A 380 Response Survey Dataset on Visitor Site Infrastructure Occupational Well-Being and Framing Effects among Tour Guides in Greece

Panagiotis Mavrakis and Alexandros Apostolakis

Abstract: Tour guides work at the point where destination infrastructure, visitor safety, cultural interpretation, and service delivery meet, yet datasets on their working conditions remain limited. This paper describes a survey dataset recording the perceptions and experiences of licensed tour guides in Greece regarding public infrastructure at archaeological sites, museums, and other organized visitor attractions, together with occupational stress and quality of life outcomes. A Greek language online questionnaire was distributed through the Panhellenic Federation of Tourist Guides and five regional guide associations. All 1,206 registered members in the sampling frame were invited, and 380 valid responses were obtained, corresponding to a response rate of 31.5%. The instrument contains 20 numbered questions covering respondent characteristics, perceived infrastructure quality and safety, delays and operational incidents, guide and visitor injuries, intervention during visitor emergencies, fatigue, psychological strain, remuneration adequacy, and intention to leave the profession. Two otherwise identical questionnaire versions were used: 185 respondents received the standard version and 195 received a version preceded by a three paragraph framing text describing how infrastructure may affect guides' well-being and performance. The dataset combines nominal, ordinal, 5-point response, and multiple response variables. It can support descriptive analysis, association testing, ordinal and binary regression, subgroup comparisons, and analysis of framing effects. Its principal value lies in linking destination infrastructure to the experiences of a nationally distributed frontline tourism profession.

Keywords: Tour guides, tourism infrastructure, occupational well-being, quality of life, workplace stress, nudge, sustainable tourism, Greece.

1. Introduction

Tour guides interpret cultural and natural resources, mediate encounters between visitors and host communities, and frequently assume responsibilities that extend beyond narration, including group coordination, in situ problem solving, and responses to safety incidents (Ap & Wong, 2001; Cohen, 1985; Sandaruwani & Gnanapala, 2016). Their performance depends mostly, or partly, on conditions they do not control, including access routes, signage, sanitation, shade, waiting areas, crowd capacity, accessibility systems, and emergency support.

Research on tourism infrastructure commonly examines destination development, visitor satisfaction, accessibility, or competitiveness. Physical surroundings also affect employees, and inadequate infrastructure can disrupt service delivery, create safety concerns, and increase workload (Bitner, 1992; Ramyar & Halim, 2020; Sugiama et al., 2022). The effects may be especially direct for guides, whose workplace changes between sites, while responsibility for the visitor group continues. Work related stress and burnout are established concerns within the profession (Akkuş & Arslan, 2023; Alrawadieh et al., 2020; Yetgin & Benligiray, 2019), but their connection with public visitor infrastructure remains underexamined.

The dataset addresses this gap through a structured survey of licensed guides in Greece. It records infrastructure assessments, delays and operational problems, guide and visitor injuries, responses to visitor incidents, and perceived effects on service quality, fatigue, personal life, health symptoms, remuneration adequacy, and occupational retention. Approximately half of the recipients also saw a short framing text before answering. This allows researchers to examine

Department of Business Administration and Tourism, Hellenic Mediterranean University, Greece
E-mail: aapostolakis@hmu.gr
Corresponding Author: Alexandros Apostolakis; E-mail: aapostolakis@hmu.gr

Handling Editor: Panagiotis Panagiotopoulos

Received 2 December 2025, Accepted 18 March 2026; Published Online: 04 November 2026.

Citation:
Mavrakis, P. & Apostolakis, A. (2025). A 380 Response Survey Dataset on Visitor Site Infrastructure Occupational Well-Being and Framing Effects among Tour Guides in Greece. *Sustainability Research in the Mediterranean*, *1*(4), 267–272.
https://doi.org/10.13052/srm2795-0514.020

© 2026 River Publishers

whether making the infrastructure and well-being relationship salient is associated with different response patterns. The dataset is relevant to tourism management, occupational well-being, heritage management, accessibility, and behavioral research. It does not establish causal effects of infrastructure, but provides a structured record of a geographically distributed professional group that can be examined across respondent characteristics, associations, and survey conditions.

2. Value of the Data

The data represent a professional population rarely covered in tourism surveys. The sampling frame included 1,206 licensed guides registered with five regional associations in the Panhellenic Federation of Tourist Guides. Responses span across Attica, Thessaloniki, the Dodecanese, Crete and Thera, and the Ionian Islands and Western Greece, and cover both recently qualified and highly experienced guides. Each record connects respondent characteristics with infrastructure related perceptions and events, including safety, delays, access problems, injury and emergency intervention, and perceived consequences for service quality, destination image, fatigue, personal life, health, remuneration, and occupational retention. These relationships cannot be examined using destination level infrastructure indicators alone.

The two parallel questionnaire versions permit analysis of response sensitivity to contextual information, provided that users account for group composition and do not assume random assignment without additional records. The instrument can also inform studies of other frontline tourism occupations or later surveys in comparable destinations.

3. Data Description

The dataset contains 380 respondent records. Of these, 185 belong to the standard questionnaire condition and 195 to the one containing the framing condition. The survey contains 20 numbered questions and a condition identifier. Most experiential items use ordered five category responses. Questions 8 to 10 permit multiple responses and can be expanded into binary indicators. The instrument was administered in Greek.

The reported sample was 78.9% women and 21.1% men. Respondents aged 20 to 35 represented 11.0% of the sample, those aged 36 to 50 represented 42.4%, and those aged 51 to 67 represented 46.6%. Professional experience was distributed across four categories: 29.0% reported 1–5 years, 11.9% 6–10 years, 16.2% 11–20 years, and 42.9% more than 21 years of guiding experience. All five associations were represented: Crete and Thera accounted for 36.3% of responses, Attica for 23.1%, the Dodecanese for 18.2%, Thessaloniki for 14.0%, and the Ionian Islands and Western Greece for 8.4%. This shows broad coverage but not proportional representation. The two survey questionnaires also differed in gender and association composition. Thus, comparisons should therefore include balance checks and, where appropriate, adjustment or stratification.

4. Experimental Design Materials and Methods

4.1. Study Design

The study used a cross-sectional quantitative survey with two conditions. It documented how licensed guides assess infrastructure at organized visitor sites and its perceived relationship with safety, service delivery, occupational strain, and quality of life. It also examined whether a short framing text was associated with different responses. Each association was asked to divide its membership in random into two approximately equal lists and sent a different Google Forms link to each.

4.2. Questionnaire Development

The questionnaire was developed from research on tour guiding, infrastructure, workplace stress, quality of life (WHOQOL Group, 1995), quality of work life (Sirgy et al., 2001), and behavioral interventions. It was prepared under academic supervision and reviewed for clarity, sequence, and relevance. The introductory page explains the study, voluntary participation, and anonymity. The survey questionnaire has been submitted to the ethics committee of the Hellenic Mediterranean University

and has received the required clearance. Four questions cover gender, age, association, and experience. Six examine safety, delays and problems during the previous five years, injuries, symptoms, and actions after visitor injury. Ten survey questions address service quality, mental health, destination image, fatigue, infrastructure stressors, personal life, physical symptoms, satisfaction, remuneration, and intention to change occupation.

4.3. Sampling and Data Collection

The target population comprised of active licensed guides in Greece registered with five professional associations. The federation identified 1,206 members: 640 in Attica, 155 in Thessaloniki, 96 in the Dodecanese, 240 in Crete and Thera, and 75 in the Ionian Islands and Western Greece. Non-members were outside the operational frame.

The Panhellenic Federation of Tourist Guides supported distribution. Association administrative personnel circulated one of two survey links by email, accompanied by information on purpose and anonymity. Three reminders were sent during a six weeks period. Responses entered two separate Google Forms files and produced 380 valid records, or 31.5% of the invitation frame. This was a census style invitation followed by voluntary response, not a simple random sample. Nonresponse, exclusion of nonmembers, different association response rates, and fieldwork at the beginning of the tourism season limits population inference.

4.4. Framing Condition

The two versions of the survey questionnaire contained identical questions and response options. The framed version added three paragraphs before the profile questions. The text stated that clear signage, lighting, rest areas, information facilities, and sanitation may support guide confidence, performance, satisfaction, and well-being; inadequate facilities may contribute to fatigue, frustration, and lower performance. The text did not remove options, or offer an incentive. It made one interpretation of the infrastructure and well-being relationship salient, consistent with broad definitions of nudging and its application in tourism (Hansen, 2016; Mertens et al., 2022; Souza-Neto et al., 2023; Yachin et al., 2024). It may also be described as an informational prime or framing treatment. Replications should use the original Greek text or document translation carefully.

4.5. Data Preparation and Analytical Compatibility

The two Google Forms files were exported and merged. The standard condition was coded 0 and the framed condition 1. Single response variables were coded categorically or ordinally, and multiple responses through option level indicators. Analysis of the empirical data was performed in Jamovi and figures used Microsoft Excel. Nominal, ordinal, and binary fields support frequencies, contingency tests, rank based comparisons, and logistic or ordinal regression.

5. Dataset Structure

The variables described in Table 1, form five substantive domains plus the questionnaire condition. Profile fields permit subgroup analysis across the infrastructure and well-being blocks.

Table 2 describes the response formats. In wide form, the 21 conceptual fields can become 33 coded columns when Q8 to Q10 are expanded into binary indicators. Other responses should be retained or recoded transparently.

6. Variable Coding Strategy

Five category items should be coded consistently within each item. High Q11 indicates stronger belief in the benefit of improvement, high Q14 or Q16 indicates greater adverse impact, and high Q18 indicates satisfaction. Composite indices require documented recoding and validation. Questions Q6 and Q7 combine labels with event ranges and are ordinal, not counts. Coding 0 to 4 preserves order without implying equal intervals. Questions Q8 to Q10 should usually be expanded into binary indicators. Neither in Q8 and no intervention in Q10 require consistency checks.

Table 1. Thematic organization of the dataset

Dataset domain	Variables	Description
Questionnaire condition	Condition	Standard questionnaire or questionnaire preceded by the infrastructure and well-being framing text
Respondent profile	Q1 to Q4	Gender, age group, professional association, years of guiding experience
Infrastructure assessment	Q5 to Q7	Perceived safety and reported frequency of delays and operational problems linked to infrastructure
Injury and incident response	Q8 to Q10	Guide or visitor injury, guide symptoms, actions taken after visitor injury
Work outcomes and infrastructure stressors	Q11 to Q15	Service quality and mental health, performance, destination image, fatigue, principal infrastructure related stressor
Quality of life and occupational retention	Q16 to Q20	Spillover into personal life, physical symptoms, infrastructure satisfaction, remuneration adequacy, intention to change profession

Table 2. Description and measurement of the survey variables

Variable	Content	Measurement	Response format
Condition	Questionnaire version	Binary	0 standard 1 framed
Q1	Gender	Categorical	Man woman other or self-description
Q2	Age group	Ordinal	20–35 36–50 51–67
Q3	Guide association	Categorical	Association membership category
Q4	Professional experience	Ordinal	1–5 6–10 11–20 more than 21 years
Q5	Safety attributed to site infrastructure	Likert	5-point disagreement to agreement
Q6	Infrastructure related delays during a season in the previous five years	Ordinal	Never to more than 6 times
Q7	Infrastructure related access changes injuries or visitor complaints	Ordinal	Never to more than 6 times
Q8	Person injured because of inadequate infrastructure	Multiple response	Guide visitor neither
Q9	Guide injuries or symptoms	Multiple response	Heat illness exhaustion dehydration muscular injury fracture other
Q10	Guide intervention after visitor injury	Multiple response	Six levels from no intervention to hospital accompaniment
Q11	Expected effect of improved infrastructure on service quality and mental health	Likert	5-point disagreement to agreement
Q12	Effect of infrastructure on guiding performance	Ordinal	Not at all to very much
Q13	Effect of infrastructure on visitor destination image	Likert	5-point disagreement to agreement
Q14	Fatigue or tension after guiding because of infrastructure	Ordinal	Not at all to very much
Q15	Main infrastructure related source of fatigue or stress	Categorical	Sanitation ticketing and refreshment facilities shade lighting rest areas crowd capacity none other
Q16	Effect of work stress on personal life	Ordinal	Not at all to very much

(*Continued*)

Table 2. Continued

Variable	Content	Measurement	Response format
Q17	Stress related physical symptoms or irritability	Ordinal	Never to very often
Q18	Satisfaction with infrastructure at visitor sites	Ordinal	Not at all to very much
Q19	Adequacy of remuneration relative to pressure	Ordinal	Not at all to fully
Q20	Consideration of changing occupation because of stress	Categorical	Yes no unsure

7. Potential Reuse and Limitations

The data support comparisons of safety, delays, injuries, and stressors across regions and experience levels. Analysts may examine whether infrastructure satisfaction relates to fatigue, physical symptoms, personal life, remuneration assessments, or intention to leave. The multiresponse variables also support focused guide and visitor safety studies. Researchers could also compare questionnaire versions and test variation by gender, age, experience, or association. This should be described as condition based or quasi experimental conditions. Baseline adjustment, sensitivity analysis, and transparent reporting of conditional responses are needed.

A culturally adapted questionnaire could be administered to guides elsewhere, to other visitor site workers, or after infrastructure improvements. Repeated collection could assess change over time. Its items may also inform a later validated scale of infrastructure related occupational strain.

Participation was voluntary, nonmembers were excluded, and regional participation was not proportional to association size. Five year recall may introduce error, and several outcomes use single study specific items. The cross-sectional design cannot establish temporal or causal direction. Within these boundaries, the dataset offers a distinctive resource on infrastructure, occupational well-being, and destination management from the perspective of licensed guides.

References

Akkuş, G., & Arslan, A. (2023). Work related stress experienced by tour guides. *Turyzm*, 33(2), 95–110.

Alrawadieh, Z., Cetin, G., Dincer, M. Z., & Istanbullu Dincer, F. (2020). The impact of emotional dissonance on quality of work life and life satisfaction of tour guides. *The Service Industries Journal*, *40*(1–2), 50–64.

Ap, J., & Wong, K. K. (2001). Case study on tour guiding: Professionalism, issues and problems. *Tourism Management*, *22*(5), 551–563.

Bitner, M. J. (1992). Servicescapes: The impact of physical surroundings on customers and employees. *Journal of Marketing*, *56*(2), 57–71.

Cohen, E. (1985). The tourist guide: The origins, structure and dynamics of a role. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *12*(1), 5–29.

Hansen, P. G. (2016). The definition of nudge and libertarian paternalism: Does the hand fit the glove? *European Journal of Risk Regulation*, *7*(1), 155–174.

Mertens, S., Herberz, M., Hahnel, U. J. J., & Brosch, T. (2022). The effectiveness of nudging: A meta-analysis of choice architecture interventions across behavioral domains. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *119*(1), e2107346118.

Ramyar, M., & Halim, N. (2020). Tourist expectation and satisfaction towards existing infrastructure and facilities in Golestan National Park, Iran. *American Research Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, *3*(7), 89–108.

Sandaruwani, J. A. R. C., & Gnanapala, W. A. C. (2016). The role of tourist guides and their impacts on sustainable tourism development: A critique on Sri Lanka. *Tourism Leisure and Global Change*, *3*, 62–73.

Sirgy, M. J., Efraty, D., Siegel, P., & Lee, D. J. (2001). A new measure of quality of work life based on need satisfaction and spillover theories. *Social Indicators Research*, *55*, 241–302.

Souza-Neto, V., Marques, O., Mayer, V. F., & Lohmann, G. (2023). Lowering the harm of tourist activities: A systematic literature review on nudges. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, *31*(9), 2173–2194.

Sugiama, A. G., Oktavia, H. C., & Karlina, M. (2022). The effect of tourism infrastructure asset quality on tourist satisfaction: A case on forest tourism in Tasikmalaya Regency. *International Journal of Applied Sciences in Tourism and Events*, *6*(1), 65–71.

WHOQOL Group. (1995). The World Health Organization quality of life assessment: Position paper from the World Health Organization. *Social Science and Medicine*, *41*(10), 1403–1409.

Yachin, J. M., Margaryan, L., Lexhagen, M., & Ioannides, D. (2024). Nudge plus in tourism: Reflexive behaviours and reflective attitudes. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 1–18.

Yetgin, D., & Benligiray, S. (2019). The effect of economic anxiety and occupational burnout levels of tour guides on their occupational commitment. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, *24*(4), 333–347.