological and social reasons. In some countries, the government, whether national, regional or local, provides significant financial aid. These funds are often aimed at various groups: young people, senior citizens, people with disabilities, underprivileged people, etc. Governments are currently taking steps to go beyond the national limits of their social tourism programmes with various types of transnational exchanges.
- Employers: it is important to note, that there are initiatives such as "holiday vouchers", whereby employers contribute financially to help facilitate holidays for their staff. Furthermore, as mentioned, it should be borne in mind that social tourism is a major economic activity with great potential and as such, attracts entrepreneurs from the tourism sector who see it as a means to boost their activities as service providers or intermediaries. One initiative worth mentioning is the Spanish company Mundo Senior ("Senior World"). The initiative comprises various large tourism companies and was set up originally to manage the social tourism programme of the Ministry for Labour and Social Affairs. It has also expanded its social scope and activity by offering specialised tourism products for senior citizens. Clearly, the competitiveness criterion is not hindered by the social nature of this activity. In the future, there will need to be public-private partnership initiatives to develop profitable social tourism programmes both within Member States and between different countries.
- Workers: ever since social tourism first emerged, trade unions, as the bodies which defend workers' rights, have had a strong presence in tourism, as a means of obtaining benefits for their members. This presence is illustrated through support for physical infrastructure, holiday complexes, guest houses, etc. and for specialised services. Experiences and commitment levels vary from country to country, but in almost all countries there is some kind of social tourism activity stemming from trade unions. It is worth mentioning the trade union organisations of the newest Member States, which are seeking a valid model for social tourism and relations with more experienced bodies.
- Specialised associations: these associations include the consumer cooperatives that in certain countries (e.g. Italy and the United Kingdom, hereinafter: UK) have extensive networks of agencies organising social tourism, together with the youth and environmental organisations operating in this field, and the associations belonging to the social tourism bodies themselves, such as the BITS, which carries out important support, coordination and promotion work.
- Groups involved directly and indirectly in social tourism: evidently, the beneficiaries themselves are the main players in the various social tourism programmes and activities. It is they who benefit first from the economic advantages that enable them to enjoy their leisure time and holidays, taking part in the sporting or cultural activities

that appeal to them. Secondly, they benefit from tourism that is respectful of geographical resources, heritage and the environment, and the relationship between the beneficiaries and the inhabitants of the host areas. Together, these activities help to foster mutual knowledge, relaxation and well-being. Local communities in which social tourism is practiced also benefit from employment, economic activity and development.

1.3.3 Calypso initiative: tourism for all

Calypso is the European Commission's three-year action running since 2009, promoting social tourism, opening up travel to underprivileged groups and at the same time boosting local economies and employment opportunities (European Commission, DG Enterprise, & Industry, 2011). It seeks to support four groups: underprivileged young adults (aged 18-30), families on low incomes, people with disabilities and people over 65 (seniors) who cannot afford to travel or are daunted by the challenges of organising a journey. These target groups are less constrained by vocational seasons, so they can help extend the tourism season and help create longer-lasting employment in the sector (Low season tourism, 2016). The Calypso exchange model promotes off-season tourism, particularly in regions where tourism is well developed, but highly seasonal. On the other hand it gives lesser-known, smaller, or emerging destinations the opportunity to promote themselves to a broader range of European tourists and it encourages longer-lasting employment in the tourism industry by making it possible to extend jobs beyond the peak season (Social & health tourism, 2016). In conclusion, the Calypso Initiative aims to improve the lives of underprivileged people across Europe by enabling those who cannot usually travel to do so. It recognises that not only does social tourism provide social benefits, but it also delivers economic benefits such as increased employment, reduced tourism seasonality and greater economic activity and growth (Sedgley et al., 2012).

After a call for proposals, they awarded 10 projects that created bilateral or multilateral exchange models, supporting travel for the target groups. One of the main projects funded by the European Commission has been the Business-to-business (hereinafter: B2B) eCalypso platform. Created in 2013, it is a market place that brings together organisations involved in sending the target groups on holiday or facilitating their departure with accommodation providers, especially in the low season. It is also a meeting place for the community of European social tourism stakeholders that offers a range of references on social tourism in Europe (Low season tourism, 2016).

1.3.4 Share of citizens who travel/do not travel

Preferences of Europeans towards tourism report 2016 reveals a proportion of respondents who travelled in 2015. 73% respondents spent at least one night away from home when travelling for professional or personal reasons, while 26% said they had not done this. The

proportion of travellers has been consistent since 2009, ranging between 69% and 73%, with a slight increase over the past two years. In Slovenia 78% of respondents travelled and 22% have not (European Commission, 2013).

The report also considers the reasons why people did not go on holidays, and whether the current economic situation has had an impact on holiday plans for the next year. Respondents who said that they had not travelled in 2015 were asked the reasons why they had not been on a holiday in that year. In 28 countries, financial reasons are the most common response (51%). It is no different with Slovenian respondents: 51% said they did not go on holidays for financial reasons, 33% because of health reasons, 16% preferred to stay at home with no motivation to travel, 25% mentioned lack of time due to work or study commitments, 7% lacked time due to family commitments and 1% did not travel because of the lack of facilities for persons with disabilities. Overall, respondents aged between 40 and 54 years were most likely to mention financial reasons (60%), while percentage for this reason is also high for those aged 25-39 (57%) (European Commission, 2013; European Commission, 2014b; European Commission, 2015; European Commission, 2016a). Furthermore, the larger a respondents' household, the more likely they are to say that financial reasons prevented them from taking a holiday – this data indicates that families really are a social tourism target group that should not be ignored (European Commission, 2013).

1.3.5 Reasons for tourist abstinence

Non-participants tend to be divided into three groups: those with income constraints, those with structural constraints (e.g. poor health, carer commitments, or work commitments) and those who prefer not to holiday. Low-income tends to be the most common reason given by people for not going on holiday, by as many as half of all non-participants (Haukeland, 1990; Davidson, 1996; Richards, 1998). Unsurprisingly, cost has historically been a particular deterrent to those with young families and lower income groups and others have found association with socio-economic grouping (English Tourist Board, 1976; Haukeland, 1990). Whereas better-off families might choose a cheaper form of holiday when resources were lower, families with already low incomes will forgo their holiday altogether (Van Raaij & Francken, 1984). Among the representative sample of parents from the 30% most economically deprived neighbourhoods across Britain, 60% were unable to afford “a family holiday away from home at least once a year” (Hazel, 2005).

Preferences of Europeans towards tourism report lists the reasons for not going on holiday. Respondents who said that did not go on holiday in 2015 (26%), were asked the reasons for not doing so. The most common response, with more than half of the respondents, were financial reasons (51%), while 23% cited health reasons, 22% preferred to stay at home or had no motivation to travel, 20% cited a lack of free time due to work or study commitments, 19% gave a lack of free time due to family commitments as the reason, 2%

did not take a holiday because of the lack of facilities for persons with disabilities and 1% because of administrative problems such as obtaining visa (European Commission, 2016a).

In Slovenia this percentage varied through years (European Commission, 2012; European Commission, 2013; European Commission, 2014b; European Commission, 2015; European Commission, 2016a):

- In 2012, respondents in Slovenia were more likely to mention financial reasons for not going on holiday compared to 2011, since the percentage increased 18 percentage points (hereinafter: pp) to 55%, compared to the year before. In 2013 it declined sharply to 41%, then in 2014 it increased to 61% and in 2015 decreased again and now stands at 51%.
- In 2012, mentions of personal reasons notably declined among respondents in Slovenia, for 18 pp compared to the year before, to 16%. In 2013 this proportion increased significantly, for 13 pp, to 29%.
- Health reasons for not taking a holiday in 2015, declined 19 pp in Slovenia, to 16% compared to year before.
- Proportion of respondents who had not taken a holiday in 2015 because of a lack of free time due to work or study commitments was 1%, same as the previous year.

The socio-demographic analysis of 2015 data of 28 countries shows, that financial reasons were most likely to be given by those aged 40-54 years (60%), followed by those aged 25-39 (57%), while those aged 55 or over (44%) were the least likely to do so. Respondents aged 15-24 were the most likely to say they lacked free time due to work or study commitments (54%, compared with 6% of people aged 55 or over). Respondents aged between 25-39, were the most likely to say that they lacked time due to family commitments (27%) and those aged 55 or over were the most inclined to mention health reasons (37%, compared with 3% of 15-24 year-olds). Those who finished their full-time education at the age of 16-19 were the most likely to say that they did not take a holiday in 2015 for financial reasons (55%), while respondents who finished their full-time education at age 20 or over, were the least likely to give that answer (46%) (European Commission, 2016a). To conclude, the data from 2012 shows, that the larger a respondents' household, the more likely they are to say that financial reasons prevented them from taking a holiday. 42% of respondents in single person households say this, compared to 53% of those in households with four or more (European Commission, 2013).

1.3.6 Planned trips

In 2016 plans for all types of holiday show slight increase from previous years. Preferences of Europeans towards tourism report reviews the expected duration of the holidays in 2016. 44% of respondents in 28 countries said they were planning to take holidays lasting between 4 and 13 consecutive nights away. In Slovenia there was a slight increase (+4 pp)

compared to previous year, standing at 47% in 2016. Almost one quarter (23%) of respondents was planning holidays with more than 13 consecutive nights away (16% in Slovenia, +5 pp compared to previous year). On the other hand 33% said they were planning to take short-stay trips of up to 3 consecutive nights away (17% in Slovenia, +2 pp). The socio-demographic analysis of 2016 data shows, that respondents aged 25 to 39 were the most likely to plan to take holidays between 4 and 13 consecutive nights away (53%), or to plan a short-stay trip lasting up to 3 consecutive nights away (39%). Those aged between 15 and 24 were the most likely to be planning holidays lasting more than 13 consecutive nights away (28%). The analysis reveals no differences between genders (European Commission, 2016a).

Looking ahead to their main holiday in 2016, respondents who previously said that they planned to go away were asked where they intended to go: 44% said they planned to spend their main holiday in their own country, 29% intended to spend their main holiday somewhere in the EU, 15% said they planned to travel to a country outside the EU, while 12% did not know where they would go. Destination plans for 2016 are very similar to those made in previous years. There was an important change in Slovenia, where respondents are now much less likely than in 2009 to be planning their main holiday outside the EU (-19 pp) (European Commission, 2016a).

Looking at the main holiday destinations, being it for the main holiday or another holiday, that the respondents said they planned to visit in 2016, there are top eight destinations excluding domestic holidays. Spain was the most popular destination for planned visits from other countries (11%), Italy was mentioned in second place (8%), followed by France (7%), the USA or Canada (5%) and Austria, Germany, Greece and Asia or Oceania (all 4%). Once again, findings are very similar to the planned destinations a year ago (European Commission, 2016a).

1.3.7 The link between the current economic situation and intensity of travel

Preferences of Europeans towards tourism report 2016 shows, that EU citizens have become more confident about their travel plans in the context of the economic situation. All respondents were asked whether the current economic situation had an impact on their holiday plans for the next year. Half of them (50%) said they would go on holiday without changing their plans, while 28% said that they would still go on holiday but would change their plans. 10% said they would not go on holiday as a result of the economic situation, 4% said they never go on holiday and 8% could not say whether the economic situation would affect their plans. Compared to year 2014 and 2015, respondents are now more likely to say that they will go on holiday in the following year, without changing their plans (+6 pp since 2014). Correspondingly, respondents are now less likely to say that they will go on holiday but will change their plans (-5 pp since 2014). The proportions that are not planning to go on holiday at all, or that say they never go on holiday, have remained

consistent since 2014. In Slovenia 50% of respondents said that they would go on holiday without changing their plans (+ 5 pp compared to previous year) and 26% of respondents said that they would still go on holiday but would change their plans (-7 pp) (European Commission, 2016a).

Looking at the socio-demographic analysis of 28 countries shows, that respondents in the 25-39 age group (36%) were the most likely to say that their 2016 holiday plans would be affected by the current economic situation, compared to those aged 55 or over (20%). Conversely, those aged 55 or over were the most likely to say that they would not go on holiday in 2016 (12%) or that they never go on holiday (8%). Respondents who finished their full-time education at 20 years old or later, were the most likely to say that they would go on holiday in 2016 without changing their plans (55%), while those who left school aged 15 or earlier were most likely to say that they would not go on holiday in 2016 (19%) (European Commission, 2016a).

2 SOCIAL TOURISM IN SLOVENIA

2.1 Analysis of the tourism sector in Slovenia

2.1.1 Market trends

In recent times, travel has changed from a luxury to a need, thus expressing the tendency for a greater influence of local industries and a pleasant life. New meaning of tourism brings a new, changed understanding of the scope and relevance of this industry in the developed world. This means that when we speak of the tourism industry, we do not refer only to the main organizations of this industry (aircraft, hotel, catering, agency, etc.) but also on other activities (ecology, urban planning, architecture, interior design, engineering, IT, politics, public relations, marketing, publishing, telecommunications, finances, food industry, culture, etc.). It cannot be denied, that the activities of visitors change the way of life in local communities, and have significant economic and social impact. Modern society has to take into account environment-related issues, cultural differences and different levels of complexity. Industrial tourism is a huge global business that is still increasing (Republic of Slovenia, Ministry of the Economy, 2006).

The range of people employed in the travel industry will continue to expand and will thus demand better organisation at all levels. The macro level will have to be reassessed in Slovenia in order to establish the causes of poor income earned by tourism. It is evident from the analysis of trends, that Slovenia may seek its opportunities in the quality of offer, easy accessibility to destinations, offering out of high season, the individualisation of offers, as a new destination in Europe, as a provider of short holidays, as a diverse, culturally and naturally rich, authentic and sustainable destination with a specialised offer, as a country for active, relaxing holidays and a destination using modern information

services for marketing and selling its tourism products and services (Republic of Slovenia, Ministry of the Economy, 2006). Tourism in Slovenia, to a large extent, still represents unexploited possibilities in terms of its economic and social development, visibility and recognisability in the world. In terms of relative volume of tourist capacities and number of tourism operators in Slovenia, as well as tourism traffic and employment in tourism (in view of Slovenia's natural attractions), Slovenia still lags behind other comparable countries and regions in Europe (Slovenian tourist board, 2007).

Slovenian tourism development strategy 2012-2016 identified obstacles in achieving greater competitiveness of Slovenian tourism. There are limited funds for the development and marketing of Slovenian tourism in terms of its importance for the economy. Accessibility of Slovenia is one of the main obstacles, because of poor direct flight connections with the key markets of Slovenian tourism, poor and outdated railway infrastructure, poor road connections from motorways to some most important tourism centres, visitor unfriendly vignette (toll collection) system etc. There are also problems with promotion, because of Slovenia's poor recognisability on target markets and inconsistent use of the national brand "I feel Slovenia" in promotional activities on foreign markets. Tourism offer is lacking competitive tourism products and their added value is too low. Some of the problems are also non-cooperation of tourism providers and unconnected tourism offer, poorly integrated gaming into tourism offer, unsatisfactory situation and insufficient action in the field of green or sustainable development in tourism and other sectors etc. There is lack of quality, qualified and motivated human resources in hospitality and tourism industries along with rigid labour legislation. Business environment is discouraging for capital investments, inadequate that poorly encourages innovations and competitiveness, accompanied by inefficient inter-ministerial coordination to promote tourism development. At last, there are some legislation obstacles, such as inconsistent implementation of the Gaming Act to ensure the earmarked use of funds from special games of chance concession fees and failure of ministerial regulations relevant for tourism to adequately take into account interests and needs of this area (Republic of Slovenia, Ministry of economic development and technology, 2012).

There are three different groups of target markets (Slovenian tourist board, 2007):

- primary markets: Italy, Austria, Germany, Croatia and Slovenia;
- prospective markets: Great Britain and Ireland, the Benelux countries, Hungary, Russia, the USA and Canada, Switzerland, France, Spain, Scandinavia, Ukraine, Israel, Greece, Poland, Czech Republic, Slovakia, Serbia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria and Romania;
- new markets: China, Japan, Australia and other overseas markets, the Middle East, India, Turkey, etc.

The fact is that the majority of tourist trade takes place during the summer months, primarily at tourist destinations offering sun and sea. Slovenia can't compete with these destinations and consequently, Slovene tourism should be designed to create motives for the arrival of tourists out of high season. Deseasonalisation (annual and weekly) would also contribute to a stable and sustainable development of destinations and to a higher quality of services, a better annual utilisation of tourist capacities, improved working conditions, a better attitude of the local population towards tourism, etc. (Republic of Slovenia, Ministry of the Economy, 2006).

Regarding seasonality, exact data on the extent to which hotels in Slovenia close down during low season is not available (estimation ca. 50%). Accommodation facilities are generally not closed in the tourism areas, spas and cities. Usually, facilities of better quality are operating during the whole year, offering also discount prices. Private accommodation is largely closed down during off-season. The majority of the tourism services on the supply side operate around the year, but increase the scale of operations during high season (i.e. engage more short term employees). On the supply side, sufficient offer exists to receive social tourism during the low season. Tourism sector is seen as an opportunity for business. Unemployment is stimulating individuals to become private service providers and to maintain them during the whole year. On the demand side, it is important for all four target groups that the cost of holiday is kept on a low level. If cheap and interesting offers existed, some of them would also go on holiday off peak season (e.g. senior citizens) (Švigelj & Cvetek, 2010).

One of the trends in the development of social tourism is international exchange. At present, there are no important examples of international exchanges in Slovenia. However, two experiences were identified. International exchange is provided by Slovenian Trade Unions. They enable their members to take holidays in Croatia and to Croatian Trade Unions members to come to Slovenia. They stay in Trade Union's own accommodation facilities for which they pay a discount price (price is subsidized by Trade Unions) (Švigelj & Cvetek, 2010). Another example of international exchange is international youth exchange programme called Platform Network for European Youth Activities that includes camps, workshops and exchanges organised in each member of the European Network (24 countries included). The Platform is working all over Europe, members are institutions or organizations within the youth sector that represent a country, a region or a local community. Activities are mainly targeted to young people aged between 15 and 25 (Švigelj & Cvetek, 2010; Platform Network for European Youth Activities, 2015).

2.1.2 Feasibility of social tourism

Social tourism in Slovenia is definitely feasible. Slovenia considers itself as a tourism destination, with tourism as an important economic segment. Slovenia has many and varied natural options for tourism (sea, mountains, spa, caves, rivers, national park, winter sports

facilities, hiking paths, etc.), which are being constantly improved. All main stakeholders, including Directorate for tourism as leading stakeholder, are of opinion, that Slovenia has good potential and interest to develop social tourism. Furthermore, all main stakeholders on national level as well as stakeholders on local level are very interested in development of social tourism. At the moment the opportunities for social tourism are not recognised by majority of municipalities and it can be assumed that this is due to a negative perception of social tourism, as awareness about it and about its positive effects is very low (Švigelj & Cvetek, 2010).

There are already appropriate accommodation units available, that can be used for international exchanges: Ministry of Public Administration owns and preserves 59 units in Croatia and 29 units in Slovenia. They are also interested to be included in project Calypso. One of the first tasks on the way to develop social tourism in Slovenia would be to develop a strategy of social tourism in Slovenia, distribute responsibilities among national stakeholders and start building local networks. There is a need to develop some new products for target groups and a need to establish, maintain and support the network of service and supply providers in the country as well as on the international level. Financial support to these developments would be necessary and it would be beneficial to learn from good practices of other countries. Also, an institution on national level covering social tourism would be needed (Švigelj & Cvetek, 2010).

To develop and boost European social tourism significantly, a financial and conceptual support from the EU would be necessary. Support and co-financing during the development phase seems available in Slovenia if combined with EU funds. Once initial introduction and development phase is completed on national and on European level, financial support from EU institutions can be reduced to a “maintaining programme and or measures” (as measures of co-financing some costs to institutions and or to exchanges). To implement social tourism in European market would be beneficial for European economy and for participants of target groups in a wide scope of elements. Social tourism (Calypso initiative) has a potential to start building on existing facilities which would in cases have to be also improved and adjusted. Private sector and individuals of the four target groups, would most likely respond to the initiative with co-financing if potentials, conditions, options would be attractive, acceptable, reasonable and beneficial (Švigelj & Cvetek, 2010).

2.2 Structures and players

2.2.1 Ministry of Economic development and Technology

The Ministry’s vision is centred to support further strengthening of international competitiveness of Slovenian companies and on adjustment of Slovenia’s economic

structures to the demands driven by global economy (Švigelj & Cvetek, 2010). The Ministry is presently divided into five directorates covering (Areas of work, 2016):

- entrepreneurship, competitiveness and technology;
- regional development and territorial cooperation;
- internal market;
- wood and furniture industry;
- tourism and internationalisation.

The Directorate for Tourism has been operating as an independent directorate within the Ministry and has two divisions (Areas of work, 2016):

- Tourism development and promotion division: for example its task is preparation of strategic development guidelines in the field of tourism, their coordination at the national, local/regional and entrepreneurial level, and monitoring their implementation. Also, there is drafting of strategic development documents in the field of tourism and their coordination with all potential participants (public, private and civil sector), and monitoring their implementation. Drafting of annual tourism policies is important (with guidelines for one year in advance), as they are a basis for coordination and implementation of adopted measures and activities in the field of encouraging tourism development. Furthermore, its task is monitoring and supervising the implementation of measures and development policy instruments in the field of tourism and catering. It also includes guidance and supervision of the activity of promoting Slovenian tourism in domestic and foreign markets, carried out by a public commercial institution, the Slovenian Tourist Board (established by the Government of the Republic of Slovenia). The division participates in international organisations and groups in the field of tourism, drafts proposals for bilateral agreements in the field of tourism and coordination of their implementation. One of the important tasks is also design, organisation and coordination of the work performed by the Expert Council for Tourism. There is also cooperation and inter-ministerial coordination within the Ministry, and with other ministries and other partners in the field of tourism and catering. Finally, its task is also preparation and coordination of implementation of research and development tasks and assignments, connected to preparation and coordination of the production of analyses, reports, information and other material in the field of tourism and catering.
- Division for investment policy and business environment development: its task is drafting and implementation of laws and implementing regulations in the field of tourism and catering and also other ministries relating to it. It offers professional assistance and cooperation with administrative units in implementing regulations and manages administrative procedures in the field of tourism and catering. It also guides and participates in the development of a favourable business environment for the

development of tourism and catering (e.g. providing appropriate systemic conditions). Furthermore, there is cooperation and inter-ministerial coordination within the Ministry, with other ministries and other partners in the field of tourism and catering. It also participates in drafting the budget and financial statement of the budget for items relating to the Directorate for Tourism. Some of its tasks are also formulating, participating and implementing cohesion policy (structural funds – ERDF, INTERREG, etc.) in the field of tourism; encouraging investment in tourism infrastructure in a broad sense (public and private tourism, sports, youth, cultural and other touristically relevant infrastructure) and participation in programme and projects councils. At last, there is preparation and coordination of the production of analyses, reports, information and other material in the field of investment policy and business environment development.

At present, the Ministry has no specific role related to social tourism, but the Directorate is planning to make a social tourism development strategy which will be a basis for future actions and developments. The Ministry is the main stakeholder on the national level, is involved in Calypso Initiative and very interested to support development of social tourism in Slovenia. One of the first steps is to prepare the already mentioned development strategy (Švigelj & Cvetek, 2010).

2.2.2 Slovenian Tourist Board

Slovenian Tourist Board is a major national tourist organisation responsible for planning and performing the promotion of Slovenia as a tourist destination, linking existing products and programmes of national importance and advancing the progress of new ones, establishment of the integral tourist information infrastructure, executing research and development work. The Slovenian Tourist Board is national umbrella organisation of Slovenian tourism actors and it has a coordinating and networking role between public, private and civil society. It builds upon the relationship of partnership in these areas, which was transmitted to the marketing strategy and built into the whole process of planning, organizing and implementing promotional and marketing activities. It is the marketing, information and analytical tourist centre of the country which uses all the modern methods, approaches, tools and activities of the global marketing of the Slovenian tourist offer. They would like to position Slovenia as a clearly and easily recognisable tourist country with precisely determined comparative and competitive advantages which will definitely contribute to the marketing of the Slovenian tourist offer. At present, they have no activities (role, projects) in social tourism, but they are interested in participating in the development of social tourism (About Slovenian tourist board, 2016; Švigelj & Cvetek, 2010).

The Tourism and Commercial Promotion Centre (hereinafter: TCPC) was officially established on October 1st 1983. The Decree on the founding of the public commercial

institute of the Slovenia Tourism Promotion Centre (hereinafter: STPC) then replaced the TCPC with the new STPC. The founders were the Republic of Slovenia, i.e. the Government, and the Slovenian Chamber of Commerce. Through a decree amending the earlier decree founding the public commercial institute, the Slovenia Tourism Promotion Centre changed its English name to Slovenian Tourist Board, and the Government remained the sole founder. At the end of 1999 the Decree transforming the public commercial institute STPC signalled the transformation of STPC into the public commercial institute of the Slovenian Tourist Board (slo. *Slovenska nacionalna turistična organizacija*), and this decree was followed by another amendment with certain adjustments, leaving the current Slovenian Tourist Board title (slo. *Slovenska turistična organizacija*). Slovenian Tourist Board was operating within SPIRIT, public agency from the beginning of 2013 till the end of July 2015. Since the August 1st 2015 Slovenian Tourist Board has continued with operations in the field of tourism on its own once again (About Slovenian tourist board, 2016).

2.2.3 Office of the Republic of Slovenia for Youth (Ministry of Education and Sport)

The Office is a public authority and an independent body within the Ministry of education and sport since 1991, responsible for the field of youth and realisation of the public interest in the youth sector at the national level. It prepares regulations and measures for the youth sector, promotes non-formal learning processes to increase competences of youth in their transition from childhood to adulthood. It develops suitable mechanisms for supporting youth organisations and organisations for youth which are of key importance for promoting active youth participation (Office of the Republic of Slovenia for youth, 2016).

The responsibilities of the Office relate to (Švigelj & Cvetek, 2010):

- the planning, organisation and implementation of measures in the area of the youth policy;
- activities in the area of social policy for children and young people, education and informal education, leisure activities, culture, public information and international cooperation;
- the formulation and supervision of the implementation of the priority youth programmes;
- the monitoring of the role and position of young people in society;
- improving the conditions for organised youth activities and youth organisations;
- stimulating the mobility of young people;
- support for international exchanges and the subsidising of trips for children and young people;
- encouraging various interest activities of young people and the creation of conditions for the inclusion of young people in social processes.

The Office takes care of development and expansion of youth hostels network in Slovenia, of developing new incentives for improved promotion of youth tourism and mobility. In the period 2010-2013, they were involved in a project to improve youth tourism infrastructure, which was co-funded by European Cohesion Fund (Švigelj & Cvetek, 2010).

2.2.4 Ministry of Labour, Family, Social Affairs and Equal opportunities

The Ministry of Labour, Family, Social Affairs and Equal opportunities is the ministry responsible for, among others, social and family affairs, as well as development of measures and assurance of social transfers (Švigelj & Cvetek, 2010). Regarding the target groups of social tourism, the Ministry has the following responsibilities (Disabled, war veterans, victims of war, 2016; Family, 2016):

- The directorate for disabled deals with the position of disabled people, their integration into society, training and employment, and participation in employment programmes. The tasks of the directorate are geared towards development issues of care, training and employment, and other rights of people with disabilities, as well as status and other organisational issues in the area of disabilities.
- Family affairs directorate covers responsibility for the formation and implementation of that part of family policy concerning marital relations, unmarried partners, parents and children, state policy regarding children, adoption, fostering and guardianship, and family incomes: child supplements, compensation for childbirth leave, parental supplement, childcare supplement, and childbirth allowance.

Mechanisms encouraged by the Ministry in the area of social development, can be defined as a policy of social development aiming at promoting equal opportunities and facilitating social participation based on investing in people and assessing all social security systems and measures tailored to the individual. Corrections of different segments of social security and the system itself will be focused on improving the position of socially weakest groups within the framework of general solidarity on the one hand and on setting up the systems of supplementary social security on the other. The development of public services will take account of the necessity for better access to services as well as a balanced regional accessibility, individualisation of services and elimination of monopolies in the provision of public services while ensuring a reasonable organisation. No specific information was received from the Disability directorate about their (possible) role in social tourism, or any current project related to this topic (Švigelj & Cvetek, 2010).

2.2.5 Zveza prijateljev mladine Slovenije

Zveza prijateljev mladine Slovenije (hereinafter: ZPMS; angl. *Slovenian Association of Friends of Youth*) is a voluntary, national association of societies of friends of youth, its

inter-society forms of integration and other non-profit, non-governmental organisations working for the benefit of children, young people and families. ZPMS is a non-governmental, independent, voluntary and non-profit organisation, working in the public interest. It is also a humanitarian organisation working as a general, charitable organisation mostly in the area of social security and aims to (Home, 2017):

- promote and implement the convention on the rights of the child;
- raise the quality of children, youth and family life;
- reduce social exclusion of children, youth and families;
- give opportunities to experience active spare time;
- to motivate individuals and organizations to positive statements about children, youth and families;
- promote voluntary work;
- develop and support cooperation with non-governmental associations in Slovenia and abroad;
- help children and young people to create positive self-image and form positive attitudes and values to life.

The organisation is involved in programs for protection of children's right and various projects such as "Children's parliament, Europe at school, Young researchers – young historians, A week of a child, National telephone helpline TOM, etc.". Most importantly, they organise free time activities and holiday programmes for children from socially disadvantaged families and children with health problems and disabilities. "A wink to the sun" (slo. *Pomežik soncu*) is a national campaign with which they want to assure free holidays for children who come from poor families, some of them see the seaside for the first time. There are also social and humanitarian programmes, aiming to reduce social exclusion of children and families in the territory of the whole Slovenia with different types of material, financial and moral help. They provide free educational assistance for children and also scholarships for those who come from families with financial or health problems. Humanitarian aid runs in different television broadcastings and they raise money and other kinds of help to give the families the opportunity to recover and the children to live a normal life as normal as possible (Projects, 2017).

2.2.6 Šent Slovenian Association for Mental Health

Šent, Slovenian Association for Mental Health, is a non-profit, non-governmental organisation intended for individuals with problems in mental health and those people who find themselves in momentary emotional distress, their relatives, experts in this field and all other people who are interested in mental health. The Association was founded in 1993 and is acting in the public interest in the fields of social welfare, health, education, employment, and in other fields according to the work goals of the Association. It has the

status of humanitarian organization from the Ministry of Labour, Family and Social Affairs on the basis of its humanitarian activities carried out mainly in the field of social welfare (About Šent, 2016).

Very important area of their work is persons with disabilities. They formed and implemented a tourism sign “Disabled friendly”. The brand is designed for tourism organisations, all related to tourism services for persons with disabilities and special needs (Švigelj & Cvetek, 2010). Their programmes and activities aim at psychosocial rehabilitation of people with mental health problems and hard to employ people; improvement of their social situation; creating opportunities for their best possible quality and independent life and strengthening of their capacity to take care of themselves (About Šent, 2016). As social tourism in Slovenia has not been developed yet to a great extent, it is difficult to place Šent as one of the main stakeholders. Nevertheless, they are very interested in gaining an active role in the area and show great interest in a future involvement of Calypso (Švigelj & Cvetek, 2010).

2.2.7 Trade unions

One of existing support systems for family social tourism in Slovenia are trade unions. They enable their members to travel cheaper than usual, by giving them subventions. That means that members do not pay full economic price, but just part of it, half of it or even nothing. Actual payment depends on member/family social and economic status. Trade unions have their own Commissions that decide about subvention. Subventions are funded from the yearly membership fees budget and also enable their members a delayed payment for their holidays. In spa and health resorts entrance tickets for pools are often included in a price for accommodation. In cases, that a member had an accident or is under stress situation, the Trade union pays complete holiday costs for the member family (Sindikalni turizem v Sloveniji, 2015; Švigelj & Cvetek, 2010). Another possibility families have is ATRIS Trade union tourism stock exchange (slo. *borza sindikalnega turizma*) that deals with reservations and other travel related activities (ATRIS d.o.o. Ljubljana, 2017).

2.2.8 Other stakeholders

Other stakeholders in the field of social tourism, who expressed interest in active involvement in social tourism are: Slovene federation of Pensioners, Municipality of Šmarješke Toplice, Municipality of Velenje, Municipality of Brežice, Youth Network MaMa, Marianum Institute Verzej, Verzej Municipality, Youth health and holiday resort Red Cross Slovenia Debeli rtič and Paraplegics Association of Slovenia (Švigelj & Cvetek, 2010).

2.3 Demand drivers

Each of the above mentioned target groups has specific demand drivers. Social and economic status of adults with disabilities in Slovenia is in many cases quite weak, therefore it is rather rare that they go on holidays. They are extremely sensitive to price, which should be as low as possible. One of the constraints can also be accessibility, thus the destination should be accessible for any disability. Most suitable accommodations are hotels (4 and 5 stars), because they have suitable infrastructure. Also, cruises (Mediterranean Sea) are becoming very popular. All equipment should be adjusted to their needs (e.g. access to building, room equipment – especially bathroom, marks for blind and visually impaired, elevators, etc.). Socialising, sightseeing and activities in pools are some of the most important activities they seek (Švigelj & Cvetek, 2010).

For families facing difficult circumstances in Slovenia, the main constraint is a weak social and economic status, as monthly revenue does not allow holidays and they are very sensitive to the price. They prefer seaside destinations in Slovenia (e.g. Koper, Piran, Izola, Portorož) and Croatia (e.g. Barbariga, Novi Grad, Umag, Porec, Baška). Regarding types of accommodation, they prefer private apartments, so they can cook for themselves and save some money, and health resorts and spas. Some important activities they seek are walking, swimming, sunbathing, dancing and sport activities. Out of specific equipment, only playground for children is needed. They prefer to go on holiday in the summer (end of June, July, August, and September) due to children's holidays and collective leave at work, but they are also open to go on holidays in other periods (Švigelj & Cvetek, 2010). For example in the UK, the first trend of domestic leisure tourism is the growing practice of turning visiting friends or relatives trips into leisure ones. One driver of this trend in recent years has been economic. With more constrained budgets, consumers wishing to maximise their leisure time have sought to capitalise on family occasions and turn these trips into leisure orientated ones. But other drivers exist as well, and ensure that this trend will become increasingly prominent even after economic recovery. One is the fundamental appeal of leisure time, and another is the changing demographic picture (e.g. longer lives and more generations create more family occasions) (Visit England, 2013).

Over 80% of young people in Slovenia do travel, but they have few constraints: they can mostly travel only during school holidays (July, August and September) and they have a limited budget, which depends on how much money they earn with student work. They like places where they can meet new people and see new cultures (e.g. exotic destinations such as Thailand, Mexico, China, India, Sri Lanka etc.). When choosing destination, fun and adventure are important factors. In Europe popular destinations are Croatia, Greece (Corfu, Ios), Spain, Bratislava, Italy etc. In Slovenia, Mariborsko Pohorje tries to be a youth friendly tourist destination. Young people highly prefer inexpensive accommodations (e.g. hostels, camps) and are very sensitive on what they pay for and what they really get. Price

is an important factor, mainly because some of the budget is for other activities than accommodation. They also always try to find transport as cheap as possible. Their most important source of information are friends and acquaintances recommendations. Most important activities for them are sightseeing, exploring, fun activities, dancing, sports, meeting new people, nature, culinary, education, etc. (Švigelj & Cvetek, 2010). In terms of destination types, rural and urban tourism have both experienced strong growth in recent years, with new activities and experiences attracting domestic visitors. Regeneration in many cities and an increase in the number of attractions has propelled the growth of urban tourism. On the other hand, younger people with less knowledge or experience of rural areas may not understand the opportunities that the countryside offers and may fail to be attracted to rural locations (Visit England, 2013).

Social and economic status of Slovenian seniors in average is not very good, which is the reason why this target segment does not travel or make holidays abroad a lot. There are no specific destinations, but it is important that climate is not too harsh (not too cold and not too hot), also the transportation should not be too long. Most suitable accommodations are hotels with at least three stars, apartments and other private accommodations (tourist farms, private rooms, etc.). They prefer health resorts and spas, usually requiring elevators in accommodation unit. Regarding activities, sightseeing, walking (Nordic walking), health programs, sports (water gym, bowling, swimming), social games and visiting tourism attractions, are very important. Sensitivity to price is very high. Most pensioners go on trips in the 3rd quarter (July, August and September), while on the other hand spa and health resorts are not influenced much by seasonality. They are also willing to go on holiday off-season (Švigelj & Cvetek, 2010). It is important to note, that health tourism, such as spa breaks for example, will not only be driven by a generation of health conscious older people but also by rising perceptions of time pressure and blurring distinctions between work and leisure. Skills tourism will be driven both by wider leisure portfolios and also the desire for new experiences. In England, 56% say that “trying new things” is important to them, and 67% say that art or culture is important to them. Similar trends in health consciousness and a desire for new experiences will also lead to the growth of active tourism. Demographic trends are also relevant here. The next generation of retired consumers are “younger” and more active than before, making them a viable market for this type of holiday (Visit England, 2013).

2.4 Social tourism for families

The main focus of my master's thesis are families in Slovenia that are facing difficulties due to low income or are otherwise socially excluded. After conversation with Petra Zega, representative from ZPMS (on May 25th 2015) I learned, that their holidays are in majority organised for children from families facing financial difficulties – by associations with resort facilities. Holidays for families are possible in facilities of Zveza prijateljev mladine (hereinafter: ZPM) Krško, ZPM Ljubljana Moste Polje and ZPM Maribor. After

conversation with Božidar Raušl, representative from ZPM Maribor (on May 25th 2015), I discovered that situation for families, in Slovenia is far from ideal. Holidays for young families are not organized, as opposed as just for children. They have two holiday centres (VIRC Poreč and Dom Miloša Zidanška Pohorje), which can be used by families when it is unoccupied, usually around 1st of May and exceptionally at the end of August. During the summer (25.6.-24.8.) they are fully occupied, also between 8.6.-20.6. and 31.8.-11.9. when they organize school in nature – therefore the most attractive terms are not available. They are more focused on groups, families are not specifically targeted. Both centres are suitable for families, but they prefer Poreč, there was no real interest for Pohorje, which could be marketed better. Special funds/subsidies to support young families are not available, there is no donor campaign on this topic, but some companies help in its specific way. Holidays are subsidized only when it comes to sick children or rehabilitation (reason for this is illness or disability, usually a child who needs a parent by his/her side). Families that decide to come are in 60% young families, the reason that they choose their centre is the availability, price, safe location suitable for children and socializing with others. When families come to Poreč, they suggest visits in cooperation with their partners (e.g. boat trip Monvi tours, sightseeing attractions as cave Baredine, Aquapark Istralandija etc.), but generally they regulate free time on their own (centre just offers informative material). Animations for children and workshops are not specifically performed, they also don't provide childcare.

As can be seen, social tourism in Slovenia as a concept and as a system is not developed or in place yet, however the interest for it among various stakeholders is high. Some of them already have facilities and services ready to be used in social tourism. Some important investments would have to be done in terms of promotion of social tourism among stakeholders (e.g. service and supply providers, institutions which can be involved in social tourism and among individuals being considered as potential target group beneficiaries). Analysis data for the target groups is partly accessible, except for the target group "Families facing difficult social circumstances", for which only limited information exists. The target group is not organised or covered by any existing non-governmental organisations (hereinafter: NGO) but it is instead targeted by various measures and by many institutions (Švigelj & Cvetek, 2010).

As previously mentioned there are at least 25% families in Slovenia facing difficult circumstances and hardly participate in tourism due to low income. Less and less families go on holiday, because they have to work more, over 1/3 of families receive less than €800 per month. Their average number of overnight stays is 3-5 nights, they practice domestic tourism, mostly visiting Slovenian coast, because travelling abroad is too expensive. Main reasons for being in this group are: unemployment, short term employment, single-parenting, jobs with low wages. There are some measures provided by NGOs to enable holidays for children from such families. All target groups receive some financial support,

mainly as a social transfer measure, but this is not to co-finance social tourism. Also, all four groups have special interest or needs which would have to be taken into consideration: facilities for disabled, entertainment for children, attractions for senior citizens etc. (Švigelj & Cvetek, 2010). “Poverty and social exclusion of families with children” study says that 46% of them often limit their revenues for holidays, especially families facing financial problems (but about 50% of them still go on holidays) (Inštitut Republike Slovenije za socialno varstvo, 2009).

3 FAMILY HOLIDAYS AS A SOCIAL RIGHT

Richards (1998) noted that tourism as a social right is still a “contested” concept in working cultures around the world. Whilst it may be ingrained in the social democratic welfare regimes of Europe, employment terms and conditions suggest that it is met by rather more resistance in the liberal regimes of Japan and United States of America (hereinafter: USA). Despite these apparent cultural differences, the opportunity to take a regular holiday, whether as an individual or as a family, has certainly been widely asserted in research and by commentators internationally as a universal social right.

The number of people who today benefit from a period of holiday, has grown considerably as a result of the spread of tourism throughout society. Still, there are many groups, which for various reasons have no access to holidays. Lack of funds is the most common factor preventing this right from becoming universal. It is unlikely that the public authorities could or would use public funds to guarantee the right to tourism or holidays. Different countries respond to the issue in a variety of ways: some are more committed for social reasons, while others are less proactive in addressing a situation which prevents holidays from becoming accessible to all. It is important to stress that social tourism can or should in no way be equated with tourism of an inferior quality or type. Quite the contrary, the hallmark of social tourism activities must be the greatest concern for overall quality as regards both facilities and service (European Economic and Social Committee, 2006).

3.1 Development of vacation rights

The growing importance of vacations as an element of consumption and well-being can be gauged from the struggle that developed during the 20th century around the right to paid vacations. In the European case, the development of vacation rights falls into three general periods (Richards, 1999). The initial period leading up to the 1st World War was the era of “vacations as favour,” when the employers decided whether to grant holidays to their workers. In practice this meant that many manual workers had no vacation at all, and only powerful groups of workers, such as the diamond workers in Amsterdam, succeeded in winning some holiday time. Professional workers were more fortunate, having around 1 week of vacation at the beginning of the century. The inter-war period ushered in the era of “vacations as demand” when vacations became part of the increasing social and economic

demands of most groups of workers. By the late 1920s about 40% of collective labour agreements in the Netherlands included some vacation provision, and after considerable labour unrest in 1928 and 1929 vacations were included in 87% of labour agreements. The rising demands from Dutch workers coincided with those of the international movement, and in 1936 the International Labour Organization adopted its first convention on paid holidays. After the 2nd World War, rising prosperity increased the vacation time demands of the workers, and the employers were also more inclined to meet them. In the social consensus following the war, there emerged the idea of “vacations as right and habit.” Legislation began to be passed in a number of European states in the 1950s and 1960s, guaranteeing minimum periods of paid vacation for workers. In the Netherlands, the average holiday entitlement rose from 13 days a year in 1946 to 25 days in 1972. In France the pre-war 12-day minimum vacation allowance was extended in 1956 to 18 days, and in 1969 to 24 days, or 4 weeks (Richards, 1999; Samuel, 1986).

In spite of the economic problems affecting most European countries in the 1980s and 1990s, the vacation entitlement of most people continued to rise. In France annual leave was increased to 30 days, thus making the annual holiday a highlight of “contemporary French social life” (Samuel, 1986). The greater availability of paid vacations had a dramatic impact on vacation participation, pushing summer holiday taking in France up from 30% of the population in 1951 to over 55% in 1992 (Samuel, 1993). However, not all European nations have formalized vacations as an element of social rights. In the UK, for example, vacations have remained a matter for collective or individual negotiation, and there is no legislation in place. As a result, vacation entitlements in the UK are noticeably lower than in most continental European countries (Rathkey, 1990).

The pattern of development in the welfare state systems of Europe contrasts sharply with the situation in more liberal economies in North America and Japan. Having achieved a 40-hour work week in 1940, well ahead of their European counterparts, American workers did not succeed in gaining significant holiday entitlements (Richards, 1999). The post-war divergence between America and Europe can be attributed to the tendency for Americans to invest increases in productivity in increased consumption rather than extension of leisure time (Schor, 1991). There is a striking difference in the area of vacations. Most workers in the United States can expect 2 weeks vacation a year, or less than half the entitlement of workers in Northern Europe (Sunoo, 1996). This difference arguably arose due to relative lack of unionization in the United States (Green & Potepan, 1988).

In Japan, leisure and holiday time has historically been even scarcer than in North America, with the prodigious Japanese capacity for work often being cited as one of the key reasons for the post-war economic success of the country (Pascale & Athos, 1986). This personal desire for more leisure time was supported by government measures, aimed at realizing a better quality of life by reducing the working year from 2,300 to 2,111 hours

in 1988 and to 1,800 hours by 1995 (Anon, 1993). Nevertheless, annual working time in Japan is still some 20% longer than in the EU. It is therefore clear, that considerable structural differences exist between nations and world regions in terms of vacation entitlement (Richards, 1999).

In light of social tourism, 21 EU and candidate countries recently recognised the social and economic benefits of tourism in the Calypso Initiative, which, as previously presented, aims to improve the lives of underprivileged people across Europe by enabling those who cannot usually travel to do so (Sedgley et al., 2012). In other countries, including the UK and USA, Social tourism is a less well-known phenomenon, and rarely publicly funded, since tourism is seen as a discretionary activity, to which no right exists. In these circumstances, any public funding for Social Tourism depends upon utilitarian considerations: whether it can confer net benefits to society as a whole (Minnaert et al., 2009).

3.2 Entitlement (right) or desert (luxury)

Social tourism can be seen as an entitlement or a desert. The entitlement exists without restrictions on those who qualify for it, purely by being part of the disadvantaged, a person can be entitled to public support. On the other hand we have the desert. A person who was made redundant when a company closed down, may be seen to deserve benefits from the government for a limited period, while looking for other employment. This person has fulfilled his/her responsibility to the society by showing willingness and ability to work and by paying taxes while in employment (George, 1999). Furthermore, due to deteriorated economic climate and the increased pressure on welfare budgets, the question of who deserves state help and who does not is becoming more prominent. Virtually no one is considered deserving, even those who do receive social assistance are viewed as temporary recipients who must demonstrate their willingness to work for welfare and who will ultimately be employed as a result of skills and experience gained through workfare and other government subsidised programmes (Chunn & Gavigan 2004).

3.3 Support of international agreements

Various international agreements have been cited for indirect support of this argument, including the right to “rest and leisure” (Hazel, 2005). Universal Declaration on Human Rights 1948 (Article 24) states, that everyone has the right to rest and leisure, including reasonable limitation of working hours and periodic holidays with pay (United Nations, 1948). Furthermore, International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights 1966 (Article 7.d) recognizes the right of everyone to the enjoyment of just and favourable conditions of work which among others ensure: rest, leisure and reasonable limitation of working hours and periodic holidays with pay, as well as remuneration for public holidays (United Nations Human Rights Office of the High Commissioner, 1966).

3.3.1 UNWTO Global Code of Ethics for Tourism

According to EESC, the right to tourism is a keystone of social tourism. Everyone has the right to rest on a daily, weekly and yearly basis, and the right to the leisure time that enables them to develop every aspect of their personality and their social integration. Everyone is entitled to exercise this right to personal development. The right to tourism is a concrete expression of this general right, and social tourism is underpinned by the desire to ensure that it is universally accessible in practice. Therefore, social tourism is not marginal or extraneous to tourism in general, which is a major industry in the world, in Europe as a whole and in various member states in particular. On the contrary, it is a way of putting into practice this universal right to participate in tourism, to travel, to get to know other regions and countries – the very foundation of tourism. This right is enshrined in Article 7 of the Global Code of Ethics for Tourism approved by the World Tourism Organization in Santiago de Chile on October 1st 1999 and adopted by the United Nations on December 21st 2001 (European Economic and Social Committee, 2006).

The World Tourism Organisation is a United Nations recognised agency (hereinafter: UNWTO), clear in its Global Code of Ethics for Tourism, that “the universal right to tourism must be regarded as the corollary” of this wider right to leisure. The UNWTO Code went further by explicitly stating that family tourism, along with other need groups, should become a particular focus, and that: social tourism, and in particular associative tourism, which facilitates widespread access to leisure, travel and holidays, should be developed with the support of the public authorities (World Tourism Organization UNWTO, 1999; Hazel, 2005). The UNWTO Code follows similar statements in its earlier Manila Declaration on sustainable tourism (1980). As both sets of agreements are accepted by the WTO’s 141 member states from across the globe, it gives us a good idea of the consensus of international support for holidays as a social right. Slovenia has been a member of UNWTO since 1993 (World Tourism Organization UNWTO, 2016; Hazel, 2005).

4 RESULTS OF NON-PARTICIPATION IN TOURISM

4.1 Parents under stress as a result of non-participation

There has been a large body of work demonstrating that stress factors at the family and household level increase the risk of parenting difficulties and parenting breakdown. Two of the most important and frequently mentioned in the literature are poverty and family structure (Ghate & Hazel, 2002). Poverty and its correlates (such as unemployment, low income, and poor housing, etc.) have long been known to be associated with higher rates of child maltreatment, particularly those forms involving physical violence and physical neglect (Cawson, Wattam, Brooker, & Kelly, 2000; Dietz 2000; Ghate & Hazel, 2002). In addition, numerous studies have demonstrated the deleterious effects of poverty and social

disadvantage on parenting skills and parent-child relationships more generally (McLeod & Shanahan 1993; Conger, Ge, Elder, Lorenz, & Simons, 1994; Ghate & Hazel, 2002). Poor parents are overrepresented in the case loads of agencies charged with responding to parenting problems, as well as among those who self-report problems within the general population (Pelton, 1981; Roberts et al. 1995). As well as among these are psychological stress that results from doing daily battle with tight budgets, debt, inadequate or overcrowded accommodation, long-term unemployment and so on (Pelton, 1978). This is thought to affect adversely individuals' emotional and mental health, leading to impaired relationships between family members (Conger et al., 1994).

4.1.1 Financial stressors

Ghate and Hazel (2002) discovered in their study on parenting in poor environments, that it is difficult to overstate the importance of financial difficulties as a source of stress in the daily lives of families in poor environments. The constant effort of managing money and making ends meet creates a sense of stress and strain for parents that permeates family life and can come to characterise the atmosphere at home. One of the main reasons for this sense of anxiety is household income, too low to cover family commitments. There is the necessity of having to juggle finances while living in a constant state of debt. Parents explained that on a low income, it was impossible to cope with periods of high expenditure such as Christmas and school holidays, without incurring debts. Even for those parents who did manage to keep on top of repayments, the regular cycle of these high cost periods meant that they were continuously faced with the pressure of catching up with "never-never" payments. Parents who weren't managing repayments described how having to handle creditors added to the stress of trying to bring up a family.

4.1.2 Housing of families in poor environments

Strongly related to low income, another major material stressor that emerged from the study was the poor quality of housing of families in poor environments. Many houses were cramped, uncomfortable and dilapidated, but respondents could not afford to move. Problems with accommodation are a major stress factor for families trying to cope in poor environments. Parents emphasised the anxiety they felt at having to struggle with problems in a place where they just wanted to feel at home. Parents rarely presented a wish-list of luxury, but just referred to the need for basic amenities to keep their children healthy (Ghate & Hazel, 2002).

4.1.3 Family structure

Being a lone parent can be considered a risk factor for parents in many senses, in particular because lone parenting tends to be associated with lower household income, greater financial strain, and all that goes with it (Bradshaw & Millar 1991). Nevertheless, material disadvantage is not the only source of stress for lone parents. Many experience higher rates

of other difficulties at the individual level, such as emotional and mental health problems, or difficulties in managing their children. However, while not having a partner could be stressful, many of those with partners reported that their relationship was a source of problems. The ones married or living as married said that lack support from their partner caused them stress to some extent. In addition, the particular problems for parenting were faced by those in an abusive relationship. Parents argued that trying to cope with parenting while in a violent relationship was in many ways more stressful than having no partner at all (Ghate & Hazel, 2002).

4.1.4 Social support to parents in poor environments

The research suggests that social support in particular, can act as a directly protective factor by actively providing help or support at moments of particular need and as an indirect factor by bolstering parents' self-esteem and sense of efficacy (Vaux, 1988). Another way of describing these multiple effects has been to talk of support as being both stress buffering, by providing instrumental and emotional assistance at times of need, and stress preventive, by enhancing the overall healthy functioning of the individual so that problems with stress do not arise so easily (Thompson, 1995; Barrera 1986; Cohen & Wills, 1985; Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). Thompson's (1995) definition emphasises that social support has two dimensions (practical or instrumental, and emotional), and also reminds us that whatever the type, relationships between individuals lie at the heart of support.

4.1.4.1 Informal support

Informal support is support arising out of a person's own network of family and friends. The findings of the study in relation to informal support show that in terms of extensivity of support (numbers of supporters available within the network and frequency of contact) most parents in the sample appeared relatively well supported. Overall, only a small minority of parents had no one they could turn to, and most had supporters within the immediate local area with whom they had frequent face-to-face or telephone contact. Moreover, most reported close-knit and warm relationships were with their most important supporters, in which family members and women played the key roles. Secondly, and arguably more important, although parents reported extensive support networks, they did not necessarily seem able or willing to draw on them in relation to real-life parenting situations. Some parents simply do not perceive themselves as requiring help with parenting (Ghate & Hazel, 2002).

As Cohen and Wills (1985) observed long ago, a large personal network is not necessary to social support, although network size is certainly an important dimension. Thompson (1995) pointed out, that network size is a rather insensitive measure of the supportive features of social networks. Supporting that findings Ghate and Hazel (2002) furthermore

note, that in the case of single mothers, research has shown that they have smaller personal networks but can nevertheless rely on those supporters they do have, for more in the way of tangible aid and emotional support.

4.1.4.2 Semi-formal support

Semi-formal support are organised forms of help and support for families and children, that parents might receive from community groups or from neighbourhood-based services. These support services are frequently provided by the voluntary sector, and are sometimes staffed by volunteers as well as paid staff. Semi-formal support services may be thought of as complementary to informal support. These services potentially give parents and children access to a wider social network, to resources and facilities not available at the individual family level, and to specialist advice or assistance that may be beyond the capacity of friends and family to supply. Examples include services for families with pre-school children as well as older children, but are weighted towards younger children as this is the age group more generally catered to by services in this sector (Ghate & Hazel, 2002).

Research showed, that in general, awareness and use of semi-formal services was relatively low among parents in poor environments. However, for those parents who do use them, these services fulfil an important role. Not only do they relieve the social isolation of both children and parents but they allow families on low incomes access to toys and equipment that they might otherwise not be able to afford. Nevertheless, substantial numbers of parents with problems, who might benefit from these services, are not using them. Benefits of semi-formal services include meeting and making contact with other local parents. It seems likely that semi-formal support services may provide a way for parents to enhance their social networks which may in time come to function as a source of informal support (Ghate & Hazel, 2002).

4.1.4.3 Formal support

Formal support services are services provided by the statutory sector alone or in partnership with the voluntary sector, often provided by large organisations, and in general accessed by a referral system. Services can be divided into universal services (e.g. health services such as health visiting and ante-natal classes) and targeted services for families in need or at risk (e.g. social services, referral-based family centres, child psychology services, speech therapy). Research showed relatively high level of awareness and use of both universal and targeted formal support services. Levels of use, although higher than for semi-formal services, were not especially high. Overall, parents were largely positive about the quality of services and valued practical assistance from understanding staff that respected them as adults by listening to their concerns and addressed their self-defined needs directly. However, although there were signs that services are reaching those in the greatest need, some groups appear particularly badly served: ethnic minority parents and

families with older children in particular are unlikely to have used formal services recently (Ghate & Hazel, 2002).

4.2 Social deprivation, social ills and social exclusion

The benefits of holiday taking for families with children are so striking, that non-participation can exacerbate feelings of disadvantage (Richards, 1998), thereby increasing social deprivation, social ills and social exclusion (Quinn & Stacey, 2010). Certainly, literature has highlighted the risk of holiday non-participation leading to the feeling of deprivation and social exclusion in young people and others (Hazel, 2005). Sedgley et al. (2012) highlighted the role of tourism participation in social inclusion: their study of London families living in poverty revealed that exclusion from tourism makes a clear contribution to their children's exclusion from everyday norms, as holidays are regarded as part of contemporary British family life. Studies like this emphasize how the benefits of social tourism extend beyond the immediate holiday experience and into participants' daily lives.

4.2.1 Missing out

Non-participation in holidays therefore results in missing out. Despite the parents' resourcefulness in finding activities for their children over the summer break, they feel that there is no compensation for not having a holiday away from home. Many of the parents expressed guilt that their children are missing out on opportunities to create happy childhood memories. Several think that a sense of excitement and novelty is missing from their activities, especially as most of the attractions have been visited in previous school holidays or as school trips. Mothers are aware, that their children compare their experiences negatively with those of children in more affluent families. Children's awareness of their limited opportunities is concerning, particularly as children, even from a young age, can be highly aware of their own poverty in a way which can negatively impact on their attitudes and behaviour, even leading to lower expectations of life (Field, 2010). Holidays provide for parents to connect with their children, and this opportunity for the parents to spend "quality time" with their children is clearly valued. In these circumstances, both the adult's and child's well being is enhanced, allowing parental relationships to develop in a less stressful and pressurised environment. This is important to the quality of children's relationships within the family, which are claimed to have a greater influence on future achievement than innate ability, schooling and even material circumstances (Allen, 2011).

The previously mentioned study of London families also revealed, that many of the families have not had a holiday away from home for many years, often simply because they cannot afford one, it is too expensive. There are also cases, when a parent who had previously saved up for a holiday is reluctant to repeat the experience because of the pressure this major investment placed on finances for the remainder of the summer

holidays. Not only expensive holidays away from home, it is also very clear that staying at home during the summer holidays is not necessarily cheap. Many of the mothers talk of the increased financial expenditure associated with higher energy and food bills and the costs of keeping their children entertained. Nevertheless, the study revealed that parents find resourceful ways to provide activities for their children, for example considerable use of free resources such as local parks, museums and local libraries (Sedgley et al., 2012).

4.2.2 Social exclusion

The apparent democratisation of travel with the majority participating means that those who are unable to go on holiday may feel that they are missing out on an important aspect of their quality of life (Richards, 1998). It is not difficult to imagine how families might feel excluded when one considers, for instance, the prominence of holidays in popular culture, including dedicated channels on digital television (e.g. The Travel Channel, Thomas Cook TV, etc.), and prime-time programmes on terrestrial television (e.g. *Wish You Were Here*, *The Holiday Programme*, *Ibiza Uncovered*, *Club Reps*, etc.) (Hazel, 2005). This was supported by Lewis (2001), who found that young people in care were aware of their social exclusion and felt that they were missing out on holidays that other children were able to experience. The idea that families not going on holiday could be considered socially excluded is also given some weight by public surveys, which have consistently identified that “a holiday at least once a year” is considered a “necessity” by the majority of people in Britain (English Tourist Board, 1976). A survey of low income workers in the mid-1970s, for instance, found that an annual holiday was considered more important than central heating (English Tourist Board, 1974).

Ghate and Hazel (2002) illustrate in their study on parenting in poor environments, how financial strain may interlock with family conflict. Parents reported forms of harassment or stress from within the family, because of low income. For example, parents felt pressure to buy children expensive, designer fashion goods for school or leisure. While expensive, branded clothes for children and teenagers may not seem like a vital necessity to some, it is clear that, in poor environments, failure to supply these for children has very real implications both for the children’s social relationships and for family harmony. Many respondents described the strain of knowing that children were being bullied by peers because they didn’t wear the right clothes, and felt frustration at not being able to do anything to change this. In conclusion, they described a situation of social exclusion for children because of these visible signs of poverty.

5 POSITIVE IMPACTS OF SOCIAL TOURISM FOR FAMILIES

5.1 Family holiday as a source of well being

Children living in poverty have the same social and cultural expectations as other children and are driven by the same social imperatives. They want and need to “fit in and join in with other children” (Ridge, 2009). Moreover, the impact of such social exclusion is keenly felt by families with children when they cannot afford holidays which are widely recognised to enhance quality of life and well-being (Sedgley et al., 2012). The Family Holiday Association (2009), which provides holidays for disadvantaged families, lists many benefits of taking a holiday including: improved well-being, self-esteem and confidence; reduced stress; strengthened family communication and bonding; the opportunity to develop new skills and widen perspectives thereby enhancing employability; and providing family narratives and treasured memories. Social tourism also helps developing independence. Holidays often help those who are usually dependent develop their independence in a safer environment (English Tourist Board, 1976), many also associate it with higher self-esteem (Lewis, 2001).

5.1.1 Relief and renewal

As we can see, there are many diverse benefits that social tourism has for families. Holidays bring relief and renewal, provide a break from routine, ensuring relief from a stressful or mundane situation in order to rest, reflect and rebuild emotional strength (Hazel, 2005; English Tourist Board, 1976). Studies have also suggested that holidays can sustain higher functioning upon return to an individual’s normal stressful environments. Examples of this are Evaluation of the Benefits of Recreational Holidays for Young People in Public Care (Lewis, 2001) and Case of vacation therapy for people with mental illness (presented below) (Amundson, Dyer, Henderson, & Rathbone-McCuan, 1991).

As a result of the deinstitutionalization movement, persons with long-term mental illness have received increasing attention and are a growing part of the service population in many mental health agencies and psychiatric hospitals. A Case of vacation therapy for people with mental illness is an interesting therapeutic program developed at the Colmery-O’Neil Veteran’s Administration Medical Center in Topeka, Kansas, USA. Their clients are both stigmatized by the diagnosis of the illness and restricted by a lack of tolerance for unusual behaviours in the larger society. The stigmatization surrounding severe mental illness also creates expected norms of behaviour that differ from the rest of the population’s in ways that severely restrict the possibility for development of normal and satisfying behaviours. Travelling the way a “normal person” is allowed to travel, gives people with severe and persistent mental illness an experience of normality which can itself be highly therapeutic (Amundson et al., 1991)

There are many gains of such a program, and some parallels can be drawn with positive impacts of social tourism for families. For the disabled veteran to be able to face the fears of travelling through planning and mutual support, gives him a model for handling other fears and anxieties. The travellers were also able to experience self-determined action, which is not easily accomplished since many of their behaviours are controlled by therapeutic regimens. The experience of deciding upon a destination, participating in planning the trip, and then receiving the enjoyment of travel created an experience. There is improved self-esteem among the travellers, who had at least a brief opportunity to choose among possibilities and accomplish a desired goal. Another valuable benefit of the program is that the travellers form helping relationships that carry over into their behaviour at home. These relationships encourage them to develop self-esteem as they are able to move out of the role of helpee to helper. They also noticed increased social skills among the travellers who have returned for trips for several years, as they were able to reach beyond their isolation and become involved with others during the trips. Another marked benefit of the program in a few situations, has been the development of hobbies. One striking example is of one traveller who decided to buy a camera and pursue amateur photography because he wanted to take pictures on the trip and then continued this hobby at home. We can see that this “normalizing” experience generated a positive effect. Also, the experience of a vacation from current living routines enabled patients to sustain higher functioning upon return to their home community (Amundson et al., 1991).

5.1.2 Health and mental health benefits

Although acknowledging the limited medical evidence, commentators have consistently asserted the health, and in particular mental health, benefits of holidays (English Tourist Board, 1976). A survey of 310 doctors found that 89% thought, that holidays could reduce stress-related illnesses (English Tourism Council, 2000). Isolated studies and clinical trials have indicated that holidays may be good for physical health (e.g. lowering the risk of heart disease) (Gump & Matthews, 2000), and there is some evidence that summer camps have positive psychological effects on children suffering physical illnesses such as cancer (Balen, Fielding, & Lewis, 1996; Winfree, Williams, & Powell, 2002).

Summer camps for children are an accepted part of the social fabric of American life. Some of these camps have been established to cater for the offspring of parents wealthy enough to afford the fees involved, and others have been founded to provide children who experience poverty and oppression in their daily lives with compensatory and healthy activities (Bradley, 1985; Balen, 1996). During the 1970s and ‘80s more than 60 camps were established in the USA, specifically for paediatric cancer patients, but studies into the impact of these camp experiences on the children involved, seem to have been relatively few and far between (Bluebond-Langner, Perkel, & Goertzel, 1991).

Smith, Gotlieb, Gurwitch and Blotcky (1987) did carry out research using objective scales with mothers, cancer patients and their siblings in order to measure the levels of physical, social and self-engaged activities, engaged in prior to and after the camp. The researchers found that there were maintained increases in physical and social activities and decreases in self-engaged activities amongst the children tested, and an increase in activities outside the family, by mothers. Bluebond-Langner, Perkel, Goertzel, Nelson, and McGeary (1990) subsequently carried out a two-year study on 50 paediatric cancer patients who had attended a camp designed to offer them a “normal” range of activities. Their conclusion was that special camps for children with cancer can contribute to the children’s acquisition and assimilation of information about cancer and its treatment.

When children are able to interact with others like themselves, they are able to realize that they are not alone. Camps can offer children with cancer the opportunity to interact with peers who accept their limitations as well as with others who have or are experiencing similar physical changes. For children with cancer, camps can provide both support and opportunities to be in control of their experiences. By choosing the activities in which they wish to participate, they are able to gain a sense of normalcy. It is important for camps to allow campers these opportunities, since many children and adolescents have come from environments where they have little independence as a result of their many hospitalizations and protective parents. When children and adolescents are given this freedom, they are able to participate in activities that help them master their feelings and gain a greater sense of autonomy. Camps are able to provide benefits to all family members. Camps provide parents with respite assurance that their child is in a safe environment. While children are at camp, they can gain independence from parents, meet friends, develop new skills, and discover new interests by participating in activities that may not have been available at home. Some camps even offer special support programs for parents to attend at the same time as their child. These programs provide opportunities for parents to relax, gain support from other parents, and spend quality time with their child in a fun environment (Winfrey et al., 2002).

5.2 Increase in social capital

5.2.1 Social interaction and inclusion

Holidays have a great impact on social interaction and provide opportunities for mixing socially with new people, with particular supportive (possibly longer term) benefits for parents who are usually housebound, either physically or through family responsibilities (English Tourist Board, 1976). Researchers have stressed, that mixing on holiday with others with similar problems or lifestyles may help normalise an isolating situation, such as suffering a physical or mental illness, as well as increasing social skills and confidence (Amundson et al., 1991; Lewis, 2001). Studies of social tourism in more economically developed countries demonstrate that such holidays provide scope for wider social

interaction, leading to increased social capital and self-confidence and are a chance for parents to create happy memories for their children and to be part of “normal life” (McCabe, 2009).

It could be said, that social tourism also contributes to broadening experiences. Holidays may help self-development by giving people the opportunities for experiences that their day to day life wouldn't normally allow (English Tourist Board, 1976; European Commission, 2001). This includes a range of new activities and different cultures abroad, that can help spark new hobbies and interests or develop new skills (Tarleton, 2002; Lewis, 2001; Amundson et al., 1991). All of the above can in turn helps to raise individuals' self-esteem (Lewis, 2001).

5.2.2 Social integration

Tourism is a powerful driver of social integration, fostering contact with other cultures, places, customs and especially, people. Without travel, holidays and tourism, it would be impossible for people to meet, talk and acknowledge one another as fundamentally equal, yet culturally different. This cultural exchange and enjoyment of leisure time is an important means of personal development, both for tourists and for those who receive them in their local environment. The cultural exchange generated by tourism is especially valuable for young people, enhancing their intellectual development and enriching their view of the world. In the EU's case, social tourism could be effective in helping to build the Citizens' Europe. It is important to stress that the general opinion is that social tourism holidays should not be differentiated from tourist holidays in general, but should help with social integration. General tourist holidays should provide social tourism groups with suitable conditions for enjoying their holiday and not the other way round. This implies that an effort has to be made, not only as regards facilities, but also the type of service and hence the special training that workers in the sector should receive (European Economic and Social Committee, 2006).

5.3 Increase in family capital

Holidays significantly contributed to increases in family capital. Minnaert et al. (2009) study shows an improvement in the family relations of the respondents as one of the clearest outcomes after the return of the respondents from holidays. The great majority of respondents indicated positive behaviour changes, mainly referring to the relationship with the children, the time spent with them and the change in parenting styles. A concern voiced by the majority of the welfare agents, was that parents did not often play or spend time with their children. One month after the holiday, a general improvement in this area was reported, as it positively affected both the children (e.g. doing better at school, being proud and happy to spend time with their parents, being better behaved), and the parents (e.g. feeling less guilty, feeling more positive towards the children, spending quality time

together). This behavioural change was directly linked to the holiday experience by the respondents: after they had spent time together on holiday and had engaged in new activities, this new behaviour pattern was repeated at home. This can also be seen as a form of experiential learning, more on this below. The study also revealed that improvements in the relationships between the adults were less clear, mainly because most interviewees headed single-parent families. In some cases though, the holiday was reported to have had a very positive effect on the relationship between the parents.

5.3.1 Stability of the family

Family capital is based on the stability of the family on the one hand, and the social contacts of the parents on the other hand (Parcel & Dufur, 2001). Holiday can contribute to both. First, a better relationship between the family members can reduce tension, and therefore make family life more agreeable. Improvements in the relationship are for example more frequent family outings, or spending quality time together after the holiday. Increases in family capital are more generally linked to higher educational performance and aspirations, and are also claimed to improve family resilience (Minnaert et al., 2009; Marjoribanks, 1998). Both of these factors can reduce certain characteristics (low education, family break-down). Second, the social contacts of the participants were shown to increase – most clearly where the group holidays were concerned. One of the main benefits participating in group holidays was meeting new people, and often keeping in touch with fellow participants after the holiday. The role of sharing, talking, and coming together is also emphasized as the great benefit of a group holiday. Participants learnt from each other, which would suggest that the group can act as a new community of practice. Moreover, enlarging social networks contributes not only to family capital, but also to the social capital of individual family members (Minnaert et al., 2009).

Leisure travel for families has in many ways become a necessity rather than a luxury (Lehto, Choi, Lin, & MacDermid, 2009). Theories indicate that for a family to function well, “time spent together”, indicating meaningful interaction, is key and shared leisure experiences within the family system have consistently been shown to be valued by participants in many leisure studies (Major, Klein, & Ehrhart, 2002; Gram, 2005; Lehto et al., 2009). Researchers have theorized that shared leisure activities establish and maintain boundaries in the family system, enhance family unity, promote collective interests and enhance communications among family members (Orthner & Mancini, 1991; Shaw & Dawson, 2001).

5.3.2 Cohesion, communication and satisfaction

Leisure experiences also act as new environmental stimuli and introduce fresh input and energy for family system development. A number of empirical studies have investigated the relationship between family leisure activity participation and family functioning

variables such as cohesion, communication and satisfaction. Researchers, for example, have examined the relationship between the level of shared leisure participation of husbands and wives and the extent of communication and task sharing in marriage. In a study of analyzing leisure time of married couples during the parental stage of their life cycle, parents view leisure as one of the means through which the parental role is enacted. Family oriented leisure and recreation activities are believed to encourage togetherness and facilitate intra-family communication and child socializing (Horna, 1993).

Vacation represents an event of sustained and varied interaction. Family vacation travel is much more than getting to a particular destination. It is a multi-dimensional phenomenon that involves planning, anticipation, trip experience and post trip recollection (Fridgen, 1984). Vacation activities provide unique opportunities for interaction among family members, as well as for interaction of the family system with its changing environment. This interaction offers new input, energy, and motivation needed for continued family system development (Orthner & Mancini, 1991). Furthermore, it facilitates the flow of information through the system, creates memorable experiences for archival comparisons, and provides a context for ongoing monitoring of its members' functioning. Overall, family vacation contributes positively to family bonding, communication and solidarity. The findings provide support for the theoretical link between family leisure travel and family functioning. With regard to adaptability, family travel plays a role in facilitating family communication (Lehto et al., 2009).

5.3.3 Strengthening family relationships

Sharing "quality time" on holidays, away from stressful situations, can help bring families together, strengthen family relationships (English Tourist Board, 1976; European Commission, 2001). Parents have reported that a family holiday can nurture relationships with both their partner and children in a way that normal routines and family roles do not allow (Davidson, 1996; Ghate & Hazel, 2002). Similar findings have been found between siblings (Winfree et al., 2002). Likewise, studies have suggested that shared experiences through a holiday together can help bond carers and the people they look after (Amundson et al., 1991; Lewis, 2001).

John R. Kelly and Janice R. Kelly (1994) have discovered that a large percentage of adult leisure activities are learned within the family context. Their study lends strong support to the proposition that the family is the main associational context of leisure learning. On the other hand, the parent-child relationship is not the only one in which leisure plays a part. Many opportunities for bonding between husbands, wives, siblings, and other family members occur during leisure. Orthner and Mancini (1991) propose that companionship during leisure might be a vital component in family stability. West and Merriam (1970) have found that shared outdoor recreation helps sustain and increase family cohesiveness by inducing processes of social interaction within a family. They have argued that families

tend to participate in outdoor activities together more than any other type of activities, because outdoor recreation often provides unique environments which isolate families from their normal social world, thereby intensifying interaction and inducing a strong “we” feeling in the group.

5.4 Aspect of quality of life

The essential role of vacations and travel in human welfare is now recognized by granting legal vacation rights in most countries, the recognition of vacations as a basic human right by the United Nations in 1948, and international declarations on vacation rights and freedom of movement by the World Tourism Organization in 1980 and 1982. Vacation time also makes a very specific contribution to the quality of life through allowing people to pursue a range of interests and by providing the opportunity for social interaction, personal development, and individual identity formation (Richards, 1999). The important role of leisure is also recognized by the World Health Organization, which includes “participation in and opportunity for recreation and pastimes” in their Quality of Life Assessment (De Vries & Van Heck, 1997).

Vacations are an integral feature of modern life for many people in developed nations and represent a possible avenue for individuals to pursue life satisfaction (Rubenstein, 1980). Some researchers define quality of life in terms of life satisfaction. Meeberg (1993) views it as a feeling of overall life satisfaction, as determined by the mentally alert individual whose life is being evaluated, while Rejeski and Mihalko (2001) suggest that quality of life is a conscious cognitive judgment of satisfaction with one’s life. Lee and Sirgy (1995), presented their satisfaction hierarchy model, the premise of which is that overall life satisfaction is functionally related to satisfaction within a number of individual life domains (e.g., personal health, work, family, love, money).

Kelly (1985) notes that tourism (vacations) is recreation on the move, engaging in activity away from home in which travel is at least part of the satisfaction sought. Zabriskie and McCormick (2003) conducted a study, the result of which is the Core and balance model of family leisure functioning. Within this model, core family leisure patterns are depicted by common, everyday, low-cost, relatively accessible, and often home-based activities that many families do frequently. They include activities such as watching television together, playing board games, gardening, and family dinners. Core activities often require little planning and resources and are spontaneous and informal. Balance family leisure activities are more novel experiences, occurring less frequently. They are usually not home-based, and require a greater investment of time, effort, and other resources. Balance patterns include activities such as family vacations, most outdoor recreation such as camping, boating, and fishing, community-based events etc.

Holidays make a huge impact on disadvantaged children's quality of life and well-being which extend beyond the holiday and beyond the children, into the wider family unit (Quinn & Stacey, 2010). Other significant benefits of social tourism include an opportunity to be free from routine and everyday pressures, to escape unsafe home, and for parents living in poor environments to "recharge their batteries" and spend quality time with their family (McCabe, 2009; Ghate & Hazel, 2002).

5.4.1 Recharging batteries

The provision of holidays away from home for children and families has been recognised as a social policy concern across mainland Europe since mid-20th century. The study was made in UK, and found that the family holiday was particularly valued by parents for a number of reasons. In particular, parents felt that both they and their children were able to recharge their batteries by getting a break from the everyday stressors of normal life in poverty. In addition, parents pointed to the family holiday as being a time that they could strengthen family relationships, spending quality time together as a family away from the distractions of everyday problems. Ironically the study also found that the family holiday tended to be the first essential item of family expenditure sacrificed in poverty (Hazel, 2005).

5.4.2 Vacations as a psychological need

Otto and Ritchie (1996) have observed that the dual themes of seeking and escaping appear to be universal in leisure and tourism psychology. The need to escape the pressures or boredom of everyday life is a common theme in leisure and tourism literature. According to Boorstin (1964), the lack of stimulation and excitement in people's everyday life requires the manufacture of pseudo-events or artificial experiences, such as tourist attractions. Other authors have argued that the alienating experiences of modernity are caused by an overdose rather than a shortage of experiences. Scitovsky (1976) therefore states, that the accelerating pace of modern life, together with the increasingly rapid turnover of products, images, and fashions, means an increasingly rapid stream of information, which if not processed efficiently, leads to stress.

Observations have led to increasing concern that tourism experiences may be becoming increasingly superficial, and that the worldly, inquisitive traveller is being replaced by the idle, superficial tourist, leading to calls for more thoughtful modes of travel (Krippendorf, 1989). Some signs are noticeable that tourism is not always as superficial as some have feared. In fact, MacCannell (1976) casts the tourist as a modern pilgrim in search of the meaning and authenticity which is missing from everyday life. Urry (1995) argues that tourism is part of a process of "re-skilling" in everyday life, equipping people with new means to make sense of the rapidly changing modern world. There is also a realization that

tourists are becoming more experienced, and therefore more discriminating about their tourism consumption.

Poon's (1993) introduced the concept of new tourism, which postulates a significant change in tourist motivations, away from the old style tourism, which was based on a mass-produced, standardized product geared to rest and relaxation, toward a new tourism, based on more flexible, more aware, and more active forms of consumption. Some authors argue that tourism is too complex to be explained in terms of a single motivation. Iso-Ahola (1980) argues that individuals seek an optimal level of stimulation, or optimal arousal, between too little stimulation (boredom) and too much stimulation (stress). Modern life is often characterized as providing either too little stimulation or too much, causing people to search for optimal arousal.

According to Richards (1999), therefore vacations can be argued to play a triple role in contributing to quality of life. Vacations can provide physical and mental relaxation; they can provide the space for personal development and the pursuit of personal and social interests; and they can also be used as a form of symbolic consumption to enhance status. Lack of time, money, work and family structures may be major constraints on vacation taking, and those who are unable to take a vacation may feel that they are missing out an important aspect of their "social rights". Bélanger and Jolin (2011) state that the mission of social tourism is to promote access to holidays, leisure and tourism for all, while on the other hand, for example McCabe and Johnson (2013) say that the potential of tourism as a social policy tool has been highlighted, as there is evidence of health and social benefits and wider welfare implications that tourism can bring to disadvantaged individuals. Smith and Hughes (1999) see a holiday as having a special significance for those, who because of their personal economic and social circumstances are rarely able to go on holiday.

5.4.3 Importance of vacations to quality of life

Society assumes that tourism is healthy for people and therefore plays a role in raising an individual's quality of life (Hobson & Dietrich, 1995). Some psychological needs are satisfied through leisure, however, its contribution to life satisfaction depends on the amount of leisure time, the value people attach to leisure and the value people attach to their attainment of travel goals (Tinsley, 1979; Shaw, 1884; Sirgy, 2010). Leisure experiences can affect the emotional, intellectual, spiritual, or physical aspects of an individual's life, and therefore represent one approach to assessing life satisfaction (Gilbert & Abdullah, 2004; Dolnicar, Yanamandram, & Cliff, 2012).

A number of studies investigating the role of vacations in quality of life were conducted in disciplines other than tourism. These studies furthermore demonstrate the potential for vacations to improve people's quality of life. For example, vacations are shown to play a role in improving the lives of people with a disability, increase the intellectual functioning

of women over 65, generate positive attitudes and greater quality of life in hospitalized dialysis patients and improve the quality of life of seniors (Card, Cole, & Humphrey, 2006; Sands, 1981; Roy & Atherson, 1983; Lee & Tideswell, 2005).

5.4.4 Social tourism and subjective well-being

Essentially, subjective well-being (hereinafter: SWB) attempts to understand what makes people happy, contented with life (Diener, 1984). Interest in SWB developed because of the recognised weak links between objective circumstances (wealth etc.) and levels of happiness (Layard, 2006). It is only in recent times that concepts of well-being have been extended beyond objective measures of wealth and material circumstances. There is a need to understand what drives well-being because lower perceptions of well-being have been attributed to depression and anxiety, stress and the need for therapy. On the other hand, high levels are associated with enjoyment of work, happiness and life satisfaction (Steger, Frazier, Kaler, & Oishi, 2006). Individuals judge different aspects of life more importantly than others and so it is also important to understand which domains of life contribute to life satisfaction (McCabe & Johnson, 2013). Well-being is furthermore often described in terms of happiness. Happiness has been recognised as an important goal of society, and there has been an explosion of research undertaken in terms of understanding what makes people happy (Lyubomirsky & Lepper, 1999).

There is an emerging interest in tourism's relationship to well-being across a range of disciplines and contexts (McCabe & Johnson, 2013). Dolnicar et al. (2012) have recently stated that it remains unclear whether vacations, as opposed to leisure time at home, contribute to people's quality of life, to which extent, and whether people differ in the extent to which vacations contribute to their quality of life. Neal, Sirgy and Uysal (2004) measured satisfaction with tourism, positioned within the leisure domain, and satisfaction with various aspects of tourism services were measured before, during and after the trip. This study established a link between satisfaction with tourism services and general life satisfaction for the first time. Sirgy (2010) states that the importance of tourism to quality of life depends on the value attached by people to tourism-related goals. Some people value tourism experiences more highly, and so it is likely that they are likely to prioritise tourism consumption more highly. Also, tourism decisions are goal-driven. The goal-valence principle states that tourism satisfaction will be enhanced when touristic goals are selected, for which attainment is likely to induce high positive affect in various life domains. Tourism experiences may produce positive affect directly in relation to the leisure domain and indirectly in other life domains, such as love life, social life, family life, spiritual and work life.

Related research has measured the effects of longer holidays on health and well-being. One of the studies measured health and well-being levels before, during and after longer vacations. They found that health and well-being levels improved early in the holiday but

returned to base levels rapidly on return to work. Holiday activities and experiences were only weakly associated with improvements in health and well-being. Whereas passive activities, savouring, and pleasure derived from activities, relaxation and control as well as sleep were strongly correlated with health and well-being improvements especially during the holiday, but also somewhat afterwards additionally (De Bloom, Guerts, & Kompier, 2013).

Dann (2001) points out that in a range of contexts, researchers have sought to understand linkages between tourism and quality of life amongst disadvantaged members of society, for example amongst senior citizens, the disabled (Lord & Patterson, 2008), cancer patients (Hunter-Jones, 2004) and others. Dann (2001) furthermore argues, that many of these people are socially disadvantaged and, hence, may regard tourism positively either as a temporary means of alleviating their negative conditions, and/or as a basic human right – thereby also contributing to an amelioration of overall life quality.

Various researchers have sought to highlight for example the transformative social possibilities of tourism (Higgins-Desbiolles, 2006) and the individual and social benefits that can be derived from participation by disadvantaged groups (Minnaert et al., 2009). The benefits of social tourism have also been elaborated in relation to specific groups, such as children with terminal cancer (Hunter-Jones, 2004). Their findings confirm previous research linking the contribution of holidays to quality of life and SWB, and demonstrate a strong link between holidays and leisure, the family and social time (McCabe & Johnson, 2013).

Social tourists differ from mainstream tourists because they are on low incomes and are affected by some specific issues and circumstances that mainstream tourists are far less likely to encounter (McCabe, 2009). McCabe and Johnson (2013) found that there are demonstrable links between holiday taking and improvements in SWB levels amongst social tourists, confirming recent studies that have found that tourism contributes to improvements in quality of life. Their findings suggest that holidays offer more value than simply short-term, hedonic experiences, but can contribute to longer-term broader aspects of life satisfaction and positive functioning. Respondents attributed high levels of impact particularly in relation to happiness and optimism, family life and relationships. However, changes in affect balance and optimism may be short-lived for social tourists whose daily life circumstances remain challenging upon return. This also supports previous findings on limits to changes in affect balance after vacations (Nawijn, Marchand, Veenhoven, & Vingerhoets, 2010), and findings that health and well-being return to previous levels quickly upon return to work after a vacation (De Bloom et al., 2013).

Tourism offers the potential to experience different places and cultures and to broaden horizons, therefore its contribution to positive functioning should be recognised. Amongst

social tourism practitioners, it is recognised that not all disadvantaged people will benefit equally from a holiday due to individual psychological and social circumstances. Also, it is reasonable to assume that holidays are likely to contribute significantly to feelings of well-being, since they represent a key area of contemporary voluntary consumer activity. Holidaymaking is an established aspect of socio-cultural life in which individuals invest a great deal of time and money. Holidays are times where people can enjoy quality time amongst families and friends and times/activities undertaken are often linked to personal growth and fulfilment. Therefore tourism has the potential to link to key aspects that lead to SWB, particularly the developmental aspects of self which contribute to welfare (McCabe & Johnson, 2013).

5.5 Potential form of learning

Tourism can also be seen as a potential form of learning. Ideas from learning theories can be applied to tourist experiences. From the perspective of experiential learning, a holiday can offer the participant the chance to encounter new situations, witness different social interactions, and compare these to his or her own behaviour pattern (Boydell, 1976). A holiday, with its opportunities to explore a new environment and engage in new activities, meet new people and be faced with unexpected problems, can provide the encounters the participants need to start their experiential learning cycle, even if this learning is not intended. This can have two effects. First, the holiday makers can develop or improve their skills: this is known as single-loop learning (e.g. the family learns to use public transport independently). Second, they may go through a deeper level of change, affecting the underlying views and attitudes for that behaviour. This is known as double-loop learning (e.g. successfully mastering the public transport system creates greater self-esteem) (Argyris & Schön, 1978).

On the other hand, situated learning, does not focus on the individual learning in itself, but rather on how the individual learns. Learning is a social activity, and largely rooted in participating in activities with a “community of practice”, who come together to carry out these activities (in school, at work, at home, in leisure activities) (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Communities of practice can be described as entities that solve problems and promote learning via communication amongst their members (Johnson, 2001). Members of low income groups are often not in paid employment, and have restricted social networks, giving limited access to new communities of practice. Holidays can bring contact with new communities of practice, which in turn can lead to increases in social capital and behaviour change (Lesser & Storck, 2001).

6 NEGATIVE IMPACTS OF SOCIAL TOURISM FOR FAMILIES

6.1 Uncertainty and anxiety

The research shows that complete inexperience with holidays, even in adulthood, was not uncommon among the beneficiaries of social tourism. Inexperience and a lack of knowledge can be linked to increased levels of uncertainty in making (travel) decisions (Minnaert, 2014). For example, playing the lottery can be seen as taking a risk. Uncertainty refers to actions with many possible outcomes, of which the parameters and probabilities are unknown – uncertainty entails a limitation of knowledge which makes the outcome of an action impossible to predict. Individuals display different levels of risk tolerance and risk aversion, depending on socio-economic factors, gender, age, culture (Williams & Baláž, 2012). Nonetheless, studies overwhelmingly find that social tourism offers opportunities for escape from the stresses of mundane life, routine variation, new experiences and a fresh sense of perspective on problems (McCabe, 2009).

There is an example, the study of a group of teenage mothers, some with no previous travel experience. The social tourism exchange was prepared by the Tourism participation centre in Flanders and the Family Holiday Association, a social tourism charity in the UK. For the beneficiaries of this exchange project, holidays were often impossible because of financial or child care constraints. Even for those beneficiaries who had travelled before, holidays were no longer seen as an expected part of their lifestyle. From the responses of the young mothers, it became clear that those with no prior tourism experience reported considerable levels of uncertainty. This caused them to feel anxious about the holiday (e.g. about staying in a caravan, safety of their children). For some mothers however, spending time alone with their child was a motivation to go on holiday, and not a source of anxiety. As a result of these concerns, the respondents with no prior tourism experience only agreed to the exchange because it was a group holiday accompanied by known support workers. The group holiday they were planning to go on included activities for mothers only, with qualified support staff looking after the children, so that the mothers would have a moment to relax. Being away from their children was something most mothers were not accustomed to at home, and was a cause of uncertainty and anxiety. The findings indicate that travel experience, and associated levels of uncertainty, play a key role in determining which tourism product may be most suitable for certain groups of social tourism beneficiaries (Minnaert, 2014).

6.2 Social stigma

Alongside the need for clear definition, there are doubts that exist on whether the term “social tourism” itself is appropriate for further promotion of the concept. It was mentioned by Family Holiday Association, that the term is “not the most attractive” and that the idea should perhaps be made more accessible for stakeholders and the public. Others agreed,

citing that there is a need for clarity to avoid stigmatisation of the concept and of those who benefit from it. The last thing we want to do is to label and make people feel unworthy because they have to have assistance to go on holiday. Stigmatisation around social tourism could be avoided by sensible marketing (All Party Parliamentary Group on Social Tourism, 2011). Some participants are conscious that such holidays may attract social stigma – people don't like their friends to know what kind of income they are on, so participating in social tourism automatically announces that you must be on a low income. Nonetheless, they were all thrilled to be approved for the holiday (Minnaert, 2014).

6.3 Return home and negative reflections

Some researchers caution that, contrary to studies that identify pre-holiday anticipation as a wholly positive aspect of the tourism experience (Gilbert & Abdullah, 2002), social tourism trips can be wrought with uncertainty (Minnaert, 2014), whilst the return home from any holiday can generate negative reflections on lives and relationships (Hall & Brown, 2006).

Return home can also lead to so called “Post vacation syndrome” (hereinafter: PVS), sometimes called also Post holiday/vacation blues – at the end of summer the vacation ends, school starts and pressures mount at work. Therapists report an increase in people seeking help in early fall. PVS is characterized by a combination of irritability, anxiety, lack of motivation, difficulty concentrating and feeling of emptiness that lasts up to a few weeks after returning to work, from vacation. Some people get a mild version every Sunday night after getting the weekend off. Several studies have found that vacations do lift peoples' spirits, but the effects don't last long. When on vacation, people have done things they love and it reminds them of what is truly important in their lives, but when the fall comes, they feel like they are losing a part of themselves (Beck, 2011). In some cases return from leave can lead to making a real change in working life (e.g. change of hours, a different job or career change), people are determined to achieve better work-life balance (Whitney, 2006).

6.4 Costs to residents

Perceiving tourism, social tourism and their impact on the side of the residents of the destination is another important view to be considered. Residents' attitudes regarding the impacts of tourism have been a subject of research for more than 30 years (García, Vázquez, & Macías, 2015). Research on tourism in the '60s focused on the positive aspects of the impacts of tourism, in the '70s on the negative aspects and in the '80s had a more balanced focus (Jafari, 1986). Research on the impacts of tourism has reached a consensus on the following groups: economic, socio-cultural and environmental. Most studies have identified these impacts in 2 possible aspects: positive and negative, because residents observed that tourism contributes to both benefits and costs in their tourism zone

(Andereck, Valentine, Knopf, & Vogt, 2005; Gursoy & Rutherford, 2004; García et al., 2015).

6.4.1 Economic impacts

Generally, the economic dimension is the main cause of positive attitudes from the residents. One of the aspects most valued by residents of this impact is the generation of employment opportunities, suggesting that tourism is an important source of income for residents. Residents also benefit from tourism to the extent that it produces greater opportunities to negotiate and, in this way, to create the local business environment. Tourism also leads to a set of improvements in community infrastructure and public facilities that contributes to the improvement of living standards (Andereck et al., 2005; Gursoy, Jurovski, & Uysal, 2002; Saveriades, 2000; Chen, 2000; García et al., 2015).

Generally, economic benefits are an important influence on residents' attitudes towards tourism, due to the fact that according to many residents tourism improves, benefits or increases the local economy (Lindberg & Johnson, 1997; Gursoy et al., 2002; García et al., 2015). One of the exceptions is the Johnson, Snepenger and Akis (1994) study, which found that residents perceived tourism as an industry offering low salaries and low quality jobs. Furthermore, the aspect of tourism least valued by residents is its seasonality (Bestard & Nadal, 2007). On the one hand, tourism creates employment opportunities but, on the other, forces residents to deal with an intra-annual irregularity as to the needs of labour. The trade off is clear: if there is no activity, no compensation, so the tourism workers should find another activity or be unemployed during the months of downtime (Cerezo & Lara de Vicente, 2005; García et al., 2015).

Residents are aware that tourism increases the cost of living, raising the price of goods and services (Johnson et al., 1994). In general, living standards go up, as does inflation and therefore, also property value and housing prices go up, including land value (Bestard & Nadal, 2007; Saveriades, 2000; Akis, Peristianis, & Warner, 1996; Korca, 1996; García et al., 2015).

6.4.2 Socio-cultural impacts

Tourism has an effect on local socio-cultural characteristics, affecting the habits, customs, social life, beliefs and values of the inhabitants of the tourist destination. In this case, interactions take place between local residents and tourists, which may result in new social and cultural opportunities or on the contrary, generate feelings of distress, pressure, congestion, etc., at different moments in the life of residents, threatening their cultural identity and social reality (García et al., 2015). Tourism has a positive influence on the services offered by the community. It creates opportunities for leisure activities, stimulates cultural activities, raises interest in maintaining and preserving historic buildings and

archaeological sites and increases pride and cultural identity that preserves cultural values. Tourism also promotes exchange among local people and tourists (Andereck et al., 2005; Bestard & Nadal, 2007; Gursoy et al., 2002; Korca, 1996; Chen, 2000; Akis et al., 1996).

Residents also perceive some negative aspects in this impact. The most important are traffic congestion and parking problems (Andereck et al., 2005; Bestard & Nadal, 2007; Johnson et al., 1994; Lindberg & Johnson, 1997). From a social viewpoint, residents may recognize that tourism increases delinquency and vandalism, serious crime and theft. It also causes increased drug use, consumption of alcohol and gives rise to prostitution (Haralambopoulos & Pizam, 1996; Andereck et al., 2005; Lindberg & Johnson, 1997; Belisle & Hoy, 1980; Saveriades, 2000; King, Pizam, & Milman, 1993; Liu & Var, 1986). Research studies have produced contradictory results. Some report that residents tend to perceive some socio-cultural aspects negatively, while others maintain that residents see tourism as offering their community diverse benefits. A possible direct relation has been observed between the positive evaluation of socio-cultural impacts and support for tourism. Other studies however suggest that tourism development probably brings benefits to the host community, but also social costs (Andereck et al., 2005; Besculides, Lee, & McCormick, 2002; Gursoy et al., 2002). There is no consensus on this impact and studies suggest that it will, depending on the context and circumstances in which tourism develops, to a greater or lesser extent, impact the socio-cultural aspect (García et al., 2015).

6.4.3 Environmental impacts

Tourism can be a reason to protect and preserve resources or may damage or destroy them as it is often developed in attractive yet fragile settings (García et al., 2015). Local residents identify the duality of the environmental impact in their community: positive and negative (Liu & Var, 1986). Residents value the fact that tourism helps preserve natural resources and it improves the appearance of their city or surroundings (Akis et al., 1996; Andereck et al., 2005; Korca, 1996). However, in some studies, residents recognize that tourism causes pollution, rubbish and especially recognize it provokes overcrowding and congestion, therefore, agglomeration in public facilities and resources (Johnson et al., 1994; Andereck et al., 2005; Brunt & Courtney, 1999; Bestard & Nadal, 2007; Lindberg & Johnson, 1997). Even where residents' concern for the environment is important to the community, it is not significant enough for them to be prepared to lower their living standards (Liu & Var, 1986). It seems that residents prefer to support tourism, putting its advantages ahead of environmental damage (García et al., 2015).

6.4.4 Unsustainability of tourism structures

In reality, infrastructures in tourist destinations and areas cannot always be called sustainable, particularly since tourism has often developed under conditions of short-term profitability, abuse of natural resources and occupation of the best areas – usually coasts

and mountains. Social tourism, which focuses more on the social conditions than the economic aspects, can help to build or rehabilitate tourist destinations while meeting economic, social and environmental sustainability criteria. The way in which the various kinds of social tourism are managed is a key factor in the sustainability of tourist destinations and areas. If sustainability is, essentially, the balance between various aspects of human activity, then social tourism is a sustainable development tool for many less developed countries which see tourism as a source of economic activity that can lift them out of poverty (European Economic and Social Committee, 2006).

7 EXISTING SOCIAL TOURISM PROGRAMMES IN THE EU

7.1 National Holiday Vouchers Agency (France)

There are many practical initiatives in Europe, which may be described as successful. The French National Holiday Vouchers Agency (fr. *Agence Nationale pour les Chèques-Vacances*, hereinafter: ANCV), had a turnover estimated at around EUR 1 billion in 2005. It was set up in 1982 as a public body with industrial and commercial character and it remains a useful social policy tool for tourism. Its objectives are to help the maximum number of people possible to go on holiday, especially those on low incomes; to provide free use through an extensive network of tourism professionals able to respond efficiently to all requests and collaborate in the development of tourism, helping to achieve a more even spread of tourism across the regions. Holiday vouchers are received annually by some 2.5 million people and benefit some 7 million travellers. The ANCV has more than 21,000 affiliated organisations which participate in its financing and some 135,000 tourism and leisure practitioners are involved in providing services. In addition, its programme helps to provide holidays for especially underprivileged groups, groups of disabled people, young people, etc., by means of holiday grants to the tune of EUR 4.5 million. The Agency also invests considerable sums in the modernisation of social tourism amenities (European Economic and Social Committee, 2006).

7.2 IMSERSO social tourism programme (Spain)

The IMSERSO social tourism programme in Spain has similar aims but uses a different approach and instruments. It helps more than 1 million people annually to go on organised trips, in groups, in the low season, and especially older people. The Spanish State invests about EUR 75 million annually in the programme, but through various tax mechanisms, increased revenue from social security contributions and savings on unemployment benefits, the programme brings in some EUR 125 million and is therefore economically highly profitable. The social and economic profitability of the programme is clear as it has enabled broad sections of the elderly population to travel for the first time, to get to know other cities and places, broaden their social relations on an equal footing, improve their physical fitness – and the quality and user satisfaction is reasonable. It is important to

mention the impact of this programme on employment, estimated at about 10,000 workers who would otherwise be unemployed in the low season as the hotels and other establishments and businesses remain open. The programme is constantly expanding and evolving, seeking out new forms of social tourism with greater cultural, health and social value, such as stays in spas, undoubtedly successful, or cultural tours and events (European Economic and Social Committee, 2006).

7.3 Other examples

Besides these two major social tourism programmes in Europe, there are other good examples, limited and targeted at more clearly defined users, but no less valuable because of that. Such is the case of the example analysed at the Barcelona Representative State Platform for Physically Disabled People (sp. *Plataforma Representativa Estatal de Discapacitados Físicos*), which focuses on a very specific group but successfully manages a programme of holidays for this group. Different, but also very interesting is the shared initiative of 3 organisations, 1 from the UK (Family Holiday Association), 1 from Belgium (Dutch *Toerisme Vlaanderen*) and 1 from France (fr. *Vacances Ouvertes*), which coordinate to facilitate “tourism for everyone” in their 3 countries. Social tourism activities can also be found in other European countries, including Portugal, Poland and Hungary, where the trade unions play an important role, and in Italy where the programme is sponsored by the consumer cooperatives. In conclusion, it can be stated that the variety of initiatives, user numbers and diversity are on the increase throughout EU (European Economic and Social Committee, 2006).

7.4 Existing provision of holidays for families in need

7.4.1 The Holiday Participation Centre (Tourism Flanders & Brussels)

A good example of successful practice in Europe is The Holiday Participation Centre, a service of Tourism Flanders & Brussels, founded in May 2001. It targets persons and families in poverty who, for diverse reasons, are unable to take a holiday. This target group is reached via social member organisations. The Holiday Participation Centre is the intersection between supply and demand. On the supply side, we find the tourism sector, which offers social rates for persons who would otherwise not be able to make use of these facilities. The demand side is embodied by the many social organisations in Flanders. They ensure that these rates are available to those who need them. Only close cooperation on the part of all concerned can make growth possible and address the challenges raised in this new development phase (Tourism Flanders & Brussels 2009).

7.4.2 UK Family Holiday Association and the European Holiday Experience

The Family Holiday Association’s holidays are targeted at families that live at very low income and that need a break from their everyday lives. To participate, the families need to

meet the following criteria: the family lives on a low income, has not been on holiday for the past four years, has at least one child of three years of age or over and has been referred by a welfare agent. The goal is that the families participate in “mainstream tourism”. Almost all holidays take place in the UK. It is the view of the association that going on holiday helps families to function better as a family, with the possibility to get away from the typical surroundings. The Family Holiday Association supports more than 1,500 families on an annual basis. Many offered holiday destinations are holiday villages, where there are activities for the children and their parents. There is also extra support and encouragement for families that are facing difficult circumstances (e.g. victims of domestic violence). Association has been cooperating with Flanders Tourist Office and the French charity Vacances Ouverts since 2006. Through this cooperation a number of families in the 3 countries have got the possibility to go on holiday to France, Belgium or the UK. 5 to 10 families travel each year from each country, and are selected based on their level of income. Exchanges take place both during the off-season and the peak-season (Family Holiday Association, 2012; HAMS, 2010).

7.4.3 Family Card Niederösterreich-Vysocina (Austria)

This is an example of regional exchange between 5 states (Tirol, Lower Austria, Upper Austria, Salzburg and Vorarlberg) and exchange between Lower Austria and 5 Czech border regions since 2002. The family card (ger. *Familienpass*) is a type of a cheque-book or discount card providing families with discounts and other offers on numerous services in the area of tourism. Example are leisure activities and short trips (e.g. a free soft drink for every child on the family card when buying a meal in a restaurant or a free ski pass for the children in company of their parents), but also advantages for longer holidays, such as a reduced price for card holders in some hotels in Austria. Exact reduction or benefit given are listed in a biannual family journal. In order to appear in the family journal, the service providers have to guarantee a minimum level of advantage for the service they are offering and they have to fulfil certain standards (e.g. certain % of reduction). The government has not received any negative feedback, number of users and purchases is high, therefore it is assessed that the family card mechanism works well in this region and for this target group (Ramboll, 2010; HAMS, 2010).

7.4.4 TYPET bilateral exchange programme between Portugal and Greece

Bilateral exchange programme has been working between Portugal and Greece since 1999. This is a specific bilateral tourism programme of a private nature. In Greece beneficiaries are families working in the Bank of Greece, and in Portugal families associated to the INATEL Foundation. Portuguese participants have enough purchasing power to pay for the trip – they are not low-income families but quite the opposite. Given these conditions, they believe that the transferability of this exchange mechanism is limited. 90 persons travel every year (per country), for the duration of 10 days. Main objectives of the exchange is

mutual knowledge on the society, history and cultural heritage of both countries; providing participants the access to leisure in a cultural way in the framework of social tourism and reinforcement of European citizenship. A bilateral protocol-agreement between institutions is drafted, which includes the hotels chosen, group characteristics, meals, means of reception, health assistance and all other details. The exchange is practically symmetrical: the programmes are similar in both countries, the stay is of equal length in each country, the same number of persons from each country takes part and is carried out in the same months (HAMS, 2010).

7.4.5 Holidays for Latvian low-income families to Czech Republic, Slovakia and Hungary

They target Latvian families with children, facing difficult circumstances (having a limited income). There are 3 travel packages that have been offered to families – to the Czech Republic, Slovakia and Hungary. These have been initiated and specifically tailored for this target group in terms of price by the private tour company Impro Travels in 2008 and offered in summer and during other school holidays. The tour operator did not profit from organising these tours, whereas it positioned itself as an affordable and socially active tour operator. Organisation of these trips has been solely the initiative of Impro Travels and did not involve any state or other public funding. A total of 20 3-6 day trips were organised involving 350 families and a total of 800 persons. The trips were organised during the peak season and they were open to all families that were interested in low budget travels for families. The holidays were tailored to the interests of both children and their parents, but a bit shorter than usual to make it cheaper (Kakteniece, 2010; HAMS, 2010).

8 CASE OF FAMILIES IN SLOVENIA

As previously said, the purpose of this master's thesis is to analyse positive and negative impacts of social tourism, specifically in case of families in Slovenia facing financial difficulties. To this end I examined the concept of social tourism through scientific literature, scientific papers and research articles, mainly from foreign experts in topics discussed. In order to critically evaluate positive and negative impacts of social tourism in the case of families in Slovenia, I summarized the basic findings based on empirical research results and studies of other authors. I explained the situation and functioning of social tourism in Slovenia through primary empirical research and publicly available secondary data. Based on in-depth theoretical and analytical review of Slovenian and European reports on social tourism I highlighted some successful practices in European Union.

Below I will compare positive and negative impacts of social tourism highlighted by studies of other authors with empirical research and gathering of primary data in cooperation with families that participated in this kind of tourism in Slovenia. I will also present the differences in experience of positive and negative impacts of social tourism between families that rarely travel and the ones that travel frequently.

8.1 Conceptual model and empirical research

Research studies mentioned in the theoretical part pointed out a range of positive and negative impacts for families participating in social tourism, as well as results of non-participation. Results of non-participation were such as parents under stress, social deprivation, social ills and social exclusion. There is a wide range of studies examining positive impacts of participation in social tourism. Family holidays are referred to as a source of well-being, there is also a case of vacation therapy for persons with long-term mental illness (Colmery-O'Neil Veteran's Administration Medical Center in Topeka, Kansas, USA) and other health benefits. Family holidays contribute to increase in social capital, family capital, quality of life, and are also considered as a potential form of learning. Negative impacts of social tourism for families relate to uncertainty and anxiety associated with going on holidays and social stigma associated with social tourism and non-participation in tourism. Some researchers caution that return home from holidays can generate negative reflections on lives and relationships, return home can also lead to so called "Post vacation syndrome". There are also economic, social-cultural and environmental costs of tourism for residents. Because these are all studies of foreign experts, I wanted to compare the situation in the case of families in Slovenia.

I conducted empirical research in which I examined perception of positive and negative impacts of participation in tourism and social tourism in the case of families in Slovenia. At the same time I also compared the differences in perception of positive and negative

impacts between families that rarely travel and the ones that travel frequently. I gathered data on marital status, employment status, age of the parents, number and age of the children, frequency on going on holidays and whether or not they have ever given up holidays in the last 5 years. Based on how frequently they travel, I then divided families into 2 groups: the ones that rarely travel and the ones that travel frequently. After that follow 3 main categories: results of non-participation, positive and negative impacts. Most of those are based on the evaluation of level of agreement or disagreement with given statements (based on 5-point Likert scale). Exception is 1 essay question, with which I wanted to discover what were the reactions of friends and family on families that could not afford holidays or they were subsidized or if they chose the cheaper holiday option.

8.2 Identification of the problem and survey's purpose

As presented in the theoretical part of the master's thesis, families (among other target groups of social tourism) are often socially excluded, as they do not have access to the commercial holiday circuit. Social tourism studies list evidence of positive impacts holidays have, especially for families. Tourism participation contributes to social inclusion, as non-participation results in missing out. Holidays are widely recognised to enhance quality of life and are a source of well-being. Furthermore, they can bring contact with new communities of practice, which can lead to increases in social capital and behaviour change, as well as increases in family capital. On the other hand, social tourism trips can be wrought with uncertainty, whilst the return home can generate negative reflections on lives and relationships. Participants in such tourism are also conscious that such holidays may attract social stigma.

Social tourism in Slovenia as a concept and as a system is not developed or in place yet. One of existing support systems for family social tourism in Slovenia are trade unions. They enable their members to travel cheaper than usual, by giving them subventions. There is also ZPMS that in majority organises holidays for children from socially weak families, but also has facilities available for families. Holidays for families are not organised, as opposed as just for children. In conclusion, situation for families in Slovenia is far from ideal. There were also no studies done in relation to positive and negative impacts of social tourism for families in Slovenia.

Therefore, purpose of the survey is to analyse positive and negative impacts of social tourism, specifically in case of families in Slovenia facing financial difficulties. To this end I will compare positive and negative impacts of social tourism highlighted by studies of other authors with empirical research and gathering of primary data in cooperation with families that participated in this kind of tourism in Slovenia. Furthermore, with empirical research and gathering of primary data, I will present the differences in perceptions of positive and negative impacts of social tourism between families that rarely travel and the ones that travel frequently.

Main research objectives of the survey are:

- to analyse results of non-participation, positive and negative impacts of social tourism for families in Slovenia, based on gathering of primary data;
- to compare my research findings with the findings of existing foreign research;
- to compare impact of results of non-participation, positive and negative impacts of social tourism between 2 groups (families that rarely travel and the ones that travel frequently);
- to introduce proposals for further research;
- to recommend ways for better and faster development of social tourism in Slovenia.

8.3 Developing of hypotheses

As previously mentioned, questionnaire consists of 3 main categories: results of non-participation, positive and negative impacts of social tourism. Each category consists of a certain number of sub-categories, which consist of a certain number of statements. These are based on the evaluation of level of agreement or disagreement with given statements (based on 5-point Likert scale).

Families (respondents) in the sample were divided into 2 groups, based on question Q3 (How often do you go on holidays/trips that last at least 3 days?). Group 1 consists of 100 families that rarely travel and Group 2 consists of 161 families that travel frequently. More on division into groups is presented in the following subchapters. I then compared the differences in experience of results of non-participation, positive and negative impacts of social tourism between these 2 groups.

In regard to that I wanted to determine, whether or not frequency of family travelling has any significant impact on respondents perception and experience of selected categories, I developed the following hypotheses:

- H1: As a result of holiday non-participation, respondents in Group 1 had a higher feeling of social deprivation than respondents in Group 2.
- H2: As a result of holiday non-participation, respondents in Group 1 had a higher feeling of social exclusion than respondents in Group 2.
- H3: Upon returning from holidays respondents in Group 1 experienced a higher feeling of family holidays as a source of well-being than respondents in Group 2.
- H4: Upon returning from holidays respondents in Group 1 experienced a higher increase in social capital than respondents in Group 2.
- H5: Upon returning from holidays respondents in Group 1 experienced a higher increase in family capital than respondents in Group 2.

- H6: Upon returning from holidays respondents in Group 1 experienced a higher contribution of holidays to their quality of life than respondents in Group 2.
- H7: Respondents in Group 1 had a higher feeling of uncertainty/anxiety associated with going on holidays than respondents in Group 2.
- H8: Respondents in Group 1 experienced a higher level of stigmatization than respondents in Group 2.
- H9: Respondents in Group 1 experienced a higher level of negative reflections upon returning home from holidays than respondents in Group 2.

I tested the hypotheses in the following way. Each sub-category consisted of selected number of statements, based on findings of empirical research results and studies of other authors. In addition to mean values for each statement, I calculated a new variable (e.g. Social deprivation, Social exclusion etc.) as a mean value of all the statements in this sub-category, for the whole sample and separately for each group (Group 1 and Group 2). It represents an overall ranking of this sub-category and is the basis for hypotheses testing.

I tested the hypotheses through the analysis of t-test. Since there were 2 independent samples, I conducted Independent Samples T-test through SPSS program. With this test I established whether or not there is a statistically significant difference between means of these 2 groups. I tested the hypotheses on the basis of results of comparison between Group 1 and Group 2. First I checked the Sig. value in Independent Samples Test, and if it was greater than 0.05, I read from the top row. Furthermore, if the t value was negative, it meant that mean value in Group 1 is lower than mean value in Group 2. That would automatically disprove the hypothesis. But, if the t value was positive, that meant that mean value in Group 1 is higher than mean value in Group 2. I furthermore checked if there is statistically significant difference between the 2 groups. I looked at the Sig. (2-tailed) value in output labelled “t-test for Equality of Means” and divided it in half for a 1-tailed test, because I did not just want to confirm that mean values in 2 groups were different, but that mean values in Group 1 were higher than in Group 2. Therefore, if the 1-tailed test value was greater than 0.05, there was no statistically significant difference and the hypothesis could not be proved. If the 1-tailed test value was less than or equal to 0.05, the mean value for one of the groups was larger than the mean value for the other and there was a statistically significant difference – I confirmed the hypothesis (Gray & Kinnear, 2012).

8.4 Methodology

A basis for this research will be theoretical and empirical research, mainly from foreign experts in topics discussed in theoretical part of master’s thesis. In survey I tried to determine whether the results of previously mentioned authors also apply in Slovenia. Results of the survey are presented more in detail in the chapter “Analysis and results of

empirical research”. In order to obtain the required data I used the method of quantitative research, by interviewing with internet questionnaire.

The questionnaire consists of 3 main categories: results of non-participation, positive impacts and negative impacts of social tourism. There is an additional category at the beginning, referring to number and age of the children in the family, frequency on going on holidays and whether or not they have ever given up holidays in the last 5 years. At the end there is also a section of demographic questions, such as marital status, employment status and age of the parents. Example of the questionnaire is enclosed in Appendix A (in Slovenian language) and Appendix B (translated to English).

8.4.1 Design of the questionnaire

To collect the data I used a questionnaire (Appendix A and Appendix B). In the first part I wanted to collect data concerning family size (questions on number and age of children), frequency of going on holidays and reasons for not going on holidays – 5 questions plus the additional one (Q6), if the respondents answered affirmative to question Q5. From here on, there are 3 main categories: results of non-participation, positive impacts and negative impacts of social tourism. Each category consists of series of statements, based on theoretical and empirical studies of foreign authors:

- Category “Results of non-participation” consists of 2 sub-categories with total of 12 statements.
- Category “Positive impacts” consists of 4 sub-categories with total of 31 statements.
- Category “Negative impacts” consists of 1 essay question and 3 sub-categories with total of 19 statements.

The respondents then indicated their agreement or disagreement with given statements (based on 5-point Likert scale). After that I compared the obtained data with the data of previously mentioned foreign studies.

As previously stated I furthermore divided families (respondents) into 2 groups, based on question Q3 (How often do you go on holidays/trips that last at least 3 days?). I then compared the differences in perception of results of non-participation, positive and negative impacts of social tourism between families that rarely travel and the ones that travel frequently. The questionnaire concludes with 4 demographic questions (gender, age of the parents, marital status and employment status).

8.4.2 Data collection

I conducted the survey via the internet, with the help of website EnKlikAnketa, which enables free design of online questionnaires. The survey was anonymous and was carried

out from 8.5.2016 to 25.5.2016 (18 days). ZPMS was of great help, especially ZPM Idrija, since they organize holidays for children from socially disadvantaged families as well as for families who are not socially disadvantaged. They had sent my questionnaire to parents of children who participated in those kinds of holidays in the last year. I also got a great response by sharing my questionnaire in numerous closed Facebook groups dedicated to families, young mothers and spending quality time with children.

Within this period 507 families completed the survey, out of which only 269 surveys were acceptable (238 were only partially completed). I accepted the survey, if all questions were completed, with exception of question Q15. I could figure out from the results of the survey that many of the respondents started to fill out the questionnaire but did not finish it. From this I can conclude that the questionnaire was too long or they were interrupted during filling it out and then did not continue to answer. As previously mentioned, I furthermore divided respondents into 2 groups. Out of 269 acceptable surveys there were 100 families that rarely travel and 161 that travel frequently. Remaining 8 families were excluded from the survey, because they represented a group that travels very frequently (from 6 to more than 10 times a year). They did not belong in either one of the other 2 groups, but were too small to form their own group. Therefore, results of 261 remaining acceptable surveys are presented below.

8.4.3 Reliability and Validity

One way of verifying the reliability of the measurement is a calculation of Cronbach's alpha. Cronbach's alpha is an index of reliability associated with the variation accounted for by the true score of the underlying construct. Construct is the hypothetical variable that is being measured (Hatcher, 1996). Alpha coefficient ranges in value from 0 to 1 and may be used to describe the reliability of factors extracted from dichotomous (questions with 2 possible answers) and/or multi-point formatted questionnaires or scales (e.g. rating scale: 1 = poor, 5 = excellent). The higher the score, the more reliable the generated scale is (Santos, 1999). Nunnally (1978) has indicated 0.7 to be an acceptable reliability coefficient but lower thresholds are sometimes used in the literature. I calculated Cronbach's alpha for all 3 categories of questions (results of non-participation, positive impacts and negative impacts). For all 3 categories the score was over 0.8, indicating that all items within the methodology are internally consistent (Table 1). The scores for each individual sub-category are presented later.

Table 1. Cronbach's alpha

Cronbach's alpha	
Results of non-participation	0.883
Positive impacts	0.950
Negative impacts	0.838

I tried to achieve validity of measurement by creating a questionnaire based on theoretical and empirical studies of foreign authors adapted for Slovenian conditions.

8.5 Analysis and results of empirical research

The results of the analysis of master's thesis, based on respondents' answers I introduced in the previous chapter will be presented in 2 parts. In the first part I will describe the sample, based on demographic data, frequency of travel and reasons for tourist abstinence.

In the second part I will present the respondents' answers to questions related to results of non-participation, positive impacts and negative impacts of social tourism (descriptive statistics). At the same time I will compare the mean values of the 2 groups and prove or disapprove the hypotheses, based on results obtained from the survey.

8.5.1 Sample description

Table 2 shows gender, age group, marital and employment status of 261 respondents that completed the survey. The respondents in the sample were mostly women. The largest share of respondents represent persons in the age group 21-40 years (89.27%), whereas there were no respondents that would fall in the first and last age group. Such allocation was expected as mothers who gave birth in 2014 were on average aged 30.6 years, whereas those who gave birth for the first time in 2014 were on average aged 29.1 years (Statistični urad Republike Slovenije, 2014).

Regarding marital status, the sample is the largest in married couple category and the smallest in widowed category. Furthermore, regarding employment status, the sample is the largest in employed category, followed by unemployed category and the smallest in category student work and other. All 4 respondents that chose the option "other" were on maternity leave.

Table 2. Sample description

Demographic data		
	Frequency	%
GENDER		
Male	2	0.77
Female	259	99.23
Total	261	100.00
AGE GROUP		
Up to 20 years	0	0.00
21-40 years	233	89.27
41-60 years	28	10.73
61 years or more	0	0.00
Total	261	100.00
MARITAL STATUS		
Single (never married)	17	6.51
Married couple	188	72.03
Unmarried couple	43	16.48
Widowed	1	0.38
Divorced	12	4.60
Total	261	100.00
EMPLOYMENT STATUS		
Student work	3	1.15
Employed (indefinite employment/fixed term)	200	76.63
Unemployed	54	20.69
Retired	0	0.00
Other	4	1.53
Total	269	100.00

In the beginning I wanted to collect data concerning family size (questions on number and age of the children), frequency of going on holidays and reasons for not going on holidays – 5 questions plus the additional one (Q6), if the respondents answered affirmative to question Q5. Table 3 shows how many children families had.

Table 3. Family size

Q1: How many children do you have?		
	Frequency	%
1	70	26.82
2	139	53.26
3	45	17.24
4	6	2.30
5	1	0.38
More than 5	0	0.00
Total	261	100.00

Over 50% of families have 2 children, followed by families with 1 child, 3, 4 and 5 children. No families in the sample had more than 5 children. In total, there were 512 children in respondent's families. The target group were families with children aged 3-13 years. Each included family had at least one child in this age range. Means, maximum and minimal ages for all children are introduced further in Table 4.

Table 4. Age of children

Q2: How old are your children?			
	Mean	Max	Min
1 st child	7.41	23	3
2 nd child	5.16	21	0
3 rd child	4.89	13	0
4 th child	3.80	9	1
5 th child	1.50	2	1
Total	4.55	23	0

8.5.2 Frequency of travel and reasons for tourist abstinence

With this next set of questions, I first wanted to discover how frequently the respondents go on holidays, when was the last time they went on a holiday, if they have ever given it up recently, and what was the reason for that. Based on data acquired in this section I furthermore divided respondents into 2 groups.

Based on question Q3 (How often do you go on holidays/trips that last at least 3 days?), families (respondents) were divided into 2 groups:

- Group 1 are families that rarely travel and consists of respondents that answered that they do not go on holidays, they go every few years or only 1 time a year. This group consists of 100 families (38.32% of all acceptable surveys). 62% of respondents in this

group answered that they have given up holidays (at least once) in the 5 years and 59.49% furthermore explained that the reasons for that were financial (Table 7 and Table 8).

- Group 2 are families that travel frequently and consists of respondents that answered they travel anywhere between 2 to 5 times a year. This group consists of 161 families (61.68% of all acceptable surveys). 40.37% of respondents in this group answered that they have given up holidays (at least once) in the 5 years, which is less than in Group 1. 47.19% of those furthermore explained that the reasons for that were financial.

There were also 8 families that were excluded from the survey, because they represented a group that travels very frequently (from 6 to more than 10 times a year). They did not belong in either one of the other two groups, but were too small to form their own group. The sample therefore consists of 261 families. The data is more thoroughly introduced in Table 5.

Table 5. Frequency of travel

Q3: How often do you go on holidays/trips that last at least 3 days?		
	Frequency	%
I do not go on holidays	5	1.92
Every few years	8	3.07
1 time a year	87	33.33
2 times a year	80	30.65
3 times a year	50	19.16
4 to 5 times a year	31	11.88
Total	261	100.00

The survey was carried out from 8.5.2016 to 25.5.2016 and respondents were asked when was the last time they went on holidays/trip that lasted at least 3 days (Q4). There were some respondents that have not been on holidays for quite some time – 11, 9, 5, 4, 3 and 2 years. There was also 1 respondent that replied with “never”. The most common answer was August 2015 (a summer before the survey was carried out), followed by May 2016 (holidays just before the survey was carried out) and February 2016 (winter holidays). The data is furthermore introduced in Table 6.

Table 6. Last time on holidays/trip

Q4: When was the last time you were on holidays/trip that lasted at least 3 days?		
	Frequency	%
Never	1	0.38
Summer 2005	1	0.38
Summer 2008	1	0.38
Summer 2011	1	0.38
Summer 2012	1	0.38
Summer 2013	3	1.15
Summer 2014	7	2.68
April 2015	0	0.00
May 2015	2	0.77
June 2015	8	3.07
July 2015	5	1.92
August 2015	99	37.93
September 2015	10	3.83
October 2015	6	2.30
November 2015	8	3.07
December 2015	4	1.53
January 2016	8	3.07
February 2016	24	9.20
March 2016	10	3.83
April 2016	18	6.90
May 2016	43	16.48
June 2016	0	0.00
No response	1	0.38
Total	261	100.00

Furthermore, respondents were asked, if they have ever given up holidays in the last 5 years (Q5). Table 7 shows that out of 261 acceptable surveys there were 127 families (48.66%) that had given up holidays (at least one time) in the last 5 years and 134 (51.34%) that did not. This question was also used as a control question for dividing families into groups. Respondents in Group 1 were more likely (62%) to answer affirmative to this question than respondents in Group 2 (40.37%).

Table 7. Giving up holidays

Q5: Have you ever given up holidays in the last 5 years?)	Both groups together		Group 1		Group 2	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Yes	127	48.66	62	62	65	40.37
No	134	51.34	38	38	96	59.63
Total	261	100.00	100	100	161	100.00

Question 6 (Q6) was the additional one, exploring the reasons for tourist abstinence of respondents that answered affirmative to question Q5. The data is introduced in Table 8, multiple answers were possible.

Table 8. Reasons for tourist abstinence

Q6: If YES, what was the reason? (multiple answers possible)		
	Frequency	%
Financial reasons	89	52.98
Personal reasons	14	8.33
Health reasons	27	16.07
Preferred to stay at home with no motivation to travel	1	0.60
Lack of time, due to work or study commitments	19	11.31
Lack of time, due to family commitments	18	10.71
Other	0	0.00
Total	168	100.00

Previously mentioned Preferences of Europeans towards tourism report 2016 investigates reasons why respondents had not been on a holiday in 2015. 51% of Slovenian respondents in the report said they did not go on holidays for financial reasons, which coincides with results of my survey where 52.98% of respondents said the same. 7% of Slovenian respondents in the report also said that they lacked time due to family commitments, 10.71% of respondents in my survey answered the same. Deviations between these 2 surveys are greater among respondents that answered that they did not go on holidays because of health reasons (33% in the report and 16.07% in the survey), preferred to stay at home with no motivation to travel (16% in the report and 0.60% in the survey) and mentioned lack of time due to work or study commitments (25% in the report and 11.31% in the survey) (European Commission, 2016a). A previous report Attitudes of Europeans towards Tourism Report 2013 also lists personal reasons as a reason for not going on holidays. In 2012 mentions of personal reasons notably declined among respondents in

Slovenia for 18 pp, compared to the year before, to 16%. Only 8.33% of the respondents in my survey answered the same (European Commission, 2013). Below, the results of 3 main categories will be presented: results of non-participation, positive impacts and negative impacts of social tourism. Each category is based on the evaluation of level of agreement or disagreement with given statements, based on 5-point Likert scale (1-strongly disagree; 2-disagree; 3-neither agree nor disagree; 4-agree; 5-strongly agree).

8.6 Results of the analysis, interpretation and hypotheses testing

8.6.1 Results on results of non-participation

8.6.1.1 Question 7: Social deprivation

The feeling of social deprivation due to holiday non-participation was measured with 6 statements on a scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Table 9 shows statements sorted by declining mean values with additional new variable “Social deprivation”. The new variable was calculated as a mean value of all the statements in this sub-category, for the whole sample and separately for each group (Group 1 and Group 2). It represents an overall ranking of this sub-category and is the basis for hypotheses testing. Standard deviation and frequency of these statements are also presented below. The data for each individual group is more thoroughly presented in Appendix C and Appendix D.

Table 9. Results of non-participation (social deprivation)

	Statements	Mean	Standard deviation	Frequency	Mean Group 1	Mean Group 2
Q7f	Spending quality time with my children on holidays leads to development of parental relationships.	3.94	1.03	261	3.84	4.00
Q7b	Even if I provide activities for my children during the summer holidays, that is no compensation for not having a holiday away from home.	3.31	1.27	261	3.48	3.20
Q7d	Children who do not go on holidays negatively compare their experiences with those of children in more affluent families.	3.31	1.09	261	3.48	3.20
Q7c	Children who do not go on holidays are deprived of happy childhood memories.	2.98	1.25	261	3.09	2.92
Q7e	Children's awareness of their own poverty from young age leads to lower expectations of life.	2.96	1.17	261	3.02	2.92
Q7a	My child was socially deprived due to holiday non-participation.	2.60	1.33	261	2.83	2.46
Q7	Social deprivation	3.18	1.26	261	3.29	3.12
Cronbach's alpha = 0.771						
T-test = 1.675; Sig. (2-tailed) = 0.095 → Sig. (1-tailed) = p = 0.048						

Mean value for statement Q7f is the highest in this sub-category, which shows agreement with statement that spending quality time with children on holidays leads to development of parental relationships. Statements Q7b through Q7e all range between 2.96 and 3.31, around “3-neither agree nor disagree”. This means, that respondents are relatively undecided about whether or not activities at home during summer holidays are a compensation for holidays away from home and if children who do not go on holidays negatively compare their experiences with those of children in more affluent families. This also means a low level of agreement with statements saying that children who do not go on holidays are deprived of happy childhood memories and that children’s awareness of their own poverty from young age leads to lower expectations of life. Statement Q7a is the lowest ranked statement in this sub-category, showing low agreement with children being socially deprived due to holiday non-participation. Mean values for all of the statements in this section are higher in Group 1 than Group 2, with the exception of statement Q7f.

Reliability of the measurement in this sub-category was verified with a calculation of Cronbach’s alpha. Nunnally (1978) has indicated 0.7 to be an acceptable reliability coefficient but lower thresholds are sometimes used in the literature. Cronbach’s alpha for this sub-category amounted to 0.771, indicating an acceptable level of reliability and this sub-category being internally consistent.

H1 hypothesis testing: As a result of holiday non-participation, respondents in Group 1 had a higher feeling of social deprivation than respondents in Group 2.

I tested hypothesis H1 through the analysis of t-test. Since there were 2 independent samples, I conducted Independent Samples T-test through SPSS program. With this test I established whether or not there is a significant difference between means of these 2 groups. I tested the hypothesis on the basis of the results of comparison between Group 1 and Group 2. In Group 1 the mean value for variable Social deprivation (3.29) was higher than in Group 2 (3.12).

The data of Independent Samples T-test is shown in more detail in Appendix U. Value t was positive ($t=1.675$), which means that the hypothesis could potentially be proved. Furthermore, Sig. (2-tailed) amounted to 0.095, divided in half for a 1-tailed test amounted to 0.048, which is a value less than 0.05 ($p < 0.05$). Based on that, I can conclude that there is a statistically significant difference between the 2 groups. Mean values in Group 1 were higher than mean values in Group 2. On average, respondents in Group 1 had a higher feeling of social deprivation than respondents in Group 2 ($t=1.675$; $p=0.048$). Based on t-test, I proved the hypothesis.

8.6.1.2 Question 8: Social exclusion

The feeling of social exclusion due to holiday non-participation was measured with 6 statements on a scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Table 10 shows statements sorted by declining mean values with additional new variable “Social exclusion”. The new variable was calculated as a mean value of all the statements in this sub-category, for the whole sample and separately for each group (Group 1 and Group 2). It represents an overall ranking of this sub-category and is the basis for hypotheses testing. Standard deviation and frequency of these statements are also presented below. The data for each individual group is more thoroughly presented in Appendix E and Appendix F.

Table 10. Results of non-participation (social exclusion)

	Statements	Mean	Standard deviation	Frequency	Mean Group 1	Mean Group 2
Q8f	Holidays are a necessity and not a luxury.	3.38	1.17	261	3.54	3.29
Q8d	All of the above causes stress in the family.	2.17	1.08	261	2.51	1.96
Q8e	All of the above negatively affects my quality of life.	2.16	1.06	261	2.50	1.95
Q8b	When I see places I can not go to on TV, I get a feeling of exclusion.	2.14	1.08	261	2.41	1.98
Q8c	When I see places I can not go to on TV, I get a feeling of inferiority.	2.06	1.06	261	2.37	1.87
Q8a	My child was socially excluded due to holiday non-participation.	2.00	0.90	261	2.12	1.93
Q8	Social exclusion	2.32	1.16	261	2.58	2.16
Cronbach's alpha = 0.878						
T-test = 3.821; Sig. (2-tailed) = 0.000 → Sig. (1-tailed) = p = 0.000						

Mean value for statement Q8f is the highest in this sub-category, which shows agreement with statement that holidays are a necessity and not luxury. Level of agreement with statements Q8a through Q8e ranges between 2.00 and 2.17 (around 2-disagree), which means disagreement with statements saying that children were socially excluded due to holiday non-participation, that when they see places they can not go on TV they get feeling of exclusion and inferiority, all of this causing stress in the family and negatively affecting their quality of life. Mean values for all of the statements in this section are higher in Group 1 than Group 2. This was to be expected, as the respondents in Group 1 have more experience with holiday non-participation and therefore deal with its effects more intensely.

Reliability of the measurement in this sub-category was verified with a calculation of Cronbach's alpha, which amounted to 0.878. This indicates a good level of reliability and this sub-category being internally consistent.

H2 hypothesis testing: As a result of holiday non-participation, respondents in Group 1 had a higher feeling of social exclusion than respondents in Group 2.

I tested hypothesis H2 through the analysis of t-test. Since there were 2 independent samples, I conducted Independent Samples T-test through SPSS program. With this test I established whether or not there is a significant difference between means of these 2 groups. I tested the hypothesis on the basis of the results of comparison between Group 1 and Group 2. In Group 1 the mean value for variable Social exclusion (2.58) was higher than in Group 2 (2.16).

The data of Independent Samples T-test is shown in more detail in Appendix V. Value t was positive ($t=3.821$), which means that the hypothesis could potentially be proved. Furthermore, Sig. (2-tailed) amounted to 0.000, divided in half for a 1-tailed test amounted to 0.000, which is a value less than 0.05 ($p < 0.05$). Based on that, I can conclude that there is a statistically significant difference between the 2 groups. Mean values in Group 1 were higher than mean values in Group 2. Respondents in Group 1 had a higher feeling of social exclusion than respondents in Group 2 ($t=3.821$; $p=0.000$). Based on t-test, I proved the hypothesis.

8.6.2 Results on positive impacts

8.6.2.1 Question 9: Source of well-being

Family holidays as a source of well-being was measured with 8 statements on a scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Table 11 shows statements sorted by declining mean values with additional new variable "Source of well-being". The new variable was calculated as a mean value of all the statements in this sub-category, for the whole sample and separately for each group (Group 1 and Group 2). It represents an overall ranking of this sub-category and is the basis for hypotheses testing. Standard deviation and frequency of these statements are also presented below. The data for each individual group is more thoroughly presented in Appendix G and Appendix H.

Mean value for statement Q9d is the highest in this sub-category, which shows a high level of agreement with statement that parents were able recharge their batteries on holidays. Statements Q9g, Q9b, Q9e and Q9h all range between 4.36 and 3.85, around "4-agree". This means that respondents agree that holidays contributed to creating treasured memories, positively contributed to their well-being and positively influenced their family communication. They also noticed higher functioning upon returning to normal stressful

environment after holidays. While statements Q9a and Q9f are the lowest ranked in this sub-category, they still show agreement with statements that respondents' children have the same social expectations as other children (from wealthier families) and that they developed new skills when on holidays. Mean values for all of the statements in this section are higher in Group 2 than Group 1, with the exception of statements Q9c and Q9a.

Table 11. Positive impacts (source of well-being)

	Statements	Mean	Standard deviation	Frequency	Mean Group 1	Mean Group 2
Q9d	I was able to recharge my batteries on holidays by getting a break from everyday routine, stressors.	4.42	0.76	216	4.36	4.46
Q9g	Holidays contributed to creating treasured memories, family narratives, etc.	4.36	0.68	216	4.28	4.42
Q9b	Holidays contribute to my well-being.	4.31	0.72	216	4.27	4.34
Q9e	Holidays positively influenced our family communication.	4.11	0.93	216	4.10	4.11
Q9h	I noticed higher functioning upon return to normal stressful environment after holidays.	3.85	0.87	216	3.82	3.86
Q9c	Holidays positively contribute to my self-esteem.	3.61	1.09	216	3.62	3.60
Q9a	My children have the same social expectations as other children (from wealthier families).	3.51	0.90	216	3.54	3.48
Q9f	When on holiday, I developed new skills.	3.48	0.93	216	3.36	3.55
Q9	Source of well being	3.96	0.94	216	3.92	3.98
Cronbach's alpha = 0.823						
T-test = -0.806; Sig. (2-tailed) = 0.421 → Sig. (1-tailed) = p = 0.211						

Reliability of the measurement in this sub-category was verified with a calculation of Cronbach's alpha, which amounted to 0.823. This indicates a good level of reliability and this sub-category being internally consistent.

H3 hypothesis testing: Upon returning from holidays, respondents in Group 1 experienced a higher feeling of family holidays as a source of well-being than respondents in Group 2.

I tested hypothesis H3 through the analysis of t-test. Since there were 2 independent samples, I conducted Independent Samples T-test through SPSS program. With this test I established whether or not there is a significant difference between means of these 2 groups. I tested the hypothesis on the basis of the results of comparison between Group 1 and Group 2. In Group 1 the mean value for variable Source of well-being (3.92) was

slightly lower than in Group 2 (3.98). It can be seen even without the t-test that the hypothesis could not be proved.

The data of Independent Samples T-test is shown in more detail in Appendix W. Value t was negative ($t=-0.806$), which would automatically disprove the hypothesis. Sig. (2-tailed) amounted to 0.421, divided in half for a 1-tailed test amounted to 0.211, which is a value greater than 0.05 ($p > 0.05$). Based on that, I conclude that there is no statistically significant difference between the 2 groups. Mean values in Group 1 were not higher than mean values in Group 2. On average, respondents in Group 1 did not experience a higher feeling of family holidays as a source of well-being than respondents in Group 2 ($t=-0.806$; $p=0.211$). The hypothesis could not be proved.

8.6.2.2 Question 10: Social capital

Holiday contribution to increase in social capital was measured with 5 statements on a scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Table 12 shows statements sorted by declining mean values with additional new variable “Social capital”. The new variable was calculated as a mean value of all the statements in this sub-category, for the whole sample and separately for each group (Group 1 and Group 2). It represents an overall ranking of this sub-category and is the basis for hypotheses testing. Standard deviation and frequency of these statements are also presented below. The data for each individual group is more thoroughly presented in Appendix I and Appendix J.

Table 12. Positive impacts (social capital)

	Statements	Mean	Standard deviation	Frequency	Mean Group 1	Mean Group 2
Q10e	On holidays I experience something I could not in everyday life (e.g. different foreign cultures, new activities, hobbies, interests, develop new skills).	3.99	0.83	261	3.90	4.05
Q10c	Holidays enhance intellectual development of my children and enrich their view of the world.	3.81	0.89	261	3.69	3.89
Q10a	For me going on holidays means the opportunity to meet new people.	3.43	0.98	261	3.37	3.46
Q10b	Holidays positively contribute to my social capital.	3.26	0.97	261	3.15	3.33
Q10d	Mixing on holidays with others with similar problems helps me normalise a feeling of isolation.	2.92	0.99	261	3.03	2.86
Q10	Social capital	3.48	1.01	261	3.43	3.52
Cronbach's alpha = 0.793						
T-test = -1.010; Sig. (2-tailed) = 0.324 → Sig. (1-tailed) = p = 0.162						

Mean value for statement Q10e is the highest in this sub-category, showing agreement with statement that respondents experienced something on holidays they could not in everyday life. It is followed by statement Q10c, agreeing that holidays enhance intellectual development of their children. The rest of the statements range between 3.43 and 2.92, around “3-neither agree nor disagree”. This means that respondents are relatively undecided about whether or not holidays represent the opportunity to meet new people, positively contribute to their social capital and if mixing on holidays with others with similar problem helps them normalise feeling of isolation. Mean values for all of the statements in this section are higher in Group 2 than Group 1, with the exception of statement Q10d.

Reliability of the measurement in this sub-category was verified with a calculation of Cronbach’s alpha, which amounted to 0.793. This indicates an acceptable level of reliability and this sub-category being internally consistent.

H4 hypothesis testing: Upon returning from holidays, respondents in Group 1 experienced a higher increase in social capital than respondents in Group 2.

I tested hypothesis H4 through the analysis of t-test. Since there were 2 independent samples, I conducted Independent Samples T-test through SPSS program. With this test I established whether or not there is a significant difference between means of these 2 groups. I tested the hypothesis on the basis of the results of comparison between Group 1 and Group 2. In Group 1 the mean value for variable Social capital (3.43) was slightly lower than in Group 2 (3.52). It can be seen even without the t-test, that the hypothesis could not be proved.

The data of Independent Samples T-test is shown in more detail in Appendix X. Value t was negative ($t=-1.010$), which would automatically disprove the hypothesis. Sig. (2-tailed) amounted to 0.324, divided in half for a 1-tailed test amounted to 0.162, which is a value greater than 0.05 ($p > 0.05$). Based on that, I conclude that there is no statistically significant difference between the 2 groups. Mean values in Group 1 were not higher than mean values in Group 2. On average, respondents in Group 1 did not experience a higher increase in social capital than respondents in Group 2 ($t=-1.010$; $p=0.162$). The hypothesis could not be proved.

8.6.2.3 Question 11: Family capital

Holiday contribution to increase family capital was measured with 14 statements on a scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Table 13 shows statements sorted by declining mean values with additional new variable “Family capital”. The new variable was calculated as a mean value of all the statements in this sub-category, for the whole sample and separately for each group (Group 1 and Group 2). It represents an overall

ranking of this sub-category and is the basis for hypotheses testing. Standard deviation and frequency of these statements are also presented below. The data for each individual group is more thoroughly presented in Appendix K and Appendix L.

Table 13. Positive impacts (family capital)

	Statements	Mean	Standard deviation	Frequency	Mean Group 1	Mean Group 2
Q11g	Shared leisure activities encourage socializing among family members.	4.26	0.76	261	4.14	4.34
Q11h	Shared leisure activities enhance communications among family members.	4.22	0.78	261	4.19	4.24
Q11m	Holidays contribute to family integration.	4.14	0.79	261	4.08	4.18
Q11k	Holidays bring new energy for family system development.	4.05	0.80	261	4.00	4.07
Q11i	Activities on holidays encourage socialization of children.	4.02	0.81	261	3.98	4.04
Q11e	Upon returning from holidays, my child was proud to spend time with his/her parents.	3.97	0.91	261	4.02	3.94
Q11n	Holidays nurture the relationship between the partners in a way that normal family roles do not allow.	3.96	0.91	261	4.01	3.93
Q11l	Holidays are the reason for the increased flow of information through our family system (contributing to better communication).	3.74	0.87	261	3.75	3.74
Q11b	Upon returning from holidays, I noticed positive behavioural changes in my relationship with children.	3.69	0.93	261	3.77	3.63
Q11j	Holidays represent a unique opportunity for interaction among family members.	3.67	1.03	261	3.81	3.59
Q11a	Upon returning from holidays, our family relations improved.	3.61	0.96	261	3.69	3.57
Q11d	Upon returning from holidays, I noticed positive changes in my child's behaviour.	3.51	0.93	261	3.61	3.44
Q11f	Upon returning from holidays, I was felling less guilty because we spend quality time together.	3.19	1.20	261	3.31	3.11
Q11c	Upon returning from holidays, I noticed that my child is doing better in school.	3.14	0.89	261	3.26	3.06
Q11	Family capital	3.80	0.97	261	3.83	3.78
Cronbach's alpha = 0.928						
T-test = 0.631; Sig. (2-tailed) = 0.528 → Sig. (1-tailed) = p = 0.264						

Mean values in this section all range between 3.14 and 4.27, therefore it can be concluded that respondents either agree with the statements or are undecided about it. Statements

Q11g and Q11h are the highest rated in this sub-category, as respondents highly agree that shared leisure activities encouraged socializing among family members and enhanced communications among them. Respondents agree with statements stating that holiday contributed to family integration (Q11m), brought new energy for family system development (Q11k), activities on holidays encouraged socialization of children (Q11i), their child was proud to spend time with his/her parents (Q11e) and that holidays nurture the relationship between the partners in a way that normal family roles do not allow (Q11n).

Moreover, respondents are relatively undecided about whether or not holidays are the reason for the increased flow of information through their family system (Q11l) or they noticed positive behavioural changes in their relationship with their children upon returning from holidays (Q11b). They were even more undecided about whether or not their child was doing better in school (Q11c), holidays represented unique opportunity for interaction among family members (Q11j), their family relations improved (Q11a), if there were any positive changes in their child's behaviour upon returning from holidays (Q11d) and if they were feeling less guilty because they spend quality time together (Q11f). Mean values for statements Q11g, Q11h, Q11m, Q11k and Q11i are relatively higher in Group 2 than Group 1. For the remaining statements, mean values are higher in Group 1 than Group 2.

Reliability of the measurement in this sub-category was verified with a calculation of Cronbach's alpha, which amounted to 0.928. This indicates an excellent level of reliability and this sub-category being internally consistent.

H5 hypothesis testing: Upon returning from holidays, respondents in Group 1 experienced a higher increase in family capital than respondents in Group 2.

I tested hypothesis H5 through the analysis of t-test. Since there were 2 independent samples, I conducted Independent Samples T-test through SPSS program. With this test I established whether or not there is a significant difference between means of these 2 groups. I tested the hypothesis on the basis of the results of comparison between Group 1 and Group 2. In Group 1 the mean value for variable Family capital (3.83) was higher than in Group 2 (3.78).

The data of Independent Samples T-test is shown in more detail in Appendix Y. Value t was positive ($t=0.631$), which means that the hypothesis could potentially be proved. Furthermore, Sig. (2-tailed) amounted to 0.631, divided in half for a 1-tailed test amounted to 0.264, which is a value greater than 0.05 ($p > 0.05$). Based on that, I conclude that there is no statistically significant difference between the 2 groups. Mean values in Group 1 were not higher than mean values in Group 2. On average, respondents in Group 1 did not

experience a higher increase in social capital than respondents in Group 2 ($t=0.631$; $p=0.264$). The hypothesis could not be proved.

8.6.2.4 Question 12: Quality of life

Holiday contribution to quality of life was measured with 4 statements on a scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Table 14 shows statements sorted by declining mean values with additional new variable “Quality of life”. The new variable was calculated as a mean value of all the statements in this sub-category, for the whole sample and separately for each group (Group 1 and Group 2). It represents an overall ranking of this sub-category and is the basis for hypotheses testing. Standard deviation and frequency of these statements are also presented below. The data for each individual group is more thoroughly presented in Appendix M and Appendix N.

Table 14. Positive impacts (quality of life)

	Statements	Mean	Standard deviation	Frequency	Mean Group 1	Mean Group 2
Q12c	Holidays contribute to my personal development.	3.61	0.94	261	3.54	3.65
Q12b	Holidays provide opportunities for social interaction.	3.37	0.86	261	3.29	3.42
Q12a	Holidays allow me to pursue a range of interests.	3.30	0.86	261	3.21	3.35
Q12d	Holidays provide me with opportunity of individual identity formation.	3.30	0.99	261	3.27	3.31
Q12	Quality of life	3.40	0.92	261	3.33	3.43
Cronbach's alpha = 0.883						
T-test = -1.072; Sig. (2-tailed) = 0.285 → Sig. (1-tailed) = p = 0.143						

Mean value for statement Q12c is the highest in this sub-category, showing relative agreement with statement that holidays contribute to respondents' personal development. The rest of the statements range between 3.30 and 3.37, around “3-neither agree nor disagree”. This means that respondents are leaning toward agreement with these statements even though that agreement is not particularly strong. Mean values for all of the statements in this section are slightly higher in Group 2 than Group 1.

Reliability of the measurement in this sub-category was verified with a calculation of Cronbach's alpha, which amounted to 0.883. This indicates a good level of reliability and this sub-category being internally consistent.

H6 hypothesis testing: Upon returning from holidays, respondents in Group 1 experienced a higher contribution of holidays to their quality of life than respondents in Group 2.

I tested hypothesis H6 through the analysis of t-test. Since there were 2 independent samples, I conducted Independent Samples T-test through SPSS program. With this test I established whether or not there is a significant difference between means of these 2 groups. I tested the hypothesis on the basis of the results of comparison between Group 1 and Group 2. In Group 1 the mean value for variable Quality of life (3.33) was slightly lower than in Group 2 (3.43). It can be seen even without the t-test, that the hypothesis could not be proved.

The data of Independent Samples T-test is shown in more detail in Appendix Z. Value t was negative ($t=-1.072$), which would automatically disprove the hypothesis. Sig. (2-tailed) amounted to 0.285, divided in half for a 1-tailed test amounted to 0.143, which is a value greater than 0.05 ($p > 0.05$). Based on that, I conclude that there is no statistically significant difference between the 2 groups. Mean values in Group 1 were not higher than mean values in Group 2. On average, respondents in Group 1 did not experience a higher contribution to quality of life than respondents in Group 2 ($t=-1.072$; $p=0.143$). The hypothesis could not be proved.

8.6.3 Results on negative impacts

8.6.3.1 Question 13: Uncertainty and anxiety

Uncertainty and anxiety associated with going on holidays were measured with 5 statements on a scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Table 15 shows statements sorted by declining mean values with additional new variable “Uncertainty and anxiety”. The new variable was calculated as a mean value of all the statements in this sub-category, for the whole sample and separately for each group (Group 1 and Group 2). It represents an overall ranking of this sub-category and is the basis for hypotheses testing. Standard deviation and frequency of these statements are also presented below. The data for each individual group is more thoroughly presented in Appendix O and Appendix P.

Mean values in this sub-category vary a lot, from 1.93 to 3.4. Mean value for statement Q13c is the highest rated in this sub-category as respondents relatively agree that spending time with their children is a motivation to go on holidays regardless of any uncertainty and anxiety. Respondents are relatively undecided about whether or not they would participate in activities for parents on holidays, if someone would look after their children (Q13d) and if they would even trust somebody to look after them (Q13e). They disagree or are relatively undecided about whether or not inexperience and lack of knowledge on planning a holiday brings them increased level of uncertainty (Q13a). The lowest level of agreement can be found in statement Q13b, where respondents disagree that they are afraid to go

holidays due to inexperience and lack of knowledge on planning it. Mean values for all of the statements in this section are higher in Group 1 than Group 2.

Table 15. Negative impacts (uncertainty and anxiety)

	Statements	Mean	Standard deviation	Frequency	Mean Group 1	Mean Group 2
Q13c	Spending time with my children is a motivation to go on holidays anyway.	3.49	1.29	261	3.67	3.37
Q13d	I would participate in activities for parents on holidays, if someone would look after my children.	2.73	1.26	261	2.74	2.72
Q13e	I am not accustomed to being away from my children, so it would be hard to trust somebody to look after them (qualified support staff on destination).	2.62	1.24	261	2.96	2.42
Q13a	Inexperience and lack of knowledge on planning a holiday brings me increased level of uncertainty in making (travel) decisions.	2.41	1.05	261	2.55	2.33
Q13b	Due to inexperience and lack of knowledge on planning a holiday, I am afraid to go on holidays.	1.93	0.94	261	2.08	1.84
Q13	Uncertainty and anxiety	2.64	1.27	261	2.80	2.54
Cronbach's alpha = 0.703						
T-test = 2.868; Sig. (2-tailed) = 0.004 → Sig. (1-tailed) = p = 0.002						

Reliability of the measurement in this sub-category was verified with a calculation of Cronbach's alpha, which amounted to 0.703. This indicates an acceptable level of reliability and this sub-category being internally consistent.

H7 hypothesis testing: Respondents in Group 1 had a higher feeling of uncertainty/anxiety associated with going on holidays, than respondents in Group 2.

I tested hypothesis H7 through the analysis of t-test. Since there were 2 independent samples, I conducted Independent Samples T-test through SPSS program. With this test I established whether or not there is a significant difference between means of these 2 groups. I tested the hypothesis on the basis of the results of comparison between Group 1 and Group 2. In Group 1 the mean value for variable Uncertainty and anxiety (2.80) was higher than in Group 2 (2.54).

The data of Independent Samples T-test is shown in more detail in Appendix AA. Value t was positive ($t=2.868$), which means that the hypothesis could potentially be proved. Furthermore, Sig. (2-tailed) amounted to 0.004, divided in half for a 1-tailed test amounted to 0.002, which is a value less than 0.05 ($p < 0.05$). Based on that, I can conclude that there

is a statistically significant difference between the 2 groups. Mean values in Group 1 were higher than mean values in Group 2. Respondents in Group 1 had a higher feeling of uncertainty/anxiety associated with going on holidays than respondents in Group 2 ($t=2.868$; $p=0.002$). Based on t-test, I proved the hypothesis.

8.6.3.2 Question 14: Social stigma

Social stigma associated with social tourism and non-participation in tourism was measured with 4 statements on a scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Table 16 shows statements sorted by declining mean values with additional new variable “Social stigma”. The new variable was calculated as a mean value of all the statements in this sub-category, for the whole sample and separately for each group (Group 1 and Group 2). It represents an overall ranking of this sub-category and is the basis for hypotheses testing. Standard deviation and frequency of these statements are also presented below. The data for each individual group is more thoroughly presented in Appendix Q and Appendix R.

Table 16. Negative impacts (social stigma)

	Statements	Mean	Standard deviation	Frequency	Mean Group 1	Mean Group 2
Q14d	Notwithstanding this, we would still choose such holidays.	3.84	0.97	261	3.90	3.81
Q14a	Because we could not afford holidays, we were stigmatized (as a family) – e.g. by friends and acquaintances who spent a lot of money for the holidays.	2.17	1.05	261	2.47	1.98
Q14b	We were stigmatized, because our holidays were subsidized.	2.14	1.00	261	2.36	2.01
Q14c	We were stigmatized, because we chose cheaper holiday option.	2.00	0.94	261	2.22	1.87
Q14	Social stigma	2.54	1.24	261	2.74	2.42
Cronbach’s alpha = 0.708						
T-test = 3.572; Sig. (2-tailed) = 0.000 → Sig. (1-tailed) = p = 0.000						

Mean values in this sub-category vary a lot, from 2.00 to 3.84. Mean value for statement Q14d is the highest rated in this sub-category, as respondents relatively agree that notwithstanding any stigmatization they would still choose such holidays. This also coincides with Minnaert’s (2014) study, where participants in social tourism were all thrilled to be approved for the holiday. The lowest level of agreement can be found in the remaining 3 statements (Q14a through Q14c), where respondents disagree that they were stigmatized because they could not afford holidays, their holidays were subsidized or they chose a cheaper holiday option. According to already mentioned study Minnaert (2014)

says that people do not like their friends to know what kind of income they are on, so participating in social tourism automatically announces that you must be on a low income. Mean values for all of the statements in this section are higher in Group 1 than Group 2.

Reliability of the measurement in this sub-category was verified with a calculation of Cronbach's alpha, which amounted to 0.708. This indicates an acceptable level of reliability and this sub-category being internally consistent.

H8 hypothesis testing: Respondents in Group 1 experienced a higher level of stigmatization than respondents in Group 2.

I tested hypothesis H8 through the analysis of t-test. Since there were 2 independent samples, I conducted Independent Samples T-test through SPSS program. With this test I established whether or not there is a significant difference between means of these 2 groups. I tested the hypothesis on the basis of the results of comparison between Group 1 and Group 2. In Group 1 the mean value for variable Social stigma (2.74) was higher than in Group 2 (2.42).

The data of Independent Samples T-test is shown in more detail in Appendix BB. Value t was positive ($t=3.572$), which means that the hypothesis could potentially be proved. Furthermore, Sig. (2-tailed) amounted to 0.000, divided in half for a 1-tailed test amounted to 0.000, which is a value less than 0.05 ($p < 0.05$). Based on that, I can conclude that there is a statistically significant difference between the 2 groups. Mean values in Group 1 were higher than mean values in Group 2. Respondents in Group 1 experienced a higher level of stigmatization than respondents in Group 2 ($t=3.572$; $p=0.000$). Based on t-test, I proved the hypothesis.

8.6.3.3 Question 15: Essay question

In the questionnaire the respondents were also asked 1 essay question, which was: "Because you could not afford holidays or they were subsidized or you chose the cheaper holiday option – what were the reactions of your friends and acquaintances; the reactions of friends and classmates of your children? Did they look at you differently?" The answers are presented below.

In Group 1, 59 (59%) respondents gave answer to this question:

- 47 (47%) of those stated that nothing (bad) happened. They did not have such (bad) experience, that it luckily did not happen, there were no bad responses. Some of them explained further, that:
 - "there is a reason to choose a cheaper holiday, because it is more important that the bills are paid and everything else settled, and then see how much is left for the

- holidays – it is irresponsible to take credit so you can afford expensive holidays that are not necessarily of better quality”;
- “we are all looking to obtain as much value for money as possible, taking advantage of offers on various websites such as Kuponko and Inadan” and
 - “I always choose the cheapest option, although I could afford more expensive one and no one looks down on me because of this”.
- 10 (10%) of those who answered to this question stated that people were looking at them differently. Some of the responses were:
 - “others were talking about where they were, what they saw and we did not have anything to say – it seemed to me as if they felt sorry for us”;
 - “some people always have to comment on the economic situation and with time I learned to ignore it” and
 - “we are always ranked from poor to rich”.
 - 2 (2%) of those gave other answers, stating:
 - “friends/family do not know the exact cause” and
 - “we are not debating how much we spend on holidays”.

Respondents in Group 2 also answered to this question even though they were the ones that travel more frequently. 88 (54.66%) respondents in this group gave answers to this question:

- 76 (47.20%) of those stated, that “everything was normal”, they “have no experience with stigmatization because of this” or that “nothing felt different”. Some went further to explain:
 - “people were understanding and did not look differently at us”;
 - “I am not explaining to anyone in what way I spend my holidays, because it is none of their business” and
 - “when we compared prices with our friends, the successful ones were the ones who spent less money on holidays, our relations were not affected”.
- 7 (4.35%) of those who answered to this question had negative experiences, stating:
 - “I sometimes felt a feeling of inferiority”;
 - “friends are looking at me differently”;
 - “parents were judging, children did not”;
 - “I felt like we belong at the bottom of the scale” and
 - “price of holidays has nothing to do with spending quality time with my children, responses of others do not interest me”.
- 5 (3.11%) gave other answers, stating that they “do not know” or “have never participated in such holidays (subsidized holidays or social tourism)”.

8.6.3.4 Question 16: Returning home and negative reflections

Returning home and negative reflections were measured with 10 statements on a scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Table 17 shows statements sorted by declining mean values with additional new variable “Returning home and negative reflections”. The new variable was calculated as a mean value of all the statements in this sub-category, for the whole sample and separately for each group (Group 1 and Group 2). It represents an overall ranking of this sub-category and is the basis for hypotheses testing. Standard deviation and frequency of these statements are also presented below. The data for each individual group is more thoroughly presented in Appendix S and Appendix T.

Table 17. Negative impacts (returning home and negative reflections)

	Statements	Mean	Standard deviation	Frequency	Mean Group 1	Mean Group 2
Q16g	When on vacation, I do things I love and that reminds me of what is truly important in my life.	3.87	0.88	261	3.76	3.94
Q16j	Upon returning from holidays I created better work-life balance.	3.08	0.89	261	3.08	3.09
Q16f	Holidays lift my spirits, but the effects do not last long.	2.82	1.09	261	2.92	2.76
Q16h	When the fall comes, I feel like I lost part of myself.	2.33	1.08	261	2.36	2.30
Q16e	Upon returning to work/everyday life from holidays, I have feeling of emptiness that lasts up to a few weeks after returning to work.	2.27	1.04	261	2.38	2.20
Q16c	Upon returning to work/everyday life from holidays, I lack motivation.	2.15	0.92	261	2.18	2.12
Q16a	Upon returning to work/everyday life from holidays, I am more irritable.	2.14	0.88	261	2.20	2.10
Q16d	Upon returning to work/everyday life from holidays, I have difficulty concentrating.	2.11	0.86	261	2.14	2.09
Q16b	Upon returning to work/everyday life from holidays, I am more anxious.	2.05	0.87	261	2.15	1.99
Q16i	Return from holidays led to making a real change in working life (e.g. change of hours, a different job, career change).	2.05	0.84	261	2.10	2.01
Q16	Return home and negative reflections	2.49	1.09	261	2.53	2.46
Cronbach's alpha = 0.787						
T-test = 0.905; Sig. (2-tailed) = 0.366 → Sig. (1-tailed) = p = 0.183						

Mean values in this sub-category vary a lot, from 2.05 to 3.87. Mean value for statement Q16g is the highest rated in this sub-category, showing agreement with statement that

respondents do things they love on vacation and that reminds them of what is truly important in their life. They are relatively undecided about whether or not they created better work-life balance upon returning from holidays (Q16j) and if holidays lifted their spirits and how long the effects of that last upon return (Q16f). With the exception of these 3 statements the respondents disagree with the majority of statements in this sub-category, leading to conclusion that upon returning home from holidays respondents did not experience Post vacation syndrome. With the exception of statements Q16g and Q16j, mean values for all of the statements in this section are slightly higher in Group 2 than Group 1.

Reliability of the measurement in this sub-category was verified with a calculation of Cronbach's alpha, which amounted to 0.787. This indicates an acceptable level of reliability and this sub-category being internally consistent.

H9 hypothesis testing: Respondents in Group 1 experienced a higher level of negative reflections upon returning home from holidays than respondents in Group 2.

I tested hypothesis H9 through the analysis of t-test. Since there were 2 independent samples, I conducted Independent Samples T-test through SPSS program. With this test I established whether or not there is a significant difference between means of these 2 groups. I tested the hypothesis on the basis of the results of comparison between Group 1 and Group 2. In Group 1 the mean value for variable Return home and negative reflections (2.53) was slightly lower than in Group 2 (2.46).

The data of Independent Samples T-test is shown in more detail in Appendix CC. Value t was positive ($t=0.905$), which means that the hypothesis could potentially be proved, but Sig. (2-tailed) amounted to 0.366, divided in half for a 1-tailed test amounted to which is a value greater than 0.05 ($p > 0.05$). Based on that, I conclude that there is no statistically significant difference between the 2 groups. Mean values in Group 1 were not higher than mean values in Group 2. On average, respondents in Group 1 did not experience a higher level of negative reflections upon returning home from holidays, than respondents in Group 2 ($t=0.905$; $p=0.183$). The hypothesis could not be proved.

8.7 Research limitations, recommendations for development and future research

It would be ideal for the survey to research among participants of social tourism in Slovenia. As social tourism in Slovenia as a concept and as a system is not developed or in place yet (Švigelj & Cvetek, 2010), I divided participants (families) into 2 groups: the ones that rarely travel and the ones that travel frequently. I learned from ZPMS that their holidays are in majority organised for children from socially weak families. They are more focused on groups, families are not specifically targeted although they should be.

Nevertheless, holidays for families are possible in their facilities, but only when the facilities are unoccupied (out of season). Among the families that rarely travel (Group 1) are families that participated in those kinds of holidays in the last year – ZPMS forwarded the survey to them on my request.

More attention should be given to the concept of social tourism in Slovenia, especially after discovering all the positive impacts it has for the families. Special funds to support young families are not available, there is also no donor campaign on this topic. Some companies help in its specific way, but I think that holidays for low income families should be subsidized (at least a part of it) by the government. At the moment holidays are subsidized only when it comes to sick children or rehabilitations. According to ZPMS there is a problem of limited facilities. One solution for that could be using empty facilities of various hotels, hostels, holiday centres, etc. in the off-season as accommodations for social tourism. Certain facilities could be selected or would volunteer in a special program, where they would allocate a certain percentage of their capacities for social tourism. With filling the capacities in the off-season, such program would also contribute to reducing tourism seasonality.

Of course social tourism is more than just providing the accommodations for families. The holiday centres of ZPMS where families can stay are just that – no activities or animations for children, workshops are not specifically performed, they also do not provide childcare. Childcare should definitely be provided, so parents can spend time with each other. On the other hand, there should be some activities that families can participate in together. Furthermore, there could also be qualified consultants assisting families, providing counselling and support.

There were definitely some research limitations in thesis survey. As stated previously, situation for research among participants of social tourism in Slovenia was not ideal. With the above presented recommendations for its development and developing the concept of social tourism in Slovenia, conditions for measuring its positive and negative impacts could be improved. If it was possible, the participants would answer the first questionnaire before participating in the holidays (before or on their arrival) and the second questionnaire after the holidays (right after or about a month after). That way it could be measured how this (social tourism) holidays really affected them and how their relationships and views changed through this experience. In thesis survey the respondents were able to answer only based on past experience. It would be even more ideal, if instead of the questionnaire, these participants participated in in-depth interviews before and after the holidays. This would of course be more time-consuming, but would provide more detailed information. There is naturally still the risk of respondents not answering truthfully due to several reasons, mainly because of loss of anonymity.

The thesis survey was carried out in May, just after the holidays at the beginning of May. When the respondents were asked when was the last time they went on holidays/trip that lasted at least 3 days, the most common answers were August 2015, May 2016 and February 2016. It comes to mind that maybe the most ideal time to carry out the survey would be in the fall, right after everybody comes back from the summer holidays. On the other hand, participants in social tourism are facing financial difficulties and obviously can not afford holidays in the high season – they would travel mainly off-season. To conclude, the best results would be achieved, if timing of the survey/interviews would be based on each individual case of organized holidays for families.

CONCLUSION

At the beginning of this master's thesis, I developed 9 hypotheses. I wanted to prove that respondents that rarely travel have a higher feeling/level of social deprivation, social exclusion, family holidays as a source of well-being, social capital, family capital, quality of life, uncertainty and anxiety, social stigma and negative reflections upon returning home than respondents that travel frequently. After conducting a survey I was able to prove 4 hypotheses (there was a statistically significant difference between the 2 groups) and unable to prove the other 5. Out of those 5, in 2 instances, the means in Group 1 were higher than in Group 2, but the difference was not big enough to show a statistically significant difference between the 2 groups. In the remaining 3 the means in Group 1 were lower than in Group 2, automatically disproving the hypotheses.

To sum up, the feelings of social deprivation and social exclusion were higher for those that rarely travel. The same respondents also had a higher feeling of uncertainty/anxiety and experienced a higher level of stigmatization than those that travel frequently. Taking the findings from theoretical part into account, this result was to be expected. Non-participation of families in tourism can exacerbate feelings of disadvantage (Richards, 1998), thereby increasing social deprivation, social ills and social exclusion (Quinn & Stacey, 2010). Nevertheless, even with confirming these hypotheses, the level of agreement with statements in thesis survey was not high enough to say with certainty, that respondents were socially deprived and/or excluded.

In the case of uncertainty/anxiety, the foreign research shows that complete inexperience with holidays, even in adulthood, was not uncommon among the beneficiaries of social tourism. Inexperience and lack of knowledge can be linked to increased levels of uncertainty in making (travel) decisions (Minnaert, 2014). The level of agreement in thesis survey shows that respondents were relatively undecided about whether or not they experienced feelings of uncertainty and anxiety associated with going on holidays. A higher stigmatization level in Group 1 was also expected. People do not like their friends to know what kind of income they are on, so participating in social tourism automatically

announces that you must be on a low income (Minnaert, 2014). Nevertheless, the level of stigmatization in both survey groups was very low.

Those that rarely travel also experienced a slightly higher increase in family capital and a higher level of negative reflections upon returning home from holidays than those that travel frequently. Minnaert et al. (2009) study shows an improvement in the family relations of the respondents as one of the clearest outcomes after the return of the respondents from holidays. One month after the holiday, a general improvement in this area was reported, as it positively affected both the children and the parents. Even though the difference between the 2 groups in this survey was expected to be higher there was an expected high level of agreement within both groups that family holidays contributed to increase in family capital. As some researchers caution that social tourism trips can be wrought with uncertainty (Minnaert, 2014), the return home from any holiday can generate negative reflections on lives and relationships (Hall & Brown, 2006). Respondents in this survey experienced low level of negative reflections upon returning home.

Those that travel frequently experienced a slightly higher feeling of family holidays as a source of well-being, a higher increase in social capital and a higher contribution of holidays to their quality of life than respondents that rarely travel. Studies of social tourism in more economically developed countries demonstrate that such holidays provide scope for wider social interaction, leading to increased social capital and self confidence and are a chance for parents to create happy memories for their children and to be part of “normal life” (McCabe, 2009). Respondents in this survey were relatively undecided about whether or not family holidays contributed to increase in their social capital. There is an emerging interest in tourism’s relationship to well-being across a range of disciplines and contexts (McCabe & Johnson, 2013). The level of agreement in connection with this in this survey was slightly higher in Group 2 than in Group 1, and there was no statistically significant difference. Nevertheless, the high level of agreement within both groups was expected – family holidays were a source of well-being. Benefits of social tourism include an opportunity to be free from routine and everyday pressures, to escape unsafe home, and for parents living in poor environments, to “recharge their batteries” and spend quality time with their family (McCabe, 2009; Ghate & Hazel, 2002). The level of agreement in this survey shows that respondents were relatively undecided about whether or not they experienced contribution of holidays to their quality of life.

SLOVENIAN SUMMARY

Socialni turizem se nanaša na iniciative, katerih cilj je na trg turizma vključiti skupine, ki bi bile sicer iz njega izključene (Minnaert, 2014). Hunziker (1951) socialni turizem opisuje kot odnose in fenomen na področju turizma, ki izhaja iz sodelovanja gospodarsko šibkih v potovanjih ali drugače prikrajšanih elementov družbe. Minnaert et al. (2006) dalje pojasnjujejo, da socialni turizem obsega vrsto različnih iniciativ, komercialnih in

nekomercialnih ter vladnih in zasebnih, katerih cilj je nuditi počitniška doživetja skupinam, ki jih drugače ne bi imele.

Minnaert et al. (2006) kot izhodišče za globljo analizo uporabljajo zelo osnovno definicijo socialnega turizma: »turizem z dodano moralno vrednostjo, katerega cilj je bodisi korist gostitelja ali obiskovalca v turistični izmenjavi«. V nasprotju z ostalo turistično industrijo socialni turizem vidi počitnice ne le kot produkt, ampak tudi kot izraz moralnega prepričanja. Počitnice lahko vidimo bodisi kot pravico vsakega posameznika bodisi kot orodje za doseganje ciljev zunaj komercialnega turizma: na primer enakost, socialna vključenost, povečanje neodvisnosti ali gospodarski razvoj za manj razvita območja.

Celo Svetovna turistična organizacija (angl. *World tourism organisation*) v svojem Globalnem etičnem kodeksu v turizmu (angl. *Global Code of Ethics for Tourism*) poudarja univerzalno pravico do turizma in pomen razvoja socialnega turizma, zlasti turizma, ki združuje ljudi, omogoča razširjen dostop do zabave, potovanj in počitniških dejavnosti. Poleg tega poudarja, da je treba spodbujati in omogočiti tudi družinski, mladinski, študentski in upokojenski turizem in turizem za invalide (World Tourism Organization UNWTO, 1999).

Invalidnost je del raznolikosti človeških skupnosti, ne pa del odstopanja od objektivnih norm. Vse skupnosti vsebujejo posameznike s posebnimi potrebami, ocenjeno je, da ima v povprečju 10% prebivalstva neke vrste invalidnost (World Health Organization, 1997). Poleg veliko večjih ekonomskih omejitev obstajajo tudi druge, večje ovire za potovanje, s katerimi se srečujejo ljudje s posebnimi potrebami. Vrhunec teh omejitev je izguba uživanja v turistični izkušnji (Darcy & Daruvalla, 1999). V Sloveniji je ocenjeno, da okoli 8% prebivalstva predstavljajo osebe s posebnimi potrebami. Potujejo lahko prek organizacij in združenj za ljudi s posebnimi potrebami, približno 50% njihovih članov potuje vsako leto (Švigelj & Cvetek, 2010). Eichhorn et al. (2013) poudarjajo pomen turizma za odpornost posameznikov s posebnimi potrebami. Ta posameznikom daje možnost, da delujejo sami in dobijo občutek za svet (Crouch & Coles, 2007). Omogočanje počitnic za invalide je torej tesno povezano s prilagajanjem infrastrukture, ki povečuje dostopnost nastanitev za vse (Tourism Flanders & Brussels, 2009). Pomembno je omeniti tudi, da invalidi kot razlog za neudeležbo ne navajajo svoje invalidnosti pač pa vrsto strukturnih omejitev (Darcy, 2003).

Družine, mladi in upokojenci, ki se soočajo s težkimi finančnimi okoliščinami, so pogosto socialno izključeni, saj nimajo dostopa do komercialnega počitniškega kroga. Študije socialnega turizma jasno dokazujejo njegove pozitivne vplive, še posebej za družine – vendar pa veliko družin (in upokojencev) še vedno ostane na stranskem tiru, ko gre za preživljanje počitnic stran od doma (Tourism Flanders & Brussels, 2009). Nadnacionalni organi, kot so Združeni narodi in Evropska unija (v nadaljevanju EU), državne oblasti,

nevladne agencije in dobrodelne organizacije sposobnost sodelovanja v turizmu vse bolj vidijo kot človekovo pravico in pravico državljanstva. Mnogi dodajajo nezmožnost udeležbe na počitnicah kot kazalec revščine tudi zato, ker so počitnice obravnavane kot sestavni del vsakdanjega načina življenja v bogatih družbah (Sedgley et al., 2012). UNICEF-ovo poročilo navaja, da je revščina otrok več kot le revščina v smislu dohodka. Je tudi revščina priložnosti in pričakovanj, kulturnih in izobraževalnih virov, stanovanj in sosesk, starševske oskrbe in časa, lokalnih storitev in virov skupnosti (UNICEF, 2010). V Sloveniji je ocenjeno, da se vsaj 25% družin sooča s težkimi okoliščinami in da skoraj ne sodelujejo v turizmu zaradi nizkega dohodka (Švigelj & Cvetek, 2010).

Otroci in mladi so še ena ciljna skupina socialnega turizma. V Sloveniji mladi med 18. in 30. letom predstavljajo skoraj 20% prebivalstva, od tega jih okoli 80% hodi na počitnice (Švigelj & Cvetek, 2010). Nacionalna raziskava v Franciji je pokazala, da je stopnja ne-odhoda na počitnice (angl. *non departure rate*) v tej skupini druga najvišja, takoj za upokojenci. To je predvsem zaradi tega, ker pred 18. letom po navadi hodijo na počitnice z družino in imajo pravilno povprečno stopnjo odhoda, po 25. letu pa ta stopnja odhoda spet naraste (HAMS, 2010). Nastanitve, ki so poleti in ob drugih počitnicah najete za mladino, morajo izpolnjevati osnovne kakovostne norme (Tourism Flanders & Brussels, 2009). Raziskave so pokazale znatno povečanje samopodobe in samozavesti med prikrajsanimi mladimi, kar dokazuje, kako izkušnja socialnega turizma prinaša raznolikost mladim iz »omejenih prostorskih svetov« (Quinn & Stacey, 2010).

Ne smemo pozabiti tudi socialnega turizma in njegove vrednosti dobrega počutja za ekonomsko prikrajsane starejše ljudi (Morgan et al., 2015). Trenutno upokojenci predstavljajo približno četrtno slovenskega prebivalstva, okoli 30% jih hodi na počitnice (Švigelj & Cvetek, 2010). V EU je več kot 17% prebivalstva starejšega od 65 let. Ti starejši ljudje so bili prepoznani kot ključni turistični trg, ki prispeva k rastočemu deležu potrošnje. Ekonomski in demografski razvoj zmanjšujeta sistem pokojninskega prihodka med gospodarsko razvitimi gospodarstvi. Zaradi tega znatnemu številu prihajajočih starejših generacij grozi revščina (Ellis et al., 2014). Mnogi evropski in severnoameriški delavci, ki se bodo upokojili po letu 2020, se bodo soočili s stisko v starosti, zaradi česar bodo počitnice manj in ne bolj dostopne za njih (Casey, 2012). Socialni turizem starejšim predstavlja priložnost za pobeg, oddih, druženje, spomine in odkrivanje nove identitete po izgubi zakonskih partnerjev (Morgan et al., 2015). Študije so poudarile, da turizem krepi dobro počutje upokojencev, jih prevzame s prenovljenim občutkom namena in jim olajša prehod iz dela v upokožitev (Hawes, 1988). Prav tako igra vlogo pri ustvarjanju in deljenju spominov, promovira in ohranja dobro duševno počutje starejših, saj spodbuja spomine in krepi socialno interakcijo (Marschall, 2012; Sellick, 2004).

Raziskava o londonskih družinah, ki živijo v revščini, je poudarila vlogo sodelovanja v turizmu in socialne vključenosti. Odkrili so, da izključenost iz turizma v veliki meri

prispeva k izključenosti otrok od vsakdanjih norm, saj so počitnice obravnavane kot del sodobnega britanskega družinskega življenja (Sedgley et al, 2012). Neudeležba na počitnicah tako posledično vodi v zamujene priložnosti. Veliko staršev je izrazilo krivdo, da so njihovi otroci zamudili priložnosti za ustvarjanje srečnih spominov. Otrokovo zavedanje o omejenih možnostih je zaskrbljujoče, zlasti zato, ker se celo zelo majhni otroci lahko zavedajo svoje revščine na način, ki negativno vpliva na njihova stališča in vedenje in lahko celo vodi v nižja pričakovanja v življenju (Field, 2010). Počitnice staršem zagotavljajo priložnost za povezovanje z otroci, izboljšanje počutja ter omogočajo razvoj starševskih odnosov pod manjšim pritiskom in v manj stresnem okolju (Allen, 2011). Koristi počitnic so za družine tako osupljive, da lahko neudeležba zaostri občutek prikrajšanosti (Richards, 1998), s čimer se povečuje socialna prikrajšanost, socialne tegobe in socialna izključenost (Quinn & Stacey, 2010).

Zagotavljanje počitnic za otroke in družine stran od doma je že od sredine 20. stoletja dalje zaznana kot skrb socialnih politik po vsej celinski Evropi. Raziskava v Veliki Britaniji je pokazala, da so s premorom od stresa vsakdanjega življenja v revščini tako starši kot otroci lahko napolnili svoje baterije (Hazel, 2005). Otroci, ki živijo v revščini, imajo enaka družbena in kulturna pričakovanja kot drugi otroci, vodijo jih enake družbene zahteve. Hočejo in morajo se vključiti in pridružiti drugim otrokom (Ridge, 2009). Poleg tega vpliv takšne socialne izključenosti močno čutijo družine z otroci, ki si ne morejo privoščiti počitnic, ki so splošno znane za izboljšanje kakovosti življenja in dobrega počutja (Sedgley et al., 2012). Študije socialnega turizma v ekonomsko bolj razvitih državah kažejo, da takšne počitnice prinašajo možnosti za širšo socialno interakcijo, kar vodi k večjemu socialnemu kapitalu in samozavesti. Predstavljajo tudi priložnost za starše, da ustvarijo vesele spomine za svoje otroke in so del »normalnega življenja« (McCabe, 2009). Počitnice prinašajo razbremenitev in obnovo, zagotavljajo oddih od rutine, razbremenitev stresnih situacij z namenom počitka, premisleka in obnove čustvene moči (Hazel, 2005; English Tourist Board, 1976). Poleg tega obstaja veliko zdravstvenih koristi počitnic, zlasti v duševnem zdravju. 89% zdravnikov v raziskavi trdi, da bi počitnice lahko zmanjšale bolezni, povezane s stresom (English Tourism Council, 2000) in da so počitnice lahko dobre za fizično zdravje (Gump & Matthews, 2000). Obstaja tudi nekaj dokazov, da imajo poletni tabori pozitiven psihološki učinek na otroke, ki trpijo za fizičnimi boleznimi (Balen et al., 1996).

Počitnice imajo velik vpliv na socialno interakcijo in zagotavljajo možnosti za spoznavanje novih ljudi, s posebej podpirajočimi (po možnosti dolgoročnimi) koristmi za starše, ki običajno večino časa preživijo doma (English Tourist Board, 1976). Na počitnicah lahko druženje z drugimi, ki imajo podobne težave ali življenjske sloge, pomaga normalizirati situacijo izoliranosti in povečati socialne spretnosti in samozavest (Amundson et al., 1991; Lewis, 2001). Socialni turizem prispeva tudi k pridobivanju novih izkušenj. To vključuje vrsto novih dejavnosti in različne kulture v tujini (Tarleton, 2002; Lewis, 2001), ki lahko

pripomorejo k spodbuditvi novih hobijev, interesov in razvijajo nove veščine (Amundson et al., 1991). Vse zgoraj naštetu lahko pripomore k dvigovanju posameznikove samozavesti (Lewis, 2001). Še ena prednost socialnega turizma je razvoj neodvisnosti. Počitnice pogosto pomagajo tistim, ki so običajno odvisni, razviti svojo neodvisnost v varnejšem okolju (English Tourist Board, 1976). Preživljanje kvalitetnega časa na počitnicah, stran od stresnih situacij, lahko družine poveže in okrepi družinske odnose (English Tourist Board, 1976; European Commission, 2001). Starši so poročali, da lahko družinske počitnice negujejo odnose tako med partnerjema kot tudi med otroki na način, ki ga običajne rutine in družinske vloge ne omogočajo (Davidson, 1996; Ghate & Hazel, 2002).

Turizem lahko obravnavamo tudi kot potencialno obliko učenja. Ideje iz učnih teorij je mogoče uporabiti tudi za turistične izkušnje. Z vidika eksperimentalnega učenja lahko počitnice udeležencu nudijo možnost, da se sreča z novimi situacijami, se udeleži različnih socialnih interakcij in le-te primerja s svojim lastnim vedenjskim vzorcem (Boydell, 1976). Počitnice lahko prinesejo stik z novimi praksami, ki lahko posledično privedejo do povečanja socialnega kapitala in vedenjskih sprememb (Lesser & Storck, 2001). Poleg tega počitnice bistveno prispevajo k povečanju družinskega kapitala, ki temelji na stabilnosti družine na eni strani in socialnih stikih staršev na drugi. Počitnice lahko prispevajo k obema (Parcel & Dufur, 2001). Raziskava iz leta 2009, ki so jo izvedli Minnaert et al. (2009), kaže, da je izboljšanje družinskih odnosov med vprašanimi eden izmed najbolj vidnih rezultatov po vrnitvi s počitnic.

Nekateri raziskovalci opozarjajo, da so lahko potovanja socialnega turizma v nasprotju z raziskavami, ki predpočitniško pričakovanje identificirajo kot popolnoma pozitivni vidik turistične izkušnje (Gilbert & Abdullah, 2002), prežeta z negotovostjo (Minnaert, 2014), medtem ko lahko po vrnitvi domov s katerikoli počitnic le-te ustvarjajo negativne refleksije na življenje in odnose (Hall & Brown, 2006). To lahko privede tudi do tako imenovanega popočitniškega sindroma (angl. *Post vacation syndrome*, v nadaljevanju PVS) – konec poletja se končajo počitnice, začne se šola in pritiski pri delu. Za PVS je značilna kombinacija razdražljivosti, tesnobe, pomanjkanja motivacije, težav s koncentracijo in občutka praznine, ki lahko traja do nekaj tednov po vrnitvi s počitnic na delo (Beck, 2011).

Raziskave kažejo, da sta neizkušenost in pomanjkanje znanja lahko povezana s povečano stopnjo negotovosti in strahu pri sprejemanju (potovalnih) odločitev. Obstaja primer, raziskava o skupini najstniških mater, v kateri nekatere niso imele predhodnih potovalnih izkušenj. Skupinske počitnice so vključevale aktivnosti samo za matere, s kvalificiranim podpornim osebjem, ki je skrbelo za otroke. Tako so imele matere trenutek za sprostitev. Biti stran od otrok je povzročilo negotovost in strah, saj je bilo to nekaj, na kar večina mater doma ni bila navajena (Minnaert, 2014). Poleg potrebe po jasni definiciji obstajajo

dvomi o tem ali je izraz »socialni turizem« sam po sebi primeren za nadaljnjo promocijo koncepta. Obstaja potreba po razjasnitvi, da bi se izognili stigmatizaciji koncepta in tistih, ki imajo od njega korist (All Party Parliamentary Group on Social Tourism, 2011). Nekateri udeleženci se zavedajo, da lahko takšne počitnice pritegnejo stigmatizacijo. Ljudje nočejo, da njihovi prijatelji vedo, koliko dohodka imajo, tako da sodelovanje v socialnem turizmu avtomatsko razglasa, da imajo nizke dohodke (Minnaert, 2014).

Glavni fokus magistrskega dela so družine v Sloveniji, ki se zaradi nizkega dohodka soočajo s težavami ali pa so kako drugače socialno izključene. Po pogovoru s Petro Zega, strokovno sodelavko ZPMS sem izvedela, da so njihove počitnice v večini organizirane za otroke iz socialno šibkih družin in sicer s strani združenj s počitniškimi objekti. Počitnice za družine so možne v objektih ZPM Krško, ZPM Ljubljana Moste Polje in ZPM Maribor. Po pogovoru z Božidarjem Raušlom, sekretarjem ZPM Maribor sem ugotovila, da je položaj družin v Sloveniji daleč od idealnega. Za razliko počitnic samo za otroke, počitnice za mlade družine niso organizirane. Imajo dva počitniška centra (VIRC Poreč in Dom Miloša Zidanška Pohorje), ki ju lahko družine koristijo, ko nista zasedena, po navadi okoli 1. maja in izjemoma konec avgusta. Poleti (25.6.-24.8.) sta popolnoma zasedena, prav tako tudi med 8.6.-20.6. in 31.8.-11.9., ko organizirajo šole v naravi, torej najbolj privlačni termini niso na voljo. Njihova ciljna skupina niso družine, saj so bolj osredotočeni na skupine. Oba centra sta primerna za družine, ampak le-te raje letujejo v Poreču. Pravega zanimanja za Pohorje ni, lahko bi ga bolje tržili. Posebna sredstva/subvencije za podporo mladih družin niso na voljo, tudi donatorskih kampanj na to temo ni, vendar pa nekatera podjetja pomagajo na svoj poseben način. Počitnice so subvencionirane samo v primerih, ko gre za bolne otroke in rehabilitacijo (razlog za to je bolezen ali invalidnost, običajno pri otrocih, ki potrebujejo prisotnost staršev). Družine, ki se odločijo priti, so v 60% mlade družine. Razlogi, da se odločijo za njihov center so: razpoložljivost, cena, varna lokacija, primerna za otroke in druženje z drugimi. Ko družine pridejo v Poreč, jim predlagajo obiske v sodelovanju s njihovimi partnerji (npr. izlet z ladjico Monvi tours, turistične atrakcije kot so jame Baredine, Aquapart Istralandija in druge), v večini pa svoj prosti čas načrtujejo same (center ponuja samo informativno gradivo). Animacije za otroke in delavnice niso posebej organizirane, prav tako ne zagotavljajo varstva otrok.

Eden od obstoječih podpornih sistemov socialnega turizma za družine v Sloveniji so sindikati. Svojim članom dajejo subvencije in jim tako omogočajo, da lahko potujejo ceneje kot običajno. To pomeni, da člani ne plačajo polne ekonomske cene, ampak samo del, polovico ali celo nič (Sindikalni turizem v Sloveniji, 2015; Švigelj & Cvetek, 2010). Kot je razvidno, socialni turizem v Sloveniji kot koncept in kot sistem še ni razvit, je pa zanimanje zanj med različnimi interesnimi skupinami veliko. Nekateri od njih že imajo pripravljene objekte in storitve za uporabo v socialnem turizmu. Potrebni bi bilo nekaj pomembnih investicij z vidika promoviranja socialnega turizma med zainteresiranimi stranmi (npr. ponudniki ponudbe in storitev, institucije, ki lahko sodelujejo pri socialnem

turizmu, posamezniki, ki se štejejo kot potencialni upravičenci). Analiza podatkov ciljnih skupin je delno dostopna, razen za ciljno skupino »Družine, ki se soočajo s težkimi socialnimi okoliščinami«, za katero obstajajo le omejene informacije. Ciljna skupina ni organizirana ali pokrita s strani katerih koli nevladnih organizacij, vendar je namesto tega tarča različnih ukrepov in številnih institucij (Švigelj & Cvetek, 2010).

Kot je bilo rečeno že prej, je bil namen tega magistrskega dela analizirati pozitivne in negativne vplive socialnega turizma, zlasti na primeru družin s finančnimi težavami v Sloveniji. V ta namen sem preučila koncept socialnega turizma s pomočjo strokovne literature in znanstvenih člankov predvsem tujih strokovnjakov na obravnavanih temah. Da bi kritično ovrednotila pozitivne in negativne vplive socialnega turizma na primeru družin v Sloveniji, sem povzela temeljne ugotovitve na podlagi rezultatov empiričnih raziskav in študij drugih avtorjev. Razložila sem situacijo in delovanje socialnega turizma v Sloveniji in sicer s pomočjo primarne raziskave in javno dostopnih sekundarnih podatkov. Na podlagi poglobljenega teoretičnega in analitičnega pregleda slovenskih in evropskih poročil o socialnem turizmu sem izpostavila še nekaj uspešnih praks v EU.

V nadaljevanju bom pozitivne in negativne vplive socialnega turizma, poudarjene v študijah drugih avtorjev, primerjala z empirično raziskavo in primarnimi podatki, pridobljenimi v sodelovanju z družinami, ki so sodelovale v tej vrsti turizma v Sloveniji. Predstavila bom tudi razlike v percepciji pozitivnih in negativnih vplivov socialnega turizma med družinami, ki redko potujejo in tistimi, ki potujejo pogosto.

S pomočjo spletne strani EnKlikAnketa, ki omogoča prosto oblikovanje spletnih vprašalnikov, sem izvedla anketo preko spleta. Anketa je bila anonimna in izvedena med 8.5.2016 in 25.5.2016 (18 dni). V veliko pomoč mi je bila ZPMS, predvsem ZPM Idrija, saj organizirajo počitnice tako za otroke iz socialno ogroženih družin kot tudi za družine, ki niso socialno ogrožene. Mojo anketo so posredovali staršem otrok, ki so v zadnjem letu sodelovali v tej vrsti počitnic. Prav tako sem dobila velik odziv z deljenjem vprašalnika v številnih zaprtih skupinah na Facebooku, namenjenim družinam, mladim mamam in kakovostnemu preživljanju časa z otroki.

V tem obdobju je raziskavo zaključilo 507 družin, od tega je bilo 269 anket sprejemljivih (238 je bilo le delno zaključenih). Anketo sem sprejela, če so bila vsa vprašanja odgovorjena (z izjemo vprašanja Q15). Iz rezultatov ankete sem ugotovila, da je veliko anketirancev začelo z reševanjem, vendar niso končali. Iz tega lahko sklepam, da je bil vprašalnik predolg ali pa jih je pri reševanju kaj prekinilo in zato niso nadaljevali z odgovarjanjem. Kot sem že omenila, so bile družine v vzorcu razdeljene v 2 skupini, na podlagi vprašanja Q3 (Kako pogosto se odpravljate na počitnice ali potovanja, ki trajajo najmanj 3 dni?). Od 269 sprejemljivih anket je bilo 100 družin takih, ki redko potujejo in 161 takih, ki potujejo pogosto. Preostalih 8 družin je bilo izključenih iz raziskave, saj so

predstavljale skupino, ki potuje zelo pogosto (od 6 do več kot 10-krat letno). Niso sodile v nobeno od drugih dveh skupin, ampak jih je bilo premalo, da bi tvorile svojo skupino. Rezultati preostalih 261 družin so predstavljeni v nadaljevanju.

Na podlagi vprašanja Q3 je bila sestava 2 skupin naslednja:

- Skupino 1 (angl. *Group 1*) predstavljajo družine, ki redko potujejo in je sestavljena iz anketirancev, ki so odgovorili, da ne hodijo na počitnice/potovanja, gredo vsakih nekaj let ali enkrat letno. Ta skupina je sestavljena iz 100 družin (38,32 % vseh sprejemljivih anket). 62 % anketirancev v tej skupini je odgovorilo, da so se v zadnjih 5 letih (vsaj enkrat) odpovedali počitnicam, 59,49 % jih je še pojasnilo, da so bili razlogi za to finančni.
- Skupino 2 (angl. *Group 2*) predstavljajo družine, ki pogosto potujejo in je sestavljena iz anketirancev, ki so odgovorili, da gredo na počitnice nekje med 2 do 5-krat na leto. Ta skupina je sestavljena iz 161 družin (61,68 % vseh sprejemljivih anket). 40,37 % anketirancev v tej skupini je odgovorilo, da so se v zadnjih 5 letih (vsaj enkrat) odpovedali počitnicam, kar je manj kot v Skupini 1. 47,19 % jih je še pojasnilo, da so razlogi za to finančni.

V raziskavi sem primerjala percepcijo pozitivnih in negativnih vplivov sodelovanja v turizmu in socialnem turizmu na primeru v družin v Sloveniji. Hkrati sem primerjala tudi razlike v percepciji pozitivnih in negativnih vplivov med družinami, ki redko potujejo in tistimi, ki potujejo pogosto. Zbirala sem podatke o zakonskem stanu, zaposlitvenem statusu, starosti staršev, številu in starosti otrok, kako pogosto gredo na počitnice in ali so se jim v zadnjih petih letih kdaj odpovedali. V nadaljevanju je bil vprašalnik sestavljen iz 3 glavnih kategorij: neudeležba na počitnicah, pozitivni vplivi in negativni vplivi socialnega turizma. Vsaka kategorija je bila sestavljena iz določenega števila podkategorij, ki so bile sestavljene iz določenega števila izjav. Odgovarjanje je temeljilo na ocenjevanju strinjanja/nestrinjanja z danimi izjavami (na podlagi 5-stopenjske Likertove lestvice).

Na začetku magistrskega dela sem postavila 9 hipotez. Želela sem dokazati, da imajo anketiranci, ki redko potujejo večji občutek/višjo raven prikrajšanosti, socialne izključenosti, družinskih počitnic kot vir dobrega počutja, socialnega kapitala, družinskega kapitala, kakovosti življenja, negotovosti in strahu, stigmatizacije in negativnih refleksij ob vrnitvi s počitnic, kot anketiranci, ki pogosto potujejo. Hipoteze sem preizkušala na naslednji način: vsako podkategorijo je sestavljalo določeno število izjav, ki so temeljile na ugotovitvah empiričnih rezultatov raziskav in študij drugih avtorjev. Poleg povprečne vrednosti vsake izjave sem izračunala tudi novo spremenljivko (npr. Prikrajšanost, Socialna izključenost, itd.) kot povprečno vrednost vseh izjav v tej podkategoriji, za celoten vzorec in ločeno za vsako skupino posebej (Skupina 1 in Skupina 2). To je predstavljalo celotno uvrstitev te podkategorije in je bilo osnova za preizkušanje hipotez.

Hipoteze sem preizkušala s pomočjo t-testa. Ker je šlo za 2 neodvisna vzorca, sem izvedla t-test neodvisnih vzorcev (angl. *Independent samples t-test*) s pomočjo programa SPSS. S tem testom sem ugotavljala ali je obstajala statistično značilna razlika med povprečnimi vrednostmi teh dveh skupin. Hipoteze sem preizkušala na podlagi primerjave rezultatov med Skupino 1 in Skupino 2. Najprej sem preverila vrednost »Sig. Value« v Testu neodvisnih vzorcev – če je bila večja od 0,05, sem brala iz zgornje vrstice. Poleg tega, če je bila vrednost *t* (angl. *t value*) negativna, je to pomenilo, da je povprečna vrednost v Skupini 1 nižja od povprečja v Skupini 2. S tem bi avtomatično ovrgla hipotezo. Če je bila vrednost *t* pozitivna, je to pomenilo, da je povprečna vrednost v Skupini 1 višja od povprečne vrednosti v Skupini 2. Pogledala sem vrednost »Sig. (2-tailed)« razdelku »t-test for Equality of Means« in jo delila z dve, da sem dobila enodelni test »1-tailed test«. To sem naredila zato, ker nisem želela potrditi samo, da sta bili vrednosti v dveh skupinah različni, ampak tudi, da so bile povprečne vrednosti v Skupini 1 višje kot v Skupini 2. Če je bila torej vrednost v »1-tailed test« večja od 0,05, ni bilo statistično značilne razlike in hipoteze ni bilo mogoče potrditi. Če je bila vrednost v »1-tailed test« manjša ali enaka 0,05, je bila povprečna vrednost v eni skupini večja od druge, odkrita je bila statistično značilna razlika – hipoteza je bila potrjena (Gray & Kinnear, 2012).

Po izvedbi ankete sem potrdila 4 hipoteze (odkrita je bila statistično značilna razlika med skupinama) in bila nezmožna potrditi ostalih 5. Od teh petih, je bila v dveh primerih povprečna vrednost v Skupini 1 višja kot v Skupini 2, vendar razlika ni bila dovolj velika, da bi pokazala statistično značilno razliko med skupinama. V ostalih treh primerih so bile povprečne vrednosti v Skupini 1 nižje kot v Skupini 2, s čimer sem lahko že avtomatično ovrgla hipotezo.

Če povzamem, občutki prikrajšanosti in socialne izključenosti so bili višji pri tistih, ki redko potujejo. Isti anketiranci so imeli tudi višji občutek negotovosti / strahu in doživeli večjo stopnjo stigmatizacije kot tisti, ki potujejo pogosto. Če upoštevam ugotovitve iz teoretičnega dela, je bil tak rezultat pričakovan. Neudeležba družin v turizmu lahko zaostri občutek prikrajšanosti (Richards, 1998), s čimer se povečuje socialna prikrajšanost, socialne tegobe in socialna izključenost (Quinn & Stacey, 2010). Kljub temu da sem uspela potrditi hipoteze, stopnja strinjanja z izjavami v anketi magistrskega dela ni bila dovolj visoka, da bi se lahko z gotovostjo reklo, da so bili anketiranci socialno ogroženi in / ali izključeni.

V primeru negotovosti in strahu tuje raziskave kažejo, da popolna neizkušnost s počitnicami tudi v odrasli dobi ni bila nič nenavadnega med upravičenci do socialnega turizma. Neizkušnost in pomanjkanje znanja je mogoče povezati s povečano stopnjo negotovosti pri sprejemanju (potovalnih) odločitev (Minnaert, 2014). Stopnja strinjanja v anketi magistrskega dela kaže, da so anketiranci dokaj neodločeni o tem ali so se soočali z

občutkom negotovosti in strahu povezanim z odhodom na počitnice. Pričakovana je bila tudi višja stopnja stigmatizacije v Skupini 1. Ljudje nočejo, da njihovi prijatelji vedo kolikšne dohodke imajo, sodelovanje v socialnem turizmu pa avtomatsko napoveduje, da so le-ti nizki (Minnaert, 2014). Kljub temu je bil nivo stigmatizacije v obeh skupinah v raziskavi zelo nizek.

Med tistimi, ki redko potujejo, je prišlo tudi do nekoliko večjega povečanja družinskega kapitala in višjo raven negativnih refleksij ob vrnitvi s počitnic kot med tistimi, ki potujejo pogosto. Študija Minnaert et al. (2009) kaže izboljšanje družinskih odnosov sodelujočih kot enega izmed najbolj jasnih rezultatov po vrnitvi s počitnic. En mesec po počitnicah so poročali o splošnem izboljšanju na tem področju, saj so pozitivno vplivale tako na otroke kot na starše. Čeprav sem v anketi magistrskega dela pričakovala večjo razliko med tema dvema skupinama, je bila dosežena pričakovana visoka stopnja strinjanja v obeh skupinah. Nekateri raziskovalci opozarjajo, da so lahko potovanja socialnega turizma polna negotovosti (Minnaert, 2014), poleg tega pa lahko vrnitev domov iz katerihkoli počitnic ustvari negativne refleksije, odzive na življenje in odnose (Hall & Brown, 2006). Anketiranci v magistrskem delu so doživeli nizko stopnjo negativnih refleksij ob vrnitvi domov.

Tisti, ki potujejo pogosto, so imeli nekoliko večji občutek družinskih počitnic kot vir dobrega počutja, večje povečanje socialnega kapitala in večji prispevek počitnic k kakovosti njihovega življenja kot tisti, ki potujejo redko. Študije socialnega turizma v ekonomsko bolj razvitih državah kažejo, da takšne počitnice zagotavljajo možnosti za širše socialne interakcije, kar vodi k večji samozavesti. To predstavlja priložnost za starše, da ustvarijo vesele spomine za svoje otroke in so del »normalnega življenja« (McCabe, 2009). Anketiranci v magistrskem delu so bilo razmeroma neodločeni o tem, ali so družinske počitnice prispevale k povečanju socialnega kapitala. V najrazličnejših disciplinah in kontekstih obstaja naraščajoč interes v odnosu turizma z dobrim počutjem (McCabe & Johnson, 2013). Raven strinjanja v zvezi s tem v anketi magistrskega dela je bila nekoliko višja v Skupini 2 kot v Skupini 1, prav tako ni bilo statistično značilne razlike. Kljub temu je bila dosežena visoka stopnja strinjanja znotraj obeh skupin – družinske počitnice so vir dobrega počutja. Prednosti socialnega turizma vključujejo možnost biti brez rutine in vsakodnevnih pritiskov, pobegniti nevarnostim doma in za starše, ki živijo v revnih okoljih, »napolniti baterije« in možnost preživljanja kakovostnega časa s svojo družino (McCabe, 2009; Ghate & Hazel, 2002). Raven strinjanja v anketi magistrskega dela kaže, da so vprašani dokaj neodločeni o tem, ali so občutili prispevek počitnic k kakovosti njihovega življenja.

REFERENCE LIST

1. *About Slovenian tourist board.* Retrieved February 5, 2016, from <http://m.slovenia.info/en/slovenian-tourist-board-stb>
2. *About Šent.* Retrieved February 7, 2016, from http://www.sent.si/index.php?m_id=english
3. *About us.* Retrieved January 12, 2016, from <http://www.gingerbread.org.uk/content/428/About-us>
4. *About ZDUS.* Retrieved March 5, 2016, from <http://www.zdus-zveza.si/index.php?id=3&lang=en>
5. Akis, S., Peristianis, N., & Warner, J. (1996). Residents' attitudes to tourism development: the case of Cyprus. *Tourism management*, 17(7), 481-494.
6. All Party Parliamentary Group on Social Tourism. (2011). *Giving Britain a Break: Inquiry into the social and economic benefits of social tourism*. London: APPG Social Tourism.
7. Allen, G. (2011). *Early Intervention, The Next Steps*. London: HM Government.
8. Amundson, R., Dyer, L., Henderson, W., & Rathbone-McCuan, E. (1991). Vacation therapy: A community normalization experience for persons with long-term mental illness. *Psychosocial Rehabilitation Journal*, 14(3), 81.
9. Andereck, K. L., Valentine, K. M., Knopf, R. C., & Vogt, C. A. (2005). Residents' perceptions of community tourism impacts. *Annals of tourism research*, 32(4), 1056-1076.
10. Anon. (1993). Public Opinion Survey on the Life of the Nation. *News from Japan*, 42, 4-6.
11. *Areas of work.* Retrieved February 4, 2016, from http://www.mgrt.gov.si/en/areas_of_work/tourism/
12. Argyris, C., & Schön, D. (1978). *Reasoning, learning, and action*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
13. *ATRIS d.o.o. Ljubljana.* Retrieved February 9, 2017, from <http://www.bizi.si/ATRIS-D-O-O-LJUBLJANA/>
14. Baelz, P. (1982). *Ethics and belief*. London: Sheldon Press.
15. Balen, R., Fielding, D., & Lewis, I. (1996). Activity camps for children with cancer. *Children & Society*, 10(4), 317-323.
16. Barrera Jr, M. (1986). Distinctions between social support concepts, measures, and models. *American journal of community psychology*, 14(4), 413-445.
17. Beck, M. (2011, September 6). The Post-Labor Day Letdown. *The Wall Street Journal*. Retrieved June 10, 2015, from <http://www.wsj.com/articles/SB10001424053111903648204576552652359497910>
18. Bélanger, C. É., & Jolin, L. (2011). The International Organisation of Social Tourism (ISTO) working towards a right to holidays and tourism for all. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 14(5), 475-482.

19. Belisle, F. J., & Hoy, D. R. (1980). The perceived impact of tourism by residents a case study in Santa Marta, Colombia. *Annals of tourism research*, 7(1), 83-101.
20. Besculides, A., Lee, M. E., & McCormick, P. J. (2002). Residents' perceptions of the cultural benefits of tourism. *Annals of tourism research*, 29(2), 303-319.
21. Bestard, A. B., & Nadal, J. R. (2007). Modelling environmental attitudes toward tourism. *Tourism Management*, 28(3), 688-695.
22. Bluebond-Langner, M., Perkel, D., Goertzel, T., Nelson, K., & McGeary, J. (1990). Children's knowledge of cancer and its treatment: impact of an oncology camp experience. *The Journal of pediatrics*, 116(2), 207-213.
23. Bluebond-Langer, M., Perkel, D., & Goertzel, T. (1991). Pediatric cancer patients' peer relationships: The impact of an oncology camp experience. *Journal of Psychosocial Oncology*, 9(2), 67-80.
24. Boorstin, D. (1964). *The Image: A Guide to Pseudo-Events in America*. New York: Harper and Row.
25. Boydell, T. (1976). *Experiential learning*. Manchester: Department of Adult Education, University of Manchester.
26. Bradley, I. (1985). An "Outsider's" Perspective on American Summer Camps. *Journal of Experiential Education*, 8(1), 28-29.
27. Bradshaw, J., & Millar, J. (1991). *Lone parent families in the UK*. London: HMSO.
28. Brown, L. (2009). The transformative power of the international sojourn: An ethnographic study of the international student experience. *Annals of tourism research*, 36(3), 502-521.
29. Brunt, P., & Courtney, P. (1999). Host perceptions of sociocultural impacts. *Annals of tourism Research*, 26(3), 493-515.
30. Burkitt, I. (2008). *Social selves: Theories of self and society*. London: Sage.
31. Card, J. A., Cole, S. T., & Humphrey, A. H. (2006). A comparison of the accessibility and attitudinal barriers model: Travel providers and travelers with physical disabilities. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 11(2), 161-175.
32. Casey, B. H. (2012). The implications of the economic crisis for pensions and pension policy in Europe. *Global Social Policy*, 12(3), 246-265.
33. Cawson, P., Wattam, C., Brooker, S., & Kelly, G. (2000). *Child maltreatment in the United Kingdom: a study of the prevalence of abuse and neglect*. London: NSPCC.
34. Cerezo, J. M., & Lara de Vicente, F. (2005). El turismo como industria de España y de la Unión Europea [Tourism as an industry of Spain and the European Union]. *Turismo Sostenible: un enfoque multidisciplinar e internacional*. Córdoba: Universidad de Córdoba.
35. Chen, J. S. (2000). An investigation of urban residents' loyalty to tourism. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 24(1), 5-19.
36. Chryssides, G., & Kaler, J. (1993). *An introduction to business ethics*. London: International Thompson Business Press.

37. Chunn, D. E., & Gavigan, S. A. (2004). Welfare law, welfare fraud, and the moral regulation of the "never deserving" poor. *Social & legal studies*, 13(2), 219-243.
38. Church, A., & Coles, T. (2006). *Tourism, power and space*. Oxon: Routledge.
39. Cohen, S., & Wills, T. A. (1985). Stress, social support, and the buffering hypothesis. *Psychological bulletin*, 98(2), 310-357.
40. Cole, S., & Morgan, N. (2010). *Tourism and inequality: Problems and prospects*. Oxford: CABI.
41. Conger, R. D., Ge, X., Elder, G. H., Lorenz, F. O., & Simons, R. L. (1994). Economic stress, coercive family process, and developmental problems of adolescents. *Child development*, 65(2), 541-561.
42. Dann, G. M. (2001). Senior tourism and quality of life. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 28(1), 235-238.
43. Darcy, S. (2003). *Disabling journeys: The tourism patterns of people with impairments in Australia*. Sydney: University of Technology.
44. Darcy, S., & Daruwalla, P. S. (1999). The trouble with travel: people with disabilities and tourism. *Social Alternatives*, 18(1), 41.
45. Darcy, S., & Dickson, T. J. (2009). A whole-of-life approach to tourism: The case for accessible tourism experiences. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 16(01), 32-44.
46. Davidson, P. (1996). The holiday and work experiences of women with young children. *Leisure Studies*, 15(2), 89-103.
47. De Bloom, J., Geurts, S. A., & Kompier, M. A. (2013). Vacation (after-) effects on employee health and well-being, and the role of vacation activities, experiences and sleep. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 14(2), 613-633.
48. De Vries, J., & Van Heck, G. L. (1997). The World Health Organization Quality of Life Assessment Instrument (WHOQOL-100): Validation study with the Dutch version. *European journal of psychological assessment*, 13(3), 164
49. Deakin, N., Davis, A., & Thomas, N. (1995). *Public welfare services and social exclusion. The development of consumer-oriented initiatives in the European Union*. Dublin: European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working.
50. Diener, E. (1984). Subjective well-being. *Psychological Bulletin*, 95, 542-575.
51. Dietz, T. L. (2000). Disciplining children: characteristics associated with the use of corporal punishment. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 24(12), 1529-1542.
52. *Disabled, war veterans, victims of war*. Retrieved February 6, 2016, from http://www.mddsz.gov.si/en/areas_of_work/invalidi_vzv/
53. Dolnicar, S., Yanamandram, V., & Cliff, K. (2012). The contribution of vacations to quality of life. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 39(1), 59-83.
54. Eichhorn, V., Miller, G., & Tribe, J. (2013). Tourism: a site of resistance strategies of individuals with a disability. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 43, 578-600.
55. Ellis, C. D., Munnell, A. H., & Eschtruth, A. D. (2014). *Falling Short: The Coming Retirement Crisis and What to Do About It*. Oxford University Press.

56. English Tourism Council. (2000). *Just What the Doctor Ordered*. London: English Tourism Council.
57. English Tourist Board. (1974). *Quantitative Survey of Wage Earners' Holiday Expectations and Needs*. London: English Tourist Board.
58. English Tourist Board. (1976). *Holidays: The Social Need*. London: English Tourist Board.
59. European Commission. (2001). *Outcome of the European Ministerial Conference "Tourism for All"*. Brussels: European Commission.
60. European Commission. (2012). *Flash Eurobarometer 334: Attitudes of Europeans towards tourism report*. Conducted by TNS Political & Social at the request of Directorate-General for Enterprise. Brussels: European Commission.
61. European Commission. (2013). *Flash Eurobarometer 370: Attitudes of Europeans towards tourism report*. Conducted by TNS Political & Social at the request of the European Commission, Directorate-General for Enterprise and Industry. Brussels: European Commission.
62. European Commission. (2014a). *Tourism industry sub-sectors, Country report Slovenia*. Retrieved February 10, 2015, from http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/tourism/tourism-business-portal/documents/business/internationalisation/slovenia_country_report.pdf
63. European Commission. (2014b). *Flash Eurobarometer 392: Preferences of Europeans towards tourism report*. Conducted by TNS Political & Social at the request of the European Commission, Directorate-General for Enterprise and Industry. Brussels: European Commission.
64. European Commission. (2015). *Flash Eurobarometer 414: Preferences of Europeans towards tourism report*. Conducted by TNS Political & Social at the request of the European Commission, Directorate-General for Internal market, Industry, Entrepreneurship and SMEs. Brussels: European Commission.
65. European Commission. (2016a). *Flash Eurobarometer 432: Preferences of Europeans towards tourism report*. Conducted by TNS Political & Social at the request of the European Commission, Directorate-General for Internal market, Industry, Entrepreneurship and SMEs. Brussels: European Commission.
66. Ramboll Management Consulting, Détente consultants, & Labour Asociados. (2010, July 16). *Calypso Study Final Report*. Retrieved December 14, 2014, from <http://biblioteca.turismoalgarve.pt/getmedia.aspx?guid=cd3155c09c78d3057b5891fe9052f7ac>
67. European Commission, DG Enterprise, & Industry. (2011). *Calypso means tourism for all*. Luxembourg: Publications office of the European Union.
68. European Economic and Social Committee. (2006). *Opinion of the European Economic and Social committee on Social Tourism in Europe*. Brussels: EESC.
69. Family. Retrieved February 6, 2016, from http://www.mddsz.gov.si/en/areas_of_work/family/

70. Family Holiday Association. (2009). *Family breaks mean the world. Review of 2009*. London: Family Holiday Association.
71. Family Holiday Association. (2012). *How we work with families*. Retrieved June 9, 2015, from <http://www.familyholidayassociation.org.uk/subpage-148-how-we-work-with-families>
72. Field, F. (2010). *The Foundation Years: preventing poor children becoming poor adults*. London: HM Government.
73. Fridgen, J. D. (1984). Environmental psychology and tourism. *Annals of tourism research*, 11(1), 19-39.
74. García, F. A., Vázquez, A. B., & Macías, R. C. (2015). Resident's attitudes towards the impacts of tourism. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 13, 33-40.
75. George, S. (1999). A short history of neo-liberalism. *Proceeding 24: Conference on Economic Sovereignty in a Globalising World*.
76. Ghate, D., & Hazel, N. (2002). *Parenting in poor environments: Stress, support and coping*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
77. Gilbert, D., & Abdullah, J. (2002). A study of the impact of the expectation of a holiday on an individual's sense of well-being. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 8(4), 352-361.
78. Gilbert, D., & Abdullah, J. (2004). Holiday taking and the sense of well-being. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 31(1), 103-121.
79. Gram, M. (2005). Family holidays. A qualitative analysis of family holiday experiences. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 5(1), 2-22.
80. Gray, C. D., & Kinnear, P. R. (2012). *IBM SPSS statistics 19 made simple*. New York: Psychology Press.
81. Green, F., & Potepan, M. J. (1988). Vacation Time and Unionism in the US and Europe. *Industrial Relations: A Journal of Economy and Society*, 27(2), 180-194.
82. Gump, B. B., & Matthews, K. A. (2000). Are vacations good for your health? The 9-year mortality experience after the multiple risk factor intervention trial. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 62(5), 608-612.
83. Gursoy, D., Jurowski, C., & Uysal, M. (2002). Resident attitudes: A structural modeling approach. *Annals of tourism research*, 29(1), 79-105.
84. Gursoy, D., & Rutherford, D. G. (2004). Host attitudes toward tourism: An improved structural model. *Annals of tourism Research*, 31(3), 495-516.
85. Hagger, C., & Murray, D. (2013). Anticipating a flourishing future with tourism experiences. *Tourist Experience and Fulfilment: Insights from Positive Psychology*, 31, 186.
86. Haley, A. J., Snaith, T., & Miller, G. (2005). The Social Impacts of Tourism: A Case Study of Bath, UK. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 32(3), 647-668.
87. Hall, D. R., & Brown, F. (2006). *Tourism and welfare: Ethics, responsibility and sustained well-being*. Wallingford: CABI.

88. Hammack, P. L. (2008). Narrative and the cultural psychology of identity. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 12(3), 222-247.
89. HAMS. (2010, March 17). *Calypso Study Compendium of Good Practices*. Retrieved December 14, 2014, from <http://ec.europa.eu/DocsRoom/documents/6928/attachments/1/translations/en/renditions/pdf>
90. Haralambopoulos, N., & Pizam, A. (1996). Perceived impacts of tourism: The case of Samos. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 23(3), 503-526.
91. Harsanyi, J. C. (1985). Rule utilitarianism, equality, and justice. *Social Philosophy and Policy*, 2(2), 115-127.
92. Haukeland, J. V. (1990). Non-travelers: The flip side of motivation. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 17(2), p. 172-184.
93. Haulot, A. (1981). Social tourism: current dimensions and future developments. *International Journal of Tourism Management*, 2(3), 207-212.
94. Haulot, A. (1983). International bureau of social tourism. *Annals of tourism research*, 10(4), 558-560.
95. Hawes, D. K. (1988). Travel-related lifestyle profiles of older women. *Journal of Travel Research*, 27(2), 22-32.
96. Hazel, N. (2005). Holidays for children and families in need: an exploration of the research and policy context for social tourism in the UK. *Children & Society*, 19(3), 225-236.
97. Higgins-Desbiolles, F. (2006). More than an “industry”: The forgotten power of tourism as a social force. *Tourism Management*, 27(6), 1192-1208.
98. Hislop, J., & Arber, S. (2006). Sleep, Gender, and Aging. *Age matters: Realigning feminist thinking*, 165.
99. Hobson, J. P., & Dietrich, U. C. (1995). Tourism, health and quality of life: Challenging the responsibility of using the traditional tenets of sun, sea, sand, and sex in tourism marketing. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 3(4), 21-38.
100. Home. Retrieved February 9, 2017, from <http://en.zpms.si/home/>
101. Horna, J. L. (1993). Married life and leisure: A multidimensional study of couples. *World Leisure & Recreation*, 35(3), 17-21.
102. Hughes, H. L. (1991). Holidays and the economically disadvantaged. *Tourism management*, 12(3), 193-196.
103. Hunter-Jones, P. (2004). Young people, holiday-taking and cancer—an exploratory analysis. *Tourism Management*, 25(2), 249-258.
104. Hunter-Jones, P., & Blackburn, A. (2007). Understanding the relationship between holiday taking and self-assessed health: an exploratory study of senior tourism. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 31(5), 509-516.
105. Hunziker, W. (1951). *Social tourism: Its nature and problems*. Geneva: International Tourists Alliance Scientific Commission.

106. Inštitut Republike Slovenije za socialno varstvo. (2009). *Revščina in socialna izključenost med družinami z otroki: materialni in nematerialni obraz revščine – zaključno poročilo* [Poverty and social exclusion among families with children: material and immaterial face of poverty – final report]. Ljubljana: Ministrstvo za delo, družino in socialne zadeve.
107. Iso-Ahola, S. E. (1980). *The Social psychological of leisure and recreation*. Iowa: Brown Co.
108. Jafari, J. (1986). A systemic view of sociocultural dimensions of tourism. *President's commission on American outdoors, Tourism*. Washington, DC: United States Travel and Tourism Administration.
109. Johnson, C. M. (2001). A survey of current research on online communities of practice. *The internet and higher education*, 4(1), 45-60.
110. Johnson, J. D., Snepenger, D. J., & Akis, S. (1994). Residents' perceptions of tourism development. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 21(3), 629-642.
111. Kakteniece, G. (2010, February 15). *Calypso Study on Social Tourism Latvia*. Retrieved June 9, 2015, from http://sete.gr/_fileuploads/entries/Online%20library/GR/110125_Calypso%20study%20on%20Social%20tourism_Latvia.pdf
112. Kelly, J. R. (1985). *Recreation business*. New York: Wiley.
113. Kelly, J. R., & Kelly, J. R. (1994). Multiple dimensions of meaning in the domains of work, family, and leisure. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 26(3), 250.
114. King, B., Pizam, A., & Milman, A. (1993). Social impacts of tourism: Host perceptions. *Annals of tourism Research*, 20(4), 650-665.
115. Knapp, M. (1984). *The economics of social care*. London: Macmillian Publishers.
116. Komppula, R., Ilves, R., & Airey, D. (2016). Social holidays as a tourist experience in Finland. *Tourism Management*, 52, 521-532.
117. Korca, P. (1996). Resident attitudes toward tourism impacts. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 23(3), 695-726.
118. Krippendorff, J. (1989). *The holiday-makers: Understanding the impact of travel and tourism*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.
119. Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge university press.
120. Layard, R. (2006). *Happiness: Lessons from a new science*. Oxford: Penguin.
121. Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress, appraisal, and coping*. New York: Springer publishing company.
122. Lee, D. J., & Sirgy, M. J. (1995). Determinants of involvement in the consumer/marketing life domain in relation to quality of life: A theoretical model and research agenda. *Development in quality of life studies in marketing*, 13-18.
123. Lee, S. H., & Tideswell, C. (2005). Understanding attitudes towards leisure travel and the constraints faced by senior Koreans. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 11(3), 249-263.

124. Lehto, X. Y., Choi, S., Lin, Y. C., & MacDermid, S. M. (2009). Vacation and family functioning. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 36(3), 459-479.
125. Lesser, E. L., & Storck, J. (2001). Communities of practice and organizational performance. *IBM systems journal*, 40(4), 831-841.
126. Lewis, E. (2001). *Evaluation of the benefits of recreational holidays for young people in public care*. London: National Children's Bureau.
127. Lindberg, K., & Johnson, R. L. (1997). Modeling resident attitudes toward tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 24(2), 402-424.
128. Liu, J. C., & Var, T. (1986). Resident attitudes toward tourism impacts in Hawaii. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 13(2), 193-214.
129. Lord, E., & Patterson, I. (2008). The benefits of physically active leisure for people with disabilities: An Australian perspective. *Annals of Leisure Research*, 11(1-2), 123-144.
130. *Low season tourism*. Retrieved February 28, 2016, from http://ec.europa.eu/growth/sectors/tourism/offer/seniors-youth_it
131. Lyubomirsky, S., & Lepper, H. S. (1999). A measure of subjective happiness: Preliminary reliability and construct validation. *Social indicators research*, 46(2), 137-155.
132. MacCannell, D. (1976). *The tourist: A new theory of the leisure class*. London: Macmillan.
133. Major, V. S., Klein, K. J., & Ehrhart, M. G. (2002). Work time, work interference with family, and psychological distress. *Journal of applied psychology*, 87(3), 427.
134. Marjoribanks, K. (1998). Family capital, children's individual attributes, and adolescents' aspirations: A follow-up analysis. *The Journal of psychology*, 132(3), 328-336.
135. Marschall, S. (2012). "Personal memory tourism" and a wider exploration of the tourism – memory nexus. *Journal of Tourism and Cultural Change*, 10(4), 321-335.
136. Marx, K. (1981). *Capital: A critique of political economy*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
137. Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1967). *The Communist manifesto*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
138. McCabe, S. (2009). Who needs a holiday? Evaluating social tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 36(4), 667-688.
139. McCabe, S., & Johnson, S. (2013). The happiness factor in tourism: Subjective well-being and social tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 41, 42-65.
140. McCabe, S., Minnaert, L., & Diekmann, A. (2011). Social tourism in Europe: Theory and practice. *Channel View Publications*, 52.
141. McLeod, J. D., & Shanahan, M. J. (1993). Poverty, parenting, and children's mental health. *American sociological review*, 58, 351-366.
142. Meeberg, G. A. (1993). Quality of life: a concept analysis. *Journal of advanced nursing*, 18(1), 32-38.

143. Minnaert, L. (2014). Social tourism participation: The role of tourism inexperience and uncertainty. *Tourism Management*, 40, 282-289.
144. Minnaert, L., Maitland, R., & Miller, G. (2006). Social tourism and its ethical foundations. *Tourism, Culture and Communication*, 7(12), 7-17.
145. Minnaert, L., Maitland, R., & Miller, G. (2009). Tourism and Social Policy: The Value of Social Tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 36(2), 316-334.
146. Minnaert, L., Maitland, R., & Miller, G. (2013). *Social Tourism: Perspectives and Potential*. Abingdon: Routledge.
147. Morgan, N., Pritchard, A., & Sedgley, D. (2015). Social tourism and well-being in later life. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 52, 1-15.
148. Naef, R., Ward, R., Mahrer-Imhof, R., & Grande, G. (2013). Characteristics of the bereavement experience of older persons after spousal loss: An integrative review. *International journal of nursing studies*, 50(8), 1108-1121.
149. Nawijn, J., Marchand, M. A., Veenhoven, R., & Vingerhoets, A. J. (2010). Vacationers happier, but most not happier after a holiday. *Applied Research in Quality of Life*, 5(1), 35-47.
150. Neal, J. D., Sirgy, M. J., & Uysal, M. (2004). Measuring the effect of tourism services on travelers' quality of life: Further validation. *Social Indicators Research*, 69(3), 243-277.
151. Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory*. New York: MacGraw-Hill.
152. Office of the Republic of Slovenia for youth. (2016). *About us*. Retrieved February 6, 2016, from <http://www.ursm.gov.si/en/>
153. *Ohranjevanje zdravja* [Maintaining health]. Retrieved March 5, 2016, from <http://www.zveza-gns.si/ohranjevanje-zdravja/>
154. Omerzel, D. G. (2006). Competitiveness of Slovenia as a tourist destination. *Managing Global Transitions*, 4(2), 167-189.
155. Orthner, D. K., & Mancini, J. A. (1990). Leisure impacts on family interaction and cohesion. *Journal of leisure research*, 22(2), 125-137.
156. Otto, J. E., & Ritchie, J. B. (1996). The service experience in tourism. *Tourism management*, 17(3), 165-174.
157. Parcel, T. L., & Dufur, M. J. (2001). Capital at home and at school: Effects on student achievement. *Social Forces*, 79(3), 881-911.
158. Pascale, R. T., & Athos, A. G. (1986). *The Art of Japanese Management*. London: Penguin.
159. Pelton, L. H. (1978). Child abuse and neglect: the myth of classlessness. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 48(4), 608-617.
160. Pelton, L. H. (1981). *The social context of child abuse and neglect*. New York: Human Sciences Press.
161. *Platform Network for European Youth Activities*. Retrieved March 15, 2015, from <http://www.platform-network.com/>
162. *Projects*. Retrieved February 9, 2017, from <http://en.zpms.si/projects/>

163. Quinn, B., & Stacey, J. (2010). The benefits of holidaying for children experiencing social exclusion: recent Irish evidence. *Leisure Studies*, 29(1), 29-52.
164. Ramboll. (2010, May 11). *Calypso Study on Social Tourism Austria*. Retrieved June 9, 2015, from http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/tourism/files/calypso/country-reports/austria_en.pdf
165. Rathkey, P. (1990). *Time Innovations and the Deployment of Manpower*. Aldershot: Avebury.
166. Rejeski, W. J., & Mihalko, S. L. (2001). Physical activity and quality of life in older adults. *The Journals of Gerontology Series A: Biological Sciences and Medical Sciences*, 56, 23-35.
167. Republic of Slovenia, Ministry of the Economy. (2006). *Development Plan and Policies of Slovene Tourism 2007-2011*. Ljubljana: Ministry of the Economy.
168. Republic of Slovenia, Ministry of economic development and technology. (2012). *Slovenian tourism development strategy 2012-2016*. Ljubljana: Ministry of economic development and technology.
169. Richards, G. (1998). Time for a holiday? Social rights and international tourism consumption. *Time & Society*, 7(1), 145-160.
170. Richards, G. (1999). Vacations and the quality of life: Patterns and structures. *Journal of Business Research*, 44(3), 189-198.
171. Ridge, T. (2009). *Living with poverty: a review of the literature on children's and families' experiences of poverty*. Department of Work and Pensions. Report no 594.
172. Roberts, C., Cronin, N., Dodd, T., & Kelly, M. (1995). *National Study of Parents and Parenting Problems*. London: FPSC.
173. Roy, C., & Atcherson, E. (1983). Mini-vacations with center dialysis patients: a three year summary. *Social work in health care*, 8(2), 117-123.
174. Rubenstein, C. (1980). Vacations: expectations, satisfactions, frustrations, fantasies. *Psychology Today*, 13(12), 62-76.
175. Ryan, C. (2002). Equity, management, power sharing and sustainability – issues of the “new tourism”. *Tourism management*, 23(1), 17-26.
176. Samuel, N. (1986). Free time in France: a historical and sociological survey. *International social science journal*, 107, 47-63.
177. Sands, J. D. (1981). The relationship of stressful life events to intellectual functioning in women over 65. *The International Journal of Aging & Human Development*, 74, 11-22.
178. Santos, J. R. A. (1999). Cronbach's alpha: A tool for assessing the reliability of scales. *Journal of extension*, 37(2), 1-5.
179. Saveriades, A. (2000). Establishing the social tourism carrying capacity for the tourist resorts of the east coast of the Republic of Cyprus. *Tourism management*, 21(2), 147-156.
180. Schor, J. (1991). *The overworked American: The unexpected decline of leisure*. New York: Basic Books.
181. Scitovsky, T. (1976). *The Joyless Economy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

182. Seabrook, J. (1995). Far horizons. *New Statesman and Society*, 8, 22.
183. Sedgley, D., Pritchard, A., & Morgan, N. (2012). Tourism poverty in affluent societies: Voices from inner-city London. *Tourism Management*, 33(4), 951-960.
184. Sellick, M. C. (2004). Discovery, connection, nostalgia: Key travel motives within the senior market. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 17(1), 55-71.
185. Shaw, S. M. (1984). The measurement of leisure: A quality of life issue. *Society and Leisure*, 7(1), 91-107.
186. Shaw, S. M., & Dawson, D. (2001). Purposive leisure: Examining parental discourses on family activities. *Leisure sciences*, 23(4), 217-231.
187. *Sindikalni turizem v Sloveniji* [Trade union tourism in Slovenia]. Retrieved June 8, 2015, from <http://www.sindikalne-pocitnice.si/>
188. Sirgy, M. J. (2010). Toward a quality-of-life theory of leisure travel satisfaction. *Journal of Travel Research*, 49, 246-260.
189. Slovenian tourist board. (2007). *Marketing plan for Slovenian tourism 2007/2011*. Ljubljana: Slovenian tourist board.
190. *Slovenija.info – 15 slovenskih naravnih zdravilišč* [Slovenia.info – 15 Slovenian natural spas]. Retrieved March 11, 2016, from <http://www.slovenia.info/?zdravilisce=0>
191. Smith, K. E., Gotlieb, S., Gurwitch, R. H., & Blotcky, A. D. (1987). Impact of a summer camp experience on daily activity and family interactions among children with cancer. *Journal of Pediatric Psychology*, 12(4), 533-542.
192. Social & health tourism. (2016). *The Calypso initiative that helps disadvantaged people to go on holiday – while at the same time increasing tourism in the low season*. Retrieved February 28, 2016, from <http://www.shtourism.eu/join.html>
193. Sowell, T. (1986). *Marxism: Philosophy and economics*. London: Unwin.
194. Statistični urad Republike Slovenije. (n.d.). *Stalna ležišča po vrstah nastanitvenih objektov, letno* [Permanent beds by types of accommodation facilities, per year]. Retrieved March 7, 2016, from http://pxweb.stat.si/pxweb/Dialog/viewplus.asp?ma=H071S&ti=&path=../Database/Hitre_Repozitorij/&lang=2
195. Statistični urad Republike Slovenije. (2012). *Kakovost življenja* [Quality of life]. Ljubljana: Statistični urad Republike Slovenije.
196. Statistični urad Republike Slovenije. (2014). *Rojeni, Slovenija, 2014* [Born, Slovenia, 2014]. Retrieved July 18, 2016, from <http://www.stat.si/statweb/prikazinovico?id=5284&idp=17&headerbar=15>
197. Statistični urad Republike Slovenije. (2015). *Statopis: statistični pregled Slovenije 2015* [Statopis: statistical review of Slovenia, 2015]. Ljubljana: Statistični urad Republike Slovenije.
198. Steger, M. F., Frazier, P., Oishi, S., & Kaler, M. (2006). The meaning in life questionnaire: Assessing the presence of and search for meaning in life. *Journal of counseling psychology*, 53(1), 80-93.

199. Sunoo, B. P. (1996). Vacations: Going once, going twice, sold. *Personnel Journal*, 75, 72-82.
200. Švigelj, T., & Cvetek, N. (2010). *Calypso Study on Social Tourism Slovenia*. Retrieved December 14, 2014, from http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/tourism/files/calypso/country-reports/slovenia_en.pdf
201. Tarleton, B., & Macaulay, F. (2002). *Better for the break? Short breaks for children and teenagers with Autistic Spectrum Disorders and their families*. London: Barnardo's.
202. Teuscher, H. (1983). Social tourism for all – the Swiss Travel Saving Fund. *Tourism Management*, 4(3), 216-219.
203. Thompson, R. A. (1995). *Preventing child maltreatment through social support: A critical analysis*. Beverly Hill: Sage Publications, Inc.
204. Tinsley, H. E., & Kass, R. A. (1979). The latent structure of the need satisfying properties of leisure activities. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 11(4), 278-291.
205. Tourism Flanders & Brussels. (2009). Holidays are for everyone. Research into the effects and the importance of holidays for people living in poverty. Retrieved December 12, 2014, from <http://www.flanders.be/en/publications/detail/holidays-are-for-everyone>
206. *Tourism – reservations*. Retrieved March 5, 2016, from http://zveza-paraplegikov.si/tourism_reservations/
207. UNICEF. (2010). *The children left behind: A league table of inequality in child well-being in the world's rich countries*. Italy: UNICEF.
208. United Nations. (n.d.). *Fact Sheet on Persons with Disabilities (Media Release)*. Retrieved June 9, 2015, from <http://www.un.org/disabilities/default.asp?id=18>
209. United Nations. (1948). *United Nations Universal Declaration on Human Rights*. Retrieved January 17, 2016, from <http://watchlist.org/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/Universal-declaration-of-human-rights.pdf>
210. United Nations Human Rights Office of the High Commissioner. (1966). *International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights*. Retrieved January 17, 2016, from <http://www.ohchr.org/EN/ProfessionalInterest/Pages/CESCR.aspx>
211. Urry, J. (1990). *The Tourist Gaze: Leisure and travel in contemporary societies*. London: Sage.
212. Van Raaij, W. F., & Francken, D. A. (1984). Vacation decisions, activities, and satisfactions. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 11(1), 101-112.
213. Vaux, A. (1988). *Social support: Theory, research, and intervention*. New York: Praeger.
214. Visit England. (2013). *Domestic Leisure Tourism Trends for the Next Decade*. Retrieved March 27, 2016, from https://www.visitengland.com/sites/default/files/visit_england_report_print_tcm30-39493.pdf

215. Wallace, B. A., & Shapiro, S. L. (2006). Mental balance and well-being: building bridges between Buddhism and Western psychology. *American Psychologist*, 61(7), 690.
216. West, P. C., & Merriam Jr, L. C. (1970). Outdoor Recreation and Family Cohesiveness: A Research Approach. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 2, 251-259.
217. Whitney, L. (2006). Got the post-holiday blues? *Daily mail*, 31. 8. 2006, 66.
218. Williams, A. M., & Baláž, V. (2012). Migration, risk, and uncertainty: Theoretical perspectives. *Population, Space and Place*, 18(2), 167-180.
219. Winfree, C., Williams, R., & Powell, G. (2002). Children with cancer: positive benefits of camp. *Camping Magazine*, 75(6), 26-33.
220. World Health Organization. (1997). *International Classification of Impairments, Disabilities and Handicaps (ICIDH)*. Geneva: World Health Organization.
221. World Tourism Organization UNWTO. (1999). *Global Code of Ethics for Tourism*. Retrieved February 27, 2015, from <http://ethics.unwto.org/en/content/global-code-ethics-tourism>
222. World Tourism Organization UNWTO. (2016). *Member states*. Retrieved January 17, 2016, from <http://www2.unwto.org/members/states>
223. Zabriskie, R. B., & McCormick, B. P. (2003). Parent and child perspectives of family leisure involvement and satisfaction with family life. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 35(2), 163-189.

APPENDIXES

TABLE OF APPENDIXES

Appendix A: Questionnaire (Slovenian language).....	1
Appendix B: Questionnaire (English language).....	9
Appendix C: Social deprivation (Group 1).....	17
Appendix D: Social deprivation (Group 2)	18
Appendix E: Social exclusion (Group 1).....	19
Appendix F: Social exclusion (Group 2).....	20
Appendix G: Source of well-being (Group 1).....	21
Appendix H: Source of well-being (Group 2).....	22
Appendix I: Social capital (Group 1)	23
Appendix J: Social capital (Group 2)	24
Appendix K: Family capital (Group 1).....	25
Appendix L: Family capital (Group 2).....	27
Appendix M: Quality of life (Group 1)	29
Appendix N: Quality of life (Group 2).....	29
Appendix O: Uncertainty and anxiety (Group 1)	30
Appendix P: Uncertainty and anxiety (Group 2).....	31
Appendix Q: Social stigma (Group 1).....	32
Appendix R: Social stigma (Group 2)	33
Appendix S: Returning home and negative reflections (Group 1)	34
Appendix T: Return home and negative reflections (Group 2)	35
Appendix U: Independent Samples T-test Q7 (Social deprivation)	36
Appendix V: Independent Samples T-test Q8 (Social exclusion).....	36
Appendix W: Independent Samples T-test Q9 (Source of well-being).....	37
Appendix X: Independent Samples T-test Q10 (Social capital).....	37
Appendix Y: Independent Samples T-test Q11 (Family capital)	38
Appendix Z: Independent Samples T-test Q12 (Quality of life)	38
Appendix AA: Independent Samples T-test Q13 (Uncertainty and anxiety).....	39
Appendix BB: Independent Samples T-test Q14 (Social stigma)	39
Appendix CC: Independent Samples T-test Q16 (Returning home and negative reflections)	40

Appendix A: Questionnaire (Slovenian language)

Sem Brigita Ziherl, študentka podiplomskega študija Ekonomske fakultete Univerze v Ljubljani. V okviru študija pišem magistrsko nalogo z naslovom »Analiza pozitivnih in negativnih vplivov socialnega turizma na primeru družin v Sloveniji«. Lepo bi vas prosila, če lahko rešite anketo, ki vam bo vzela 10 minut časa. Anketa je anonimna, podatki pa bodo uporabljeni izključno za potrebe magistrske naloge, zato vas prosim, da ste pri odgovarjanju vprašanj iskreni. Za kakršna koli vprašanja se lahko name obrnete na e-mail: brigitaziherl@gmail.com. Za vse podane odgovore se vam že vnaprej zahvaljujem.

Q1. Koliko otrok imate?

- ☐ 1
- ☐ 2
- ☐ 3
- ☐ 4
- ☐ 5
- ☐ Več kot 5

Q2. Koliko so stari vaši otroci?

- ☐ 1. otrok: _____
- ☐ 2. otrok: _____
- ☐ 3. otrok: _____
- ☐ 4. otrok: _____
- ☐ 5. otrok: _____
- ☐ 6. otrok: _____

Q3. Kako pogosto se odpravljate na počitnice ali potovanja, ki trajajo najmanj 3 dni?

- ☐ Ne hodim na počitnice/potovanja
- ☐ Na vsakih nekaj let
- ☐ 1x letno
- ☐ 2x letno
- ☐ 3x letno
- ☐ 4x do 5x letno
- ☐ 6x do 10x letno
- ☐ Več kot 10x letno

Q4. Kdaj ste bili nazadnje na počitnicah ali potovanju, ki je trajalo najmanj 3 dni?

Q5. Ali ste se v zadnjih 5ih letih kdaj odrekli počitnicam/potovanju?

- ☐ Da
- ☐ Ne

Na naslednje vprašanje odgovarjate samo, če ste se v zadnjih 5 letih kdaj odrekli počitnicam/potovanju.

Q6. Kaj je bil razlog, zaradi katerega ste se v zadnjih 5 letih kdaj odrekli počitnicam/potovanju? (možnih je več odgovorov)

- ☐ Finančni razlogi
- ☐ Osebni razlogi
- ☐ Zdravstveni razlogi
- ☐ Odločili ostati doma/brez motivacije za potovanje
- ☐ Pomanjkanje časa zaradi delovnih ali študijskih obveznosti
- ☐ Pomanjkanje časa zaradi družinskih obveznosti
- ☐ Drugo: _____

NEUDELEŽBA NA POČITNICAH

*Naslednji sklop vprašanj se nanaša na občutek **prikrajšanosti**, zaradi neudeležbe na počitnicah.*

Q7. Označite (ne)strinjanje z naslednjimi trditvami (1- sploh se ne strinjam; 2- se ne strinjam; 3- se niti ne strinjam, niti strinjam; 4- se strinjam; 5- popolnoma se strinjam):

		1	2	3	4	5
Q7a	Moj otrok je bil zaradi neudeležbe na počitnicah prikrajšan.					
Q7b	Tudi če za otroke med poletjem (počitnicami) oblikujem druge aktivnosti, to ni nadomestitev počitnic stran od doma.					
Q7c	Otroci, ki ne gredo na počitnice, so prikrajšani za vesele spomine iz otroštva.					
Q7d	Otroci, ki ne gredo na počitnice, negativno primerjajo svoje izkušnje z otroci, ki so bili (iz "bogatejših" družin).					
Q7e	Menim, da imajo otroci, ki se že od malih nog zavedajo revščine, zaradi tega nižja pričakovanja v življenju.					
Q7f	Preživljanje kakovostnega časa z otrokom na počitnicah vodi k razvoju starševskih odnosov.					

Naslednji sklop vprašanj se nanaša na občutek **socialne izključenosti**, zaradi neudeležbe na počitnicah.

Q8. Označite (ne)strinjanje z naslednjimi trditvami (*1- sploh se ne strinjam; 2- se ne strinjam; 3- se niti ne strinjam, niti strinjam; 4- se strinjam; 5- popolnoma se strinjam*):

		1	2	3	4	5
Q8a	Moj otrok je bil zaradi neudeležbe na počitnicah socialno izključen.					
Q8b	Ko na TV vidim kraje kamor ne morem iti, mi to povzroči občutek izključenosti.					
Q8c	Ko na TV vidim kraje kamor ne morem iti, mi to povzroči občutek manjvrednosti.					
Q8d	Vse zgoraj navedeno povzroča stres znotraj družine.					
Q8e	Vse zgoraj navedeno negativno vpliva na kakovost mojega življenja.					
Q8f	Menim, da so počitnice nujna in ne luksuzna dobrina.					

POZITIVNI VPLIVI

Naslednji sklop vprašanj se nanaša na družinske počitnice kot **vir dobrega počutja**.

Q9. Označite (ne)strinjanje z naslednjimi trditvami (*1- sploh se ne strinjam; 2- se ne strinjam; 3- se niti ne strinjam, niti strinjam; 4- se strinjam; 5- popolnoma se strinjam*):

		1	2	3	4	5
Q9a	Moji otroci imajo ista družbena pričakovanja kot ostali otroci (iz bogatejših družin).					
Q9b	Iti na počitnice pripomore k mojemu boljšemu počutju.					
Q9c	Iti na počitnice pozitivno pripomore k moji samozavesti.					
Q9d	Ko grem na počitnice si napolnim baterije, s tem ko si vzamem oddih od vsakdanje rutine, stresa (življenja v revščini).					
Q9e	Počitnice so pozitivno vplivale na našo družinsko komunikacijo.					
Q9f	Na počitnicah sem razvil nova znanja.					

(se nadaljuje)

(nadaljevanje)

		1	2	3	4	5
Q9g	Počitnice so prispevale k ustvarjanju dragocenih spominov, družinskih pripovedi, itd.					
Q9h	Ko sem se po počitnicah vrnil/a v normalno stresno okolje, sem opazil/a višje oz. bolj produktivno delovanje.					

Naslednji sklop vprašanj se nanaša na to, kako počitnice pripomorejo k dvigu vašega socialnega kapitala.

Socialni kapital = vključenost posameznika v družbene vezi in omrežja; medsebojne povezave med ljudmi, njihova razmerja.

Q10. Označite (ne)strinjanje z naslednjimi trditvami (1- sploh se ne strinjam; 2- se ne strinjam; 3- se niti ne strinjam, niti strinjam; 4- se strinjam; 5- popolnoma se strinjam):

		1	2	3	4	5
Q10a	Iti na počitnice zame pomeni priložnost za spoznavanje novih ljudi.					
Q10b	Iti na počitnice pozitivno pripomore k mojemu socialnemu kapitalu.					
Q10c	Iti na počitnice izboljša intelektualni razvoj mojih otrok z bogatim pogledom na svet.					
Q10d	S tem ko na počitnicah srečam druge s podobnimi problemi, mi to pomaga normalizirati občutek izoliranosti.					
Q10e	Ko grem na počitnice, doživim nekaj kar v vsakdanjem življenju ne bi mogel/la (npr. različne tuje kulture, nove aktivnosti, hobiji, interesi, razvijanje novih spretnosti).					

Naslednji sklop vprašanj se nanaša na to, kako počitnice pripomorejo k dvigu vašega družinskega kapitala.

Družinski kapital = vezi med starši in otroci, ki so koristne oz. pomembne za socializacijo otrok. Te so odraz časa in pozornosti, ki jo starši namenjajo otrokom in spremljanju njihovih aktivnosti ter skrbi za njihov uspešen razvoj, vključno z njihovimi šolskimi uspehi in akademskimi dosežki.

Q11. Označite (ne)strinjanje z naslednjimi trditvami (1- sploh se ne strinjam; 2- se ne strinjam; 3- se niti ne strinjam, niti strinjam; 4- se strinjam; 5- popolnoma se strinjam):

		1	2	3	4	5
Q11a	Opažam, da so se po vrnitvi iz počitnic naši družinski odnosi izboljšali.					
Q11b	Po vrnitvi s počitnic opažam pozitivne vedenjske spremembe v odnosu s svojimi otroci.					
Q11c	Po vrnitvi s počitnic opažam, da je šlo otroku bolje v šoli.					
Q11d	Po vrnitvi s počitnic opažam pozitivne spremembe v otrokovem obnašanju.					
Q11e	Po vrnitvi s počitnic je bil otrok ponosen, da je preživel več časa s svojimi starši.					
Q11f	Ker smo šli na počitnice, imam manjši občutek krivde, zaradi skupaj preživetega kvalitetnega časa.					
Q11g	Dejavnosti na počitnicah spodbujajo druženje med družinskimi člani.					
Q11h	Dejavnosti na počitnicah spodbujajo komunikacijo znotraj družine.					
Q11i	Dejavnosti na počitnicah spodbujajo socializacijo otrok.					
Q11j	Počitnice predstavljajo edinstveno priložnost za interakcijo med družinskimi člani.					
Q11k	Počitnice prinesejo novo energijo, potrebno za nadaljnji razvoj družinskega sistema.					
Q11l	Počitnice so razlog za pospešen pretok informacij skozi naš družinski sistem (so prispevale k boljši komunikaciji).					
Q11m	Počitnice prispevajo k družinskemu povezovanju.					
Q11n	Počitnice negujejo odnos med partnerjema, na način ki ga običajne družinske vloge (oz. rutine) ne omogočajo.					

*Naslednji sklop vprašanj se nanaša na to, kako počitnice vplivajo na **kakovost vašega življenja**.*

Q12. Označite (ne)strinjanje z naslednjimi trditvami (*1- sploh se ne strinjam; 2- se ne strinjam; 3- se niti ne strinjam, niti strinjam; 4- se strinjam; 5- popolnoma se strinjam*):

		1	2	3	4	5
Q12a	Počitnice mi omogočajo, da sledim spektru interesov.					
Q12b	Počitnice mi zagotavljajo možnosti za socialne interakcije.					
Q12c	Počitnice pripomorejo k mojemu osebnemu razvoju.					
Q12d	Počitnice mi pomagajo pri odkrivanju individualne identitete.					

NEGATIVNI VPLIVI

Naslednji sklop vprašanj se nanaša na **negotovost in strah**, povezana z odhodom na počitnice.

Q13. Označite (ne)strinjanje z naslednjimi trditvami (1- sploh se ne strinjam; 2- se ne strinjam; 3- se niti ne strinjam, niti strinjam; 4- se strinjam; 5- popolnoma se strinjam):

		1	2	3	4	5
Q13a	Neizkušenosť oz. pomanjkanje znanja o načrtovanju počitnic mi prinaša povečano stopnjo negotovosti pri sprejemanju odločitev (o le teh).					
Q13b	Zaradi neizkušenosť oz. pomanjkanja znanja o načrtovanju počitnic me je strah iti na počitnice.					
Q13c	Preživljanje časa z otrokom je motivacija, da grem vseeno na počitnice.					
Q13d	Na počitnicah bi se udeležil/a aktivnosti za starše, če bi medtem kdo pazil na moje otroke.					
Q13e	Nisem navajen/a biti stran od otrok, zato bi jih težko zaupal/a nekomu v varstvo (strokovnjaku, ki je na destinaciji prav zaradi tega razloga zaposlen).					

Na naslednji sklop vprašanj odgovarjajte samo, če ste se kdaj odpovedali počitnicam oz. so vam jih subvencionirali oz. ste za le te izbrali cenejšo varianto. Vprašanja se nanašajo na **stigmatizacijo** povezano s socialnim turizmom oz. neudeležbo v turizmu.

Stigmatizacija = poseben odziv okolja na drugačnost, ki stigmatizirane osebe dojema kot manjvredne. Te so lahko tarča posmeha, zaničevanja, opravljanja, psihičnega in fizičnega nasilja.

Q14. Označite (ne)strinjanje z naslednjimi trditvami (1- sploh se ne strinjam; 2- se ne strinjam; 3- se niti ne strinjam, niti strinjam; 4- se strinjam; 5- popolnoma se strinjam):

		1	2	3	4	5
Q14a	Ker si nismo morali privoščiti počitnic, smo bili stigmatizirani (kot družina) – npr. s strani prijateljev in znancev, ki so veliko zapravili za počitnikovanje.					
Q14b	Ker so nam počitnice subvencionirali, smo bili stigmatizirani.					
Q14c	Ker smo za počitnice izbrali cenejšo varianto, smo bili stigmatizirani.					
Q14d	Ne glede na vse, bi se še vedno odločili za take počitnice.					

Q15. Ker si niste morali privoščiti počitnic oz. so bile le te subvencionirane oz. ste izbrali cenejšo varianto – kakšni so bili odzivi vaših prijateljev in znancev; odzivi prijateljev in sošolcev vaših otrok? Se vam je zdelo da drugače gledajo na vas?

Naslednji sklop vprašanj se nanaša na vrnitev iz počitnic in negativne refleksije, natančneje na popočitniški sindrom (angl. Post vacation syndrome) oz. kaj se zgodi konec poletja, ko se začnejo pritiski v službi oz. šoli.

Q16. Označite (ne)strinjanje z naslednjimi trditvami (1- sploh se ne strinjam; 2- se ne strinjam; 3- se niti ne strinjam, niti strinjam; 4- se strinjam; 5- popolnoma se strinjam):

		1	2	3	4	5
Q16a	Po vrnitvi s počitnic v službo/vsakdanje življenje sem bolj razdražljiv.					
Q16b	Po vrnitvi s počitnic v službo/vsakdanje življenje sem bolj živčen (anksiozen).					
Q16c	Po vrnitvi s počitnic v službo/vsakdanje življenje mi manjka motivacije.					
Q16d	Po vrnitvi s počitnic v službo/vsakdanje življenje imam težave s koncentracijo.					
Q16e	Po vrnitvi s počitnic v službo/vsakdanje življenje imam občutek praznine, ki traja nekaj tednov po vrnitvi na delo.					
Q16f	Počitnice mi sicer dvignejo moralo, a učinki ne trajajo dolgo.					
Q16g	Ker na počitnicah delam stvari ki jih imam rad, me to spomni na stvari, ki so resnično pomembne v življenju.					
Q16h	Ko pride jesen, se počutim kot da sem izgubil/a del sebe.					
Q16i	Vrnitev s počitnic je vodila v drastične spremembe v službi (npr. sprememba delovnih ur, druga služba, karijerne spremembe).					
Q16j	Po vrnitvi s počitnic sem ustvaril/a boljše ravnovesje med poklicnim in zasebnim življenjem.					

DEMOGRAFSKI PODATKI

Q17. Spol:

- ☐ Moški
☐ Ženski

Q18. V katero starostno skupino spadate?

- ☐ do 20 let
- ☐ 21-40 let
- ☐ 41-60 let
- ☐ 61 let ali več

Q19. Kakšen je vaš zakonski stan?

- ☐ Samski (nikoli poročen)
- ☐ Poročeni
- ☐ Izven zakonska zveza
- ☐ Ovdoveli
- ☐ Razvezani
- ☐ Drugo: _____

Q20. Kakšen je vaš trenutni zaposlitveni status?

- ☐ Delo prek študentskega servisa (dijak/študent)
- ☐ Zaposlen (za nedoločen/določen čas)
- ☐ Nezaposlen
- ☐ Upokojen
- ☐ Drugo: _____

Appendix B: Questionnaire (English language)

My name is Brigita Ziherl and I am a postgraduate student at the Faculty of Economics, University of Ljubljana. I am doing a research for my master's thesis, titled "An analysis of positive and negative impact of social tourism in the case of families in Slovenia". I kindly ask you to fill out the questionnaire, which will take 10 minutes of your time. The questionnaire is anonymous and the data will only be used for the purpose of the master's thesis, so I ask you to be honest. For any questions you can contact me by e-mail: brigitaziherl@gmail.com. I thank you in advance for all of the given answers.

Q1. How many children do you have?

- ☐ 1
- ☐ 2
- ☐ 3
- ☐ 4
- ☐ 5
- ☐ More than 5

Q2. How old are your children?

- ☐ 1st child: _____
- ☐ 2nd child: _____
- ☐ 3rd child: _____
- ☐ 4th child: _____
- ☐ 5th child: _____
- ☐ 6th child: _____

Q3. How often do you go on holidays/trips that last at least 3 days?

- ☐ I do not go on holidays
- ☐ Every few years
- ☐ 1 time a year
- ☐ 2 times a year
- ☐ 3 times a year
- ☐ 4 to 5 times a year
- ☐ 6 to 10 times a year
- ☐ More than 10 times a year

Q4. When was the last time you were on holiday/trip that lasted at least 3 days?

Q5. Have you ever given up holidays in the last 5 years?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

Q6. If YES, what was the reason? (multiple answers possible)

- ☐ Financial reasons
- ☐ Personal reasons
- ☐ Health reasons
- ☐ Preferred to stay at home with no motivation to travel
- ☐ Lack of time, due to work or study commitments
- ☐ Lack of time, due to family commitments
- ☐ Other: _____

RESULTS OF NON-PARTICIPATION

*The next set of questions refers to the feeling of **social deprivation** due to holiday non-participation.*

Q7. Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements (1-strongly disagree; 2-disagree; 3-neither agree nor disagree; 4-agree; 5-strongly agree):

		1	2	3	4	5
Q7a	My child was socially deprived due to holiday non-participation.					
Q7b	Even if I provide activities for my children during the summer holidays that is no compensation for not having a holiday away from home.					
Q7c	Children who do not go on holidays are deprived of happy childhood memories.					
Q7d	Children who do not go on holidays negatively compare their experiences with those of children in more affluent families.					
Q7e	Children's awareness of their own poverty from young age leads to lower expectations of life.					
Q7f	Spending quality time with my children on holidays leads to development of parental relationships.					

*The next set of questions refers to the feeling of **social exclusion** due to holiday non-participation.*

Q8. Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements (*1-strongly disagree; 2-disagree; 3-neither agree nor disagree; 4-agree; 5-strongly agree*):

		1	2	3	4	5
Q8a	My child was socially excluded due to holiday non-participation.					
Q8b	When I see places I can not go to on TV, I get a feeling of exclusion.					
Q8c	When I see places I can not go to on TV, I get a feeling of inferiority.					
Q8d	All of the above causes stress in the family.					
Q8e	All of the above negatively affects my quality of life.					
Q8f	Holidays are a necessity and not a luxury.					

POSITIVE IMPACTS

*The next set of questions refers to family holidays as a **source of well-being**.*

Q9. Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements (*1-strongly disagree; 2-disagree; 3-neither agree nor disagree; 4-agree; 5-strongly agree*):

		1	2	3	4	5
Q9a	My children have the same social expectations as other children (from wealthier families).					
Q9b	Holidays contribute to my well-being.					
Q9c	Holidays positively contribute to my self-esteem.					
Q9d	I was able to recharge my batteries on holidays by getting a break from everyday routine, stressors.					
Q9e	Holidays positively influenced our family communication.					
Q9f	When on holiday, I developed new skills.					
Q9g	Holidays contributed to creating treasured memories, family narratives, etc.					
Q9h	I noticed higher functioning upon return to normal stressful environment after holidays.					

*The next set of questions refers to how holidays contribute to **increase in social capital**.*

Social capital = involvement of individuals in social ties and networks; relationships between human beings and their relationships.

Q10. Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements (*1-strongly disagree; 2-disagree; 3-neither agree nor disagree; 4-agree; 5-strongly agree*):

		1	2	3	4	5
Q10a	For me going on holidays means the opportunity to meet new people.					
Q10b	Holidays positively contribute to my social capital.					
Q10c	Holidays enhance intellectual development of my children and enrich their view of the world.					
Q10d	Mixing on holidays with others with similar problems helps me normalise a feeling of isolation.					
Q10e	On holidays I experience something I could not in everyday life (e.g. different foreign cultures, new activities, hobbies, interests, develop new skills).					

*The next set of questions refers to how holidays contribute to **increase in family capital**.*

Family capital = a bond between parents and children, useful/important for the socialization of children. They are a reflection of the time and attention that parents devote to their children (monitoring their activities) and ensure their successful development, including academic success and achievements.

Q11. Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements (*1-strongly disagree; 2-disagree; 3-neither agree nor disagree; 4-agree; 5-strongly agree*):

		1	2	3	4	5
Q11a	Upon returning from holidays, our family relations improved.					
Q11b	Upon returning from holidays, I noticed positive behavioural changes in my relationship with children.					
Q11c	Upon returning from holidays, I noticed that my child is doing better in school.					
Q11d	Upon returning from holidays, I noticed positive changes in my child's behaviour.					
Q11e	Upon returning from holidays, my child was proud to spend time with his/her parents.					

(to be continued)

(continued)

		1	2	3	4	5
Q11f	Upon returning from holidays, I was feeling less guilty because we spend quality time together.					
Q11g	Shared leisure activities encourage socializing among family members.					
Q11h	Shared leisure activities enhance communications among family members.					
Q11i	Activities on holidays encourage socialization of children.					
Q11j	Holidays represent a unique opportunity for interaction among family members.					
Q11k	Holidays bring new energy for family system development.					
Q11l	Holidays are the reason for the increased flow of information through our family system (contributing to better communication).					
Q11m	Holidays contribute to family integration.					
Q11n	Holidays nurture the relationship between the partners in a way that normal family roles do not allow.					

The next set of questions refers to how holidays contribute to your quality of life.

Q12. Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements (1-strongly disagree; 2-disagree; 3-neither agree nor disagree; 4-agree; 5-strongly agree):

		1	2	3	4	5
Q12a	Holidays allow me to pursue a range of interests.					
Q12b	Holidays provide opportunities for social interaction.					
Q12c	Holidays contribute to my personal development.					
Q12d	Holidays provide me with opportunity of individual identity formation.					

NEGATIVE IMPACTS

The next set of questions refers to **uncertainty and anxiety** associated with going on holidays.

Q13. Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements (*1-strongly disagree; 2-disagree; 3-neither agree nor disagree; 4-agree; 5-strongly agree*):

		1	2	3	4	5
Q13a	Inexperience and lack of knowledge on planning a holiday brings me increased level of uncertainty in making (travel) decisions.					
Q13b	Due to inexperience and lack of knowledge on planning a holiday, I am afraid to go on holidays.					
Q13c	Spending time with my children is a motivation to go on holidays anyway.					
Q13d	I would participate in activities for parents on holidays, if someone would look after my children.					
Q13e	I am not accustomed to being away from my children, so it would be hard to trust somebody to look after them (qualified support staff on destination).					

Answer the following questions only if you ever could not afford holidays or they were subsidized or you chose the cheaper holiday option. The questions refer to **social stigma** associated with social tourism and non-participation in tourism.

Social stigma = the extreme disapproval of a person or group on socially characteristic grounds that are perceived, and serve to distinguish them from other members of a society.

Q14. Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements (*1-strongly disagree; 2-disagree; 3-neither agree nor disagree; 4-agree; 5-strongly agree*):

		1	2	3	4	5
Q14a	Because we could not afford holidays, we were stigmatized (as a family) – e.g. by friends and acquaintances who spent a lot of money for the holidays.					
Q14b	We were stigmatized, because our holidays were subsidized.					
Q14c	We were stigmatized, because we chose cheaper holiday option.					
Q14d	Notwithstanding this, we would still choose such holidays.					

Q15. Because you could not afford holidays or they were subsidized or you chose the cheaper holiday option – what were the reactions of your friends and acquaintances; the reactions of friends and classmates of your children? Did they look at you differently?

*The next set of questions refers to **returning home and negative reflections**, more specifically Post vacation syndrome – what happens at the end of summer, once the pressures at work or school start.*

Q16. Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements (1-strongly disagree; 2-disagree; 3-neither agree nor disagree; 4-agree; 5-strongly agree):

		1	2	3	4	5
Q16a	Upon returning to work/everyday life from holidays, I am more irritable.					
Q16b	Upon returning to work/everyday life from holidays, I am more anxious.					
Q16c	Upon returning to work/everyday life from holidays, I lack motivation.					
Q16d	Upon returning to work/everyday life from holidays, I have difficulty concentrating.					
Q16e	Upon returning to work/everyday life from holidays, I have feeling of emptiness that lasts up to a few weeks after returning to work.					
Q16f	Holidays lift my spirits, but the effects do not last long.					
Q16g	When on vacation, I do things I love and that reminds me of what is truly important in my life.					
Q16h	When the fall comes I feel like I lost part of myself.					
Q16i	Return from holidays led to making a real change in working life (e.g. change of hours, a different job, career change).					
Q16j	Upon returning from holidays I created better work-life balance.					

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

Q17. Gender:

- ☐ Male
☐ Female

Q18. Which age group do you belong to?

- ☐ Up to 20 years
- ☐ 21-40 years
- ☐ 41-60 years
- ☐ 61 years or more

Q19. What is your marital status?

- ☐ Single (never married)
- ☐ Married couple
- ☐ Unmarried couple
- ☐ Widowed
- ☐ Divorced
- ☐ Other: _____

Q20. What is your employment status?

- ☐ Student work
- ☐ Employed (indefinite employment/fixed term)
- ☐ Unemployed
- ☐ Retired
- ☐ Other: _____

Appendix C: Social deprivation (Group 1)

	Statements	Answers						Mean	Standard deviation
		1- strongly disagree	2- disagree	3-neither agree nor disagree	4-agree	5- strongly agree	Total		
		n* (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)		
Q7a	My child was socially deprived due to holiday non-participation.	21 (21)	18 (18)	27 (27)	25 (25)	9 (9)	100 (100)	2.83	1.27
Q7b	Even if I provide activities for my children during the summer holidays that is no compensation for not having a holiday away from home.	9 (9)	12 (12)	18 (18)	44 (44)	17 (17)	100 (100)	3.48	1.18
Q7c	Children who do not go on holidays are deprived of happy childhood memories.	13 (13)	21 (21)	23 (23)	30 (30)	13 (13)	100 (100)	3.09	1.25
Q7d	Children who do not go on holidays negatively compare their experiences with those of children in more affluent families.	4 (4)	15 (15)	22 (22)	47 (47)	12 (12)	100 (100)	3.48	1.02
Q7e	Children's awareness of their own poverty from young age leads to lower expectations of life.	12 (12)	21 (21)	30 (30)	27 (27)	10 (10)	100 (100)	3.02	1.17
Q7f	Spending quality time with my children on holidays leads to development of parental relationships.	5 (5)	11 (11)	9 (9)	45 (45)	30 (30)	100 (100)	3.84	1.13

Legend: * frequency

Appendix D: Social deprivation (Group 2)

	Statements	Answers						Mean	Standard deviation
		1- strongly disagree n* (%)	2- disagree n (%)	3-neither agree nor disagree n (%)	4-agree n (%)	5- strongly agree n (%)	Total n (%)		
Q7a	My child was socially deprived due to holiday non-participation.	52 (32.30)	39 (24.22)	30 (18.63)	24 (14.91)	16 (9.94)	161 (100)	2.46	1.34
Q7b	Even if I provide activities for my children during the summer holidays that is no compensation for not having a holiday away from home.	22 (13.66)	33 (20.50)	23 (14.29)	57 (35.40)	26 (16.15)	161 (100)	3.20	1.31
Q7c	Children who do not go on holidays are deprived of happy childhood memories.	22 (13.66)	43 (26.71)	45 (27.95)	28 (17.39)	23 (14.29)	161 (100)	2.92	1.25
Q7d	Children who do not go on holidays negatively compare their experiences with those of children in more affluent families.	13 (8.07)	30 (18.63)	47 (29.19)	53 (32.92)	18 (11.18)	161 (100)	3.20	1.12
Q7e	Children's awareness of their own poverty from young age leads to lower expectations of life.	20 (12.42)	43 (26.71)	42 (26.09)	42 (26.09)	14 (8.70)	161 (100)	2.92	1.17
Q7f	Spending quality time with my children on holidays leads to development of parental relationships.	5 (3.11)	6 (3.73)	26 (16.15)	71 (44.10)	53 (32.92)	161 (100)	4.00	0.96

Legend: * frequency

Appendix E: Social exclusion (Group 1)

	Statements	Answers						Mean	Standard deviation
		1- strongly disagree n* (%)	2- disagree n (%)	3-neither agree nor disagree n (%)	4-agree n (%)	5- strongly agree n (%)	Total n (%)		
Q8a	My child was socially excluded due to holiday non-participation.	27 (27)	43 (43)	23 (23)	5 (5)	2 (2)	100 (100)	2.12	0.94
Q8b	When I see places I can not go to on TV, I get a feeling of exclusion.	25 (25)	32 (32)	25 (25)	13 (13)	5 (5)	100 (100)	2.14	1.15
Q8c	When I see places I can not go to on TV, I get a feeling of inferiority.	27 (27)	32 (32)	22 (22)	15 (15)	4 (4)	100 (100)	2.37	1.15
Q8d	All of the above causes stress in the family.	25 (25)	26 (26)	26 (26)	19 (19)	4 (4)	100 (100)	2.51	1.18
Q8e	All of the above negatively affects my quality of life.	23 (23)	27 (27)	30 (30)	17 (17)	3 (3)	100 (100)	2.50	1.11
Q8f	Holidays are a necessity and not a luxury.	7 (7)	10 (10)	25 (25)	38 (38)	20 (20)	100 (100)	3.54	1.13

Legend: * frequency

Appendix F: Social exclusion (Group 2)

	Statements	Answers						Mean	Standard deviation
		1- strongly disagree	2- disagree	3-neither agree nor disagree	4-agree	5- strongly agree	Total		
		n* (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)		
Q8a	My child was socially excluded due to holiday non-participation.	57 (35.40)	68 (42.24)	29 (18.01)	5 (3.11)	2 (1.24)	161 (100)	1.93	0.88
Q8b	When I see places I can not go to on TV, I get a feeling of exclusion.	63 (39.13)	58 (36.02)	23 (14.29)	15 (9.32)	2 (1.24)	161 (100)	1.98	1.01
Q8c	When I see places I can not go to on TV, I get a feeling of inferiority.	65 (40.37)	68 (42.24)	15 (9.32)	10 (6.21)	3 (1.86)	161 (100)	1.87	0.95
Q8d	All of the above causes stress in the family.	62 (38.51)	58 (36.02)	26 (16.15)	15 (9.32)	0 (0.00)	161 (100)	1.96	0.96
Q8e	All of the above negatively affects my quality of life.	63 (39.13)	58 (36.02)	26 (16.15)	13 (8.07)	1 (0.62)	161 (100)	1.95	0.97
Q8f	Holidays are a necessity and not a luxury.	16 (9.94)	23 (14.29)	47 (29.19)	49 (30.43)	26 (16.15)	161 (100)	3.29	1.19

Legend: * frequency

Appendix G: Source of well-being (Group 1)

	Statements	Answers						Mean	Standard deviation
		1- strongly disagree n* (%)	2- disagree n (%)	3-neither agree nor disagree n (%)	4-agree n (%)	5- strongly agree n (%)	Total n (%)		
Q9a	My children have the same social expectations as other children (from wealthier families).	1 (1)	13 (13)	29 (29)	45 (45)	12 (12)	100 (100)	3.54	0.90
Q9b	Holidays contribute to my well-being.	1 (1)	1 (1)	8 (8)	50 (50)	40 (40)	100 (100)	4.27	0.74
Q9c	Holidays positively contribute to my self-esteem.	6 (6)	10 (10)	22 (22)	40 (40)	22 (22)	100 (100)	3.62	1.12
Q9d	I was able to recharge my batteries on holidays by getting a break from everyday routine, stressors.	2 (2)	1 (1)	4 (4)	45 (45)	48 (48)	100 (100)	4.36	0.79
Q9e	Holidays positively influenced our family communication.	2 (2)	3 (3)	16 (16)	41 (41)	38 (38)	100 (100)	4.10	0.92
Q9f	When on holiday, I developed new skills.	3 (3)	16 (16)	32 (32)	40 (40)	9 (9)	100 (100)	3.36	0.96
Q9g	Holidays contributed to creating treasured memories, family narratives, etc.	1 (1)	1 (1)	7 (7)	51 (51)	40 (40)	100 (100)	4.28	0.73
Q9h	I noticed higher functioning upon return to normal stressful environment after holidays.	2 (2)	4 (4)	25 (25)	48 (48)	21 (21)	100 (100)	3.82	0.88

Legend: * frequency

Appendix H: Source of well-being (Group 2)

	Statements	Answers						Mean	Standard deviation
		1- strongly disagree n* (%)	2- disagree n (%)	3-neither agree nor disagree n (%)	4-agree n (%)	5- strongly agree n (%)	Total n (%)		
Q9a	My children have the same social expectations as other children (from wealthier families).	2 (1.24)	26 (16.15)	38 (23.60)	82 (50.93)	13 (8.07)	161 (100)	3.48	0.90
Q9b	Holidays contribute to my well-being.	0 (0.00)	2 (1.24)	16 (9.94)	69 (42.86)	74 (45.96)	161 (100)	4.34	0.71
Q9c	Holidays positively contribute to my self-esteem.	3 (1.86)	25 (15.53)	44 (27.33)	50 (31.06)	39 (24.22)	161 (100)	3.60	1.07
Q9d	I was able to recharge my batteries on holidays by getting a break from everyday routine, stressors.	1 (0.62)	2 (1.24)	12 (7.45)	53 (32.92)	93 (57.76)	161 (100)	4.46	0.74
Q9e	Holidays positively influenced our family communication.	1 (0.62)	10 (6.21)	26 (16.15)	57 (35.40)	67 (41.61)	161 (100)	4.11	0.94
Q9f	When on holiday, I developed new skills.	2 (1.24)	15 (9.32)	60 (37.27)	60 (37.27)	24 (14.91)	161 (100)	3.55	0.90
Q9g	Holidays contributed to creating treasured memories, family narratives, etc.	0 (0.00)	1 (0.62)	11 (6.83)	69 (42.86)	80 (49.69)	161 (100)	4.42	0.65
Q9h	I noticed higher functioning upon return to normal stressful environment after holidays.	1 (0.62)	9 (5.59)	40 (24.84)	72 (44.72)	39 (24.22)	161 (100)	3.86	0.87

Legend: * frequency

Appendix I: Social capital (Group 1)

	Statements	Answers						Mean	Standard deviation
		1- strongly disagree n* (%)	2- disagree n (%)	3-neither agree nor disagree n (%)	4-agree n (%)	5- strongly agree n (%)	Total n (%)		
Q10a	For me going on holidays means the opportunity to meet new people.	4 (4)	12 (12)	36 (36)	39 (39)	9 (9)	100 (100)	3.37	0.95
Q10b	Holidays positively contribute to my social capital.	7 (7)	14 (14)	43 (43)	29 (29)	7 (7)	100 (100)	3.15	0.99
Q10c	Holidays enhance intellectual development of my children and enrich their view of the world.	1 (1)	11 (11)	22 (22)	50 (50)	16 (16)	100 (100)	3.69	0.91
Q10d	Mixing on holidays with others with similar problems helps me normalise a feeling of isolation.	4 (4)	29 (29)	32 (32)	30 (30)	5 (5)	100 (100)	3.03	0.98
Q10e	On holidays I experience something I could not in everyday life (e.g. different foreign cultures, new activities, hobbies, interests, develop new skills).	1 (1)	9 (9)	13 (13)	53 (53)	24 (24)	100 (100)	3.90	0.90

Legend: * frequency

Appendix J: Social capital (Group 2)

	Statements	Answers						Mean	Standard deviation
		1- strongly disagree n* (%)	2- disagree n (%)	3-neither agree nor disagree n (%)	4-agree n (%)	5- strongly agree n (%)	Total n (%)		
Q10a	For me going on holidays means the opportunity to meet new people.	4 (2.48)	25 (15.53)	48 (29.81)	61 (37.89)	23 (14.29)	161 (100)	3.46	1.00
Q10b	Holidays positively contribute to my social capital.	6 (3.73)	21 (13.04)	63 (39.13)	56 (34.78)	15 (9.32)	161 (100)	3.33	0.95
Q10c	Holidays enhance intellectual development of my children and enrich their view of the world.	3 (1.86)	8 (4.97)	30 (18.63)	83 (51.55)	37 (22.98)	161 (100)	3.89	0.88
Q10d	Mixing on holidays with others with similar problems helps me normalise a feeling of isolation.	14 (8.70)	42 (26.09)	66 (40.99)	31 (19.25)	8 (4.97)	161 (100)	2.86	0.99
Q10e	On holidays I experience something I could not in everyday life (e.g. different foreign cultures, new activities, hobbies, interests, develop new skills).	0 (0.00)	7 (4.35)	23 (14.29)	86 (53.42)	45 (27.95)	161 (100)	4.05	0.77

Legend: * frequency

Appendix K: Family capital (Group 1)

	Statements	Answers						Mean	Standard deviation
		1- strongly disagree	2- disagree	3-neither agree nor disagree	4- agree	5- strongly agree	Total		
		n* (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)		
Q11a	Upon returning from holidays, our family relations improved.	2 (2)	9 (9)	26 (26)	44 (44)	19 (19)	100 (100)	3.69	0.95
Q11b	Upon returning from holidays, I noticed positive behavioural changes in my relationship with children.	3 (3)	6 (6)	19 (19)	55 (55)	17 (17)	100 (100)	3.77	0.91
Q11c	Upon returning from holidays, I noticed that my child is doing better in school.	3 (3)	13 (13)	48 (48)	27 (27)	9 (9)	100 (100)	3.26	0.91
Q11d	Upon returning from holidays, I noticed positive changes in my child's behaviour.	3 (3)	10 (10)	25 (25)	47 (47)	15 (15)	100 (100)	3.61	0.96
Q11e	Upon returning from holidays, my child was proud to spend time with his/her parents.	2 (2)	6 (6)	11 (11)	50 (50)	31 (31)	100 (100)	4.02	0.92
Q11f	Upon returning from holidays, I was feeling less guilty because we spend quality time together.	7 (7)	21 (21)	25 (25)	28 (28)	19 (19)	100 (100)	3.31	1.20
Q11g	Shared leisure activities encourage socializing among family members.	1 (1)	4 (4)	10 (10)	50 (50)	35 (35)	100 (100)	4.14	0.83
Q11h	Shared leisure activities enhance communications among family members.	1 (1)	3 (3)	8 (8)	52 (52)	36 (36)	100 (100)	4.19	0.79
Q11i	Activities on holidays encourage socialization of children.	1 (1)	3 (3)	16 (26)	57 (57)	23 (23)	100 (100)	3.98	0.78
Q11j	Holidays represent a unique opportunity for interaction among family members.	2 (2)	2 (2)	24 (24)	57 (57)	15 (15)	100 (100)	3.81	0.79
Q11k	Holidays bring new energy for family system development.	1 (1)	3 (3)	13 (13)	61 (61)	22 (22)	100 (100)	4.00	0.75

Legend: * frequency

(to be continued)

(continued)

	Statements	Answers						Mean	Standard deviation
		1- strongly disagree n* (%)	2- disagree n (%)	3-neither agree nor disagree n (%)	4- agree n (%)	5- strongly agree n (%)	Total n (%)		
Q11i	Holidays are the reason for the increased flow of information through our family system (contributing to better communication).	1 (1)	2 (2)	33 (33)	49 (49)	15 (15)	100 (100)	3.75	0.77
Q11m	Holidays contribute to family integration.	1 (1)	2 (2)	12 (12)	58 (58)	27 (27)	100 (100)	4.08	0.75
Q11n	Holidays nurture the relationship between the partners in a way that normal family roles do not allow.	1 (1)	5 (5)	12 (12)	56 (56)	26 (26)	100 (100)	4.01	0.82

Legend: * frequency

Appendix L: Family capital (Group 2)

	Statements	Answers						Mean	Standard deviation
		1- strongly disagree	2- disagree	3-neither agree nor disagree	4-agree	5- strongly agree	Total		
		n* (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)		
Q11a	Upon returning from holidays, our family relations improved.	3 (1.86)	20 (12.42)	47 (29.19)	65 (40.37)	26 (16.15)	161 (100)	3.57	0.97
Q11b	Upon returning from holidays, I noticed positive behavioural changes in my relationship with children.	2 (1.24)	18 (11.18)	46 (28.57)	66 (40.99)	29 (18.01)	161 (100)	3.63	0.95
Q11c	Upon returning from holidays, I noticed that my child is doing better in school.	7 (4.35)	25 (15.53)	90 (55.90)	29 (18.01)	10 (6.21)	161 (100)	3.06	0.87
Q11d	Upon returning from holidays, I noticed positive changes in my child's behaviour.	3 (1.86)	20 (12.42)	58 (36.02)	63 (39.13)	17 (10.56)	161 (100)	3.44	0.91
Q11e	Upon returning from holidays, my child was proud to spend time with his/her parents.	2 (1.24)	9 (5.59)	31 (19.25)	73 (45.34)	46 (28.57)	161 (100)	3.94	0.90
Q11f	Upon returning from holidays, I was feeling less guilty because we spend quality time together.	17 (10.56)	33 (20.50)	48 (29.81)	41 (25.47)	22 (13.66)	161 (100)	3.11	1.19
Q11g	Shared leisure activities encourage socializing among family members.	1 (0.62)	3 (1.86)	6 (3.73)	82 (50.93)	69 (42.86)	161 (100)	4.34	0.70
Q11h	Shared leisure activities enhance communications among family members.	1 (0.62)	4 (2.48)	16 (9.94)	75 (46.58)	65 (40.37)	161 (100)	4.24	0.78
Q11i	Activities on holidays encourage socialization of children.	1 (0.62)	7 (4.35)	24 (14.91)	81 (50.31)	48 (29.81)	161 (100)	4.04	0.82
Q11j	Holidays represent a unique opportunity for interaction among family members.	7 (4.35)	26 (16.15)	33 (20.50)	55 (34.16)	40 (24.84)	161 (100)	3.59	1.15
Q11k	Holidays bring new energy for family system development.	1 (0.62)	5 (3.11)	28 (17.39)	74 (45.96)	53 (32.92)	161 (100)	4.07	0.83

Legend: * frequency

(to be continued)

(continued)

	Statements	Answers						Mean	Standard deviation
		1- strongly disagree n* (%)	2- disagree n (%)	3-neither agree nor disagree n (%)	4-agree n (%)	5- strongly agree n (%)	Total n (%)		
Q11l	Holidays are the reason for the increased flow of information through our family system (contributing to better communication).	2 (1.24)	13 (8.07)	44 (27.33)	68 (42.24)	34 (21.12)	161 (100)	3.74	0.93
Q11m	Holidays contribute to family integration.	2 (1.24)	2 (1.24)	23 (14.29)	72 (44.72)	62 (38.51)	161 (100)	4.18	0.81
Q11n	Holidays nurture the relationship between the partners in a way that normal family roles do not allow.	4 (2.48)	7 (4.35)	35 (21.74)	65 (40.37)	50 (31.06)	161 (100)	3.93	0.96

Legend: * frequency

Appendix M: Quality of life (Group 1)

	Statements	Answers						Mean	Standard deviation
		1- strongly disagree	2- disagree	3-neither agree nor disagree	4-agree	5- strongly agree	Total		
		n* (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)		
Q12a	Holidays allow me to pursue a range of interests.	2 (2)	16 (16)	46 (46)	31 (31)	5 (5)	100 (100)	3.21	0.84
Q12b	Holidays provide opportunities for social interaction.	2 (2)	15 (15)	39 (39)	40 (40)	4 (4)	100 (100)	3.29	0.84
Q12c	Holidays contribute to my personal development.	3 (3)	10 (10)	31 (31)	42 (42)	14 (14)	100 (100)	3.54	0.96
Q12d	Holidays provide me with opportunity of individual identity formation.	4 (4)	16 (16)	35 (35)	39 (39)	6 (6)	100 (100)	3.27	0.94

Legend: * frequency

Appendix N: Quality of life (Group 2)

	Statements	Answers						Mean	Standard deviation
		1- strongly disagree	2- disagree	3-neither agree nor disagree	4-agree	5- strongly agree	Total		
		n* (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)		
Q12a	Holidays allow me to pursue a range of interests.	1 (0.62)	24 (14.91)	68 (42.24)	53 (32.92)	15 (9.32)	161 (100)	3.25	0.87
Q12b	Holidays provide opportunities for social interaction.	3 (1.86)	16 (9.94)	68 (42.24)	58 (36.02)	16 (9.94)	161 (100)	3.42	0.87
Q12c	Holidays contribute to my personal development.	3 (1.86)	12 (7.45)	53 (32.92)	63 (39.13)	30 (18.63)	161 (100)	3.65	0.93
Q12d	Holidays provide me with opportunity of individual identity formation.	7 (4.35)	25 (15.53)	60 (37.27)	49 (30.43)	20 (12.42)	161 (100)	3.31	1.02

Legend: * frequency

Appendix O: Uncertainty and anxiety (Group 1)

	Statements	Answers						Mean	Standard deviation
		1- strongly disagree	2- disagree	3-neither agree nor disagree	4-agree	5- strongly agree	Total		
		n* (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)		
Q13a	Inexperience and lack of knowledge on planning a holiday brings me increased level of uncertainty in making (travel) decisions.	13 (13)	40 (40)	29 (29)	15 (15)	3 (3)	100 (100)	2.55	1.00
Q13b	Due to inexperience and lack of knowledge on planning a holiday, I am afraid to go on holidays.	31 (31)	40 (40)	20 (20)	8 (8)	1 (1)	100 (100)	2.08	0.96
Q13c	Spending time with my children is a motivation to go on holidays anyway.	5 (5)	12 (12)	13 (13)	51 (51)	19 (19)	100 (100)	3.67	1.07
Q13d	I would participate in activities for parents on holidays, if someone would look after my children.	14 (14)	33 (33)	26 (26)	19 (19)	8 (8)	100 (100)	2.74	1.16
Q13e	I am not accustomed to being away from my children, so it would be hard to trust somebody to look after them (qualified support staff on destination).	11 (11)	28 (28)	28 (28)	20 (20)	13 (13)	100 (100)	2.96	1.21

Legend: * frequency

Appendix P: Uncertainty and anxiety (Group 2)

	Statements	Answers						Mean	Standard deviation
		1- strongly disagree	2- disagree	3-neither agree nor disagree	4-agree	5- strongly agree	Total		
		n* (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)		
Q13a	Inexperience and lack of knowledge on planning a holiday brings me increased level of uncertainty in making (travel) decisions.	47 (29.19)	40 (24.84)	49 (30.43)	24 (14.91)	1 (0.62)	161 (100)	2.33	1.07
Q13b	Due to inexperience and lack of knowledge on planning a holiday, I am afraid to go on holidays.	71 (44.10)	56 (34.78)	23 (14.29)	11 (6.83)	0 (0.00)	161 (100)	1.84	0.91
Q13c	Spending time with my children is a motivation to go on holidays anyway.	31 (19.25)	11 (6.83)	20 (12.42)	65 (40.37)	34 (21.12)	161 (100)	3.37	1.40
Q13d	I would participate in activities for parents on holidays, if someone would look after my children.	41 (25.47)	32 (19.88)	31 (19.25)	45 (27.95)	12 (7.45)	161 (100)	2.72	1.31
Q13e	I am not accustomed to being away from my children, so it would be hard to trust somebody to look after them (qualified support staff on destination).	44 (27.33)	50 (31.06)	34 (21.12)	22 (13.66)	11 (6.83)	161 (100)	2.42	1.22

Legend: * frequency

Appendix Q: Social stigma (Group 1)

	Statements	Answers						Mean	Standard deviation
		1- strongly disagree	2- disagree	3-neither agree nor disagree	4-agree	5- strongly agree	Total		
		n* (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)		
Q14a	Because we could not afford holidays, we were stigmatized (as a family) – e.g. by friends and acquaintances who spent a lot of money for the holidays.	20 (20)	37 (37)	26 (26)	10 (10)	7 (7)	100 (100)	2.47	1.13
Q14b	We were stigmatized, because our holidays were subsidized.	22 (22)	37 (37)	28 (28)	9 (9)	4 (4)	100 (100)	2.36	1.05
Q14c	We were stigmatized, because we chose cheaper holiday option.	26 (26)	41 (41)	22 (22)	7 (7)	4 (4)	100 (100)	2.22	1.04
Q14d	Notwithstanding this, we would still choose such holidays.	3 (3)	2 (2)	21 (21)	50 (50)	24 (24)	100 (100)	3.90	0.89

Legend: * frequency

Appendix R: Social stigma (Group 2)

	Statements	Answers						Mean	Standard deviation
		1- strongly disagree	2- disagree	3-neither agree nor disagree	4-agree	5- strongly agree	Total		
		n* (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)		
Q14a	Because we could not afford holidays, we were stigmatized (as a family) – e.g. by friends and acquaintances who spent a lot of money for the holidays.	57 (35.40)	64 (39.75)	28 (17.39)	10 (6.21)	2 (1.24)	161 (100)	1.98	0.95
Q14b	We were stigmatized, because our holidays were subsidized.	58 (36.02)	56 (34.78)	36 (22.36)	10 (6.21)	1 (0.62)	161 (100)	2.01	0.95
Q14c	We were stigmatized, because we chose cheaper holiday option.	63 (39.13)	61 (37.89)	33 (20.50)	3 (1.86)	1 (0.62)	161 (100)	1.87	0.85
Q14d	Notwithstanding this, we would still choose such holidays.	9 (5.59)	5 (3.11)	32 (19.88)	77 (47.83)	38 (23.60)	161 (100)	3.81	1.02

Legend: * frequency

Appendix S: Returning home and negative reflections (Group 1)

	Statements	Answers						Mean	Standard deviation
		1- strongly disagree n* (%)	2- disagree n (%)	3-neither agree nor disagree n (%)	4-agree n (%)	5- strongly agree n (%)	Total n (%)		
Q16a	Upon returning to work/everyday life from holidays, I am more irritable.	17 (17)	58 (58)	15 (15)	8 (8)	2 (2)	100 (100)	2.20	0.89
Q16b	Upon returning to work/everyday life from holidays, I am more anxious.	22 (22)	52 (52)	15 (15)	11 (11)	0 (0)	100 (100)	2.15	0.89
Q16c	Upon returning to work/everyday life from holidays, I lack motivation.	20 (20)	52 (52)	18 (18)	10 (10)	0 (0)	100 (100)	2.18	0.87
Q16d	Upon returning to work/everyday life from holidays, I have difficulty concentrating.	23 (23)	50 (50)	18 (18)	8 (8)	1 (1)	100 (100)	2.14	0.90
Q16e	Upon returning to work/everyday life from holidays, I have feeling of emptiness that lasts up to a few weeks after returning to work.	18 (18)	43 (43)	24 (24)	13 (13)	2 (2)	100 (100)	2.38	0.99
Q16f	Holidays lift my spirits, but the effects do not last long.	13 (13)	26 (26)	24 (24)	30 (30)	7 (7)	100 (100)	2.92	1.17
Q16g	When on vacation, I do things I love and that reminds me of what is truly important in my life.	3 (3)	6 (6)	18 (18)	58 (58)	15 (15)	100 (100)	3.76	0.89
Q16h	When the fall comes I feel like I lost part of myself.	19 (19)	46 (46)	21 (21)	8 (8)	6 (6)	100 (100)	2.36	1.07
Q16i	Return from holidays led to making a real change in working life (e.g. change of hours, a different job, career change).	25 (25)	44 (44)	27 (27)	4 (4)	0 (0)	100 (100)	2.10	0.82
Q16j	Upon returning from holidays I created better work-life balance.	4 (4)	21 (21)	43 (43)	27 (27)	5 (5)	100 (100)	3.08	0.92

Legend: * frequency

Appendix T: Return home and negative reflections (Group 2)

	Statements	Answers						Mean	Standard deviation
		1- strongly disagree n* (%)	2- disagree n (%)	3-neither agree nor disagree n (%)	4-agree n (%)	5- strongly agree n (%)	Total n (%)		
Q16a	Upon returning to work/everyday life from holidays, I am more irritable.	40 (24.84)	77 (47.83)	34 (21.12)	8 (4.97)	2 (1.24)	161 (100)	2.10	0.87
Q16b	Upon returning to work/everyday life from holidays, I am more anxious.	47 (29.19)	80 (49.69)	24 (14.91)	9 (5.59)	1 (0.62)	161 (100)	1.99	0.85
Q16c	Upon returning to work/everyday life from holidays, I lack motivation.	40 (24.84)	81 (50.93)	20 (12.42)	17 (10.56)	2 (1.24)	161 (100)	2.12	0.95
Q16d	Upon returning to work/everyday life from holidays, I have difficulty concentrating.	39 (24.22)	80 (49.69)	31 (19.25)	11 (6.83)	0 (0.00)	161 (100)	2.09	0.84
Q16e	Upon returning to work/everyday life from holidays, I have feeling of emptiness that lasts up to a few weeks after returning to work.	46 (28.57)	64 (39.75)	27 (16.77)	20 (12.42)	4 (2.48)	161 (100)	2.20	1.07
Q16f	Holidays lift my spirits, but the effects do not last long.	19 (11.80)	48 (29.81)	51 (31.68)	39 (24.22)	4 (2.48)	161 (100)	2.76	1.03
Q16g	When on vacation, I do things I love and that reminds me of what is truly important in my life.	3 (1.86)	6 (3.73)	29 (18.01)	83 (51.55)	40 (24.84)	161 (100)	3.94	0.86
Q16h	When the fall comes I feel like I lost part of myself.	41 (25.47)	62 (38.51)	31 (19.25)	22 (13.66)	5 (3.11)	161 (100)	2.30	1.09
Q16i	Return from holidays led to making a real change in working life (e.g. change of hours, a different job, career change).	48 (29.81)	71 (44.10)	34 (21.12)	8 (4.97)	0 (0.00)	161 (100)	2.01	0.84
Q16j	Upon returning from holidays I created better work-life balance.	8 (4.97)	26 (16.15)	76 (47.20)	46 (28.57)	5 (3.11)	161 (100)	3.09	0.88

Legend: * frequency

Appendix U: Independent Samples T-test Q7 (Social deprivation)

Group Statistics

	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Social.deprivation	1	100	3,2901	,84688	,08469
	2	161	3,1170	,78950	,06222

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Social.deprivation	Equal variances assumed	,879	,349	1,675	259	,095	,17314	,10338	-,03042	,37671
	Equal variances not assumed			1,648	198,873	,101	,17314	,10509	-,03409	,38037

Appendix V: Independent Samples T-test Q8 (Social exclusion)

Group Statistics

	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Social.exclusion	1	100	2,5755	,90549	,09055
	2	161	2,1616	,75424	,05944

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Social.exclusion	Equal variances assumed	8,455	,004	3,987	259	,000	,41389	,10382	,20946	,61831
	Equal variances not assumed			3,821	181,820	,000	,41389	,10832	,20017	,62760

Appendix W: Independent Samples T-test Q9 (Source of well-being)

Group Statistics

	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Source.of.well. being	1	100	3,9212	,63305	,06331
	2	161	3,9807	,54545	,04299

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Source.of.well. being	Equal variances assumed	,226	,635	-,806	259	,421	-,05955	,07391	-,20509	,08600
	Equal variances not assumed			-,778	186,777	,437	-,05955	,07652	-,21050	,09141

Appendix X: Independent Samples T-test Q10 (Social capital)

Group Statistics

	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Social.capital	1	100	3,4280	,74455	,07446
	2	161	3,5168	,65481	,05161

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Social.capital	Equal variances assumed	1,739	,188	-1,010	259	,314	-,08877	,08792	-,26189	,08435
	Equal variances not assumed			-,980	189,858	,328	-,08877	,09059	-,26747	,08992

Appendix Y: Independent Samples T-test Q11 (Family capital)

Group Statistics

	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Family.capital	1	100	3,8300	,65303	,06530
	2	161	3,7776	,65029	,05125

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Family.capital	Equal variances assumed	,452	,502	,631	259	,528	,05236	,08293	-,11094	,21566
	Equal variances not assumed			,631	209,363	,529	,05236	,08301	-,11129	,21601

Appendix Z: Independent Samples T-test Q12 (Quality of life)

Group Statistics

	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Quality.of. life	1	100	3,3275	,76681	,07668
	2	161	3,4348	,79820	,06291

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Quality.of. life	Equal variances assumed	,098	,754	-1,072	259	,285	-,10728	,10012	-,30444	,08987
	Equal variances not assumed			-1,082	216,439	,281	-,10728	,09918	-,30277	,08821

Appendix AA: Independent Samples T-test Q13 (Uncertainty and anxiety)

Group Statistics

	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Uncertainty.and. anxiety	1	100	2,8000	,62989	,06299
	2	161	2,5354	,85516	,06740

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Uncertainty.and. anxiety	Equal variances assumed	9,893	,002	2,675	259	,008	,26460	,09891	,06983	,45936
	Equal variances not assumed			2,868	251,485	,004	,26460	,09225	,08292	,44628

Appendix BB: Independent Samples T-test Q14 (Social stigma)

Group Statistics

	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Social.stigma	1	100	2,7375	,78847	,07885
	2	161	2,4161	,65069	,05128

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Social.stigma	Equal variances assumed	2,378	,124	3,572	259	,000	,32135	,08996	,14421	,49849
	Equal variances not assumed			3,417	180,487	,001	,32135	,09406	,13576	,50694

Appendix CC: Independent Samples T-test Q16 (Returning home and negative reflections)

Group Statistics

Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Return.home.and. negative. reflections	1	100	2,5270	,59269
	2	161	2,4602	,57056
				,05927
				,04497

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Return.home.and. negative. reflections	Equal variances assumed	,003	,954	,905	259	,366	,06675	,07374	-,07844	,21195
	Equal variances not assumed			,897	203,956	,371	,06675	,07440	-,07993	,21344