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ABSTRACT

Analysis of visual elements of leisure attractiveness of Slovenian landscapes

This paper discusses the attractiveness of the Slovenian landscape as a leisure space. It focuses in particular on the relationship of attractiveness with landscape diversity and naturalness. As a starting point, the study of Perko et al. (2017) was used in which the authors identified the most and the least diverse Slovenian areas, i.e. landscape hotspots and coldspots. An online survey was conducted using photographs taken in selected hotspots and coldspots. Respondents were asked to rate the attractiveness of the landscapes shown in the photographs as destinations for a leisure trip. The attractiveness of the landscapes did not differ depending on whether they were in a hotspot or coldspot. On the other hand, the results clearly indicate the higher attractiveness of landscapes in which relatively natural landscape elements predominate.
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IZVLEČEK

Analiza vidnih elementov prostočasne privlačnosti slovenskih pokrajin
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1 Introduction

Landscape with its characteristics plays a key role in tourism and recreation. It has often been seen as a pull factor (Mohd Taher et al. 2015; Mutanga et al. 2017; Fraiz, de Carlos, and Araújo 2020) and its evaluation for tourism and recreation was an early subject of scientific interest (Nolte 2004; Jacobsen 2007). Among the key factors of the landscape attractiveness are its visual attributes, which have therefore often been the subject of debate in the field of recreation and tourism research (e.g., Fyhri, Jacobsen, and Tømmervik 2009; Deghati Najd et al. 2015; Delgado Martínez and Pantoja Timarán 2016). The issue of visual landscape quality is important in the context of recreation and tourism from different points of view, e.g., from the perspective of tourism development planning (Pires 2011), regional planning (Grêt-Regamey, Bishop, and Bebi 2007) or satisfying the recreational needs of the local population (Arriaza et al. 2004; Bujosa Bestard and Riera Font 2009).

Landscape is not static, but is subject to constant change. Changes in the landscape that affect its visual characteristics can positively (Hunziker 1995; Hunziker and Kienast 1999; Lindemann-Matthies et al. 2010) or negatively (Broekel and Alfken 2015; Sæþórsdóttir and Ólafsdóttir 2020) influence its attractiveness to tourists and recreationists, depending on the nature of these changes. However, the relationship between tourism/recreation and the landscape is not one-sided, as tourism and recreation are also among the factors transforming the landscape and can contribute to those changes that are negatively evaluated by tourists (Hunziker 1992).

In the past, many approaches to the study of the visual/aesthetic quality of landscape have been developed within different disciplines. Two contrasting paradigms have been distinguished (Wu et al. 2006): the expert approach (e.g., Jeršič 1999) and the community perception-based approach. According to Jacobsen (2007), one approach is based on the fact that landscape quality is inherent in the actual setting, while the other approach assumes that landscape quality is in the eyes of the observer. Lothian (1999) spoke of an objectivist or physical paradigm in relation to the former and a subjectivist or psychological paradigm in relation to the latter. Similar subdivisions have been cited by some other authors (Le Floch 1996; Dirin and Popov 2010).

A good part of the assessments within the ‘subjectivist’ (Lothian 1999) paradigm was based on the use of photographs, including in the area of assessing the attractiveness of the landscape from a tourism perspective. Such an approach has many advantages, e.g., lower costs, experimental context control, field visits are rarely feasible with a larger number of respondents (Daniel and Meitner 2001; Jacobsen 2007; Pastorella et al. 2017). Empirical studies have shown that some landscape characteristics significantly influence the perceived attractiveness or visual quality of a landscape. Among the factors that have often been shown to have a positive influence on landscape attractiveness is landscape diversity. For example, in the case of forest recreation (in Mallorca, Spain), Bujosa Bestard and Riera Font (2009) found that landscape diversity was an important determinant of individuals’ choices of recreational sites. Similar results were obtained by Schirpke et al. (2013) in a survey of locals and tourists in Alpine areas in Italy and Austria, and Dramstad et al. (2006) in a survey from Norway. With regard to the agricultural landscape, Junge et al. (2015) and Hunziker (1995) also found the positive influence of perceived diversity on the evaluation of the landscape.

Another factor that has often been found to be important in relation to visual landscape quality is the naturalness of the landscape. Tveit, Ode and Fry (2006) define naturalness as proximity to a pre-conceived natural state. When choosing a destination, among the attractiveness factors, visitors often prefer those aspects related to nature (Fraiz et al. 2020). Arriaza et al. (2004) identified the degree of wildness of the landscape as the most important factor influencing the perceived visual quality of the landscape. Similarly, Wu et al. (2006) found that perceived visual quality of the landscape increased with the degree of wildness and the proportion of natural vegetation. In line with this, de Vries et al. (2013) and Pastorella et al. (2017) noted the positive influence of forest on visual landscape quality, and
Han (2007) identified tundra and coniferous forest as the most valued biomes. The attractiveness of agricultural landscape is positively influenced by more extensive (and thus more natural) land uses (Schüpbach, Zgraggen, and Szerencsits 2008; Lindemann-Mathies et al. 2010; Junge et al. 2015).

The presence of water also has a positive influence on landscape attractiveness. Wu et al. (2006) found that perceived visual quality of the landscape increased with the amount of visible water area. Similarly, Pastorella et al. (2017) stated that water surfaces (along with forests) were the most valued features of the Alpine landscape. Smrekar, Polajnar Horvat and Erhartič (2016) focused on the attractiveness of individual landforms in the Alpine protected area (Triglav National Park), and lakes were found to be the most attractive. Several other studies have also highlighted the positive influence of water on landscape attractiveness (Yang and Brown 1992; Hammit, Patterson, and Noe 1994; Arriaza et al. 2004; Polat and Akay 2015).

Previous research has also highlighted the role of a number of other factors that influence perceptions of landscape attractiveness. These include, for example, landscape color features (Arriaza et al. 2004; Zubelzu and del Campo 2014; Polat and Akay 2015), long vistas (Schirpke et al. 2013), building density and patterns (Tyrväinen et al. 2014), dynamic and ephemeral conditions, or variations in these features (Dakin 2003; Junge et al. 2015; Pastorella et al. 2017). Dakin (2003) pointed out another important aspect, which is that people value landscape more intimately and less visually than expert approaches to landscape evaluation assume. For residents, the value of ordinary landscapes is based on a range of criteria related to emotions, everyday experiences, and intimate knowledge of places (Vouligny, Domon, and Ruiz 2009). Even within the tourism context, knowledge of the tourist destination influences how the visual elements are perceived and assessed (MacKay and Fesenmaier 1997).

On the other hand, previous research has identified those attributes that negatively affect landscape attractiveness and are often associated with human interventions. Perceived landscape quality decreases with the presence of negative man-made elements, such as roads and buildings (Wu et al. 2006) or wind turbines (Broekel and Alfken 2015; Sæþórsdóttir and Ólafsdóttir 2020). Intensive agricultural use is also negatively related to visual landscape quality (Lindemann-Mathies et al. 2010; Schirpke et al. 2013; 2019).

Landscape preferences vary between different groups, e.g., between different demographic and socio-economic groups. Several authors noted differences in the valuation of wild, uninhabited areas. Thus, the more educated (Sancho Royo 1973; Buijs, Elands, and Langers 2009), the younger (Van den Berg and Koole 2006; Lindemann-Mathies et al. 2010), and men (Sancho Royo 1973; Gallardo et al. 1989) value wilderness more. On the other hand, a greater preference for cultivated, agrarian landscapes has been observed among women (Sancho Royo 1973; Vanderheyden et al. 2014), the elderly (Van den Berg and Koole 2006; Lindemann-Mathies et al. 2010), and the rural population (Sancho Royo 1973).

Differences in the evaluation of visual landscape quality were also found between tourists and locals (Höchtl, Lehringer, and Konold 2005; Hunziker et al. 2008; Schirpke et al. 2013), as well as between different cultures (Yang and Brown 1992; Buijs, Elands, and Langers 2009) or between residents of different language groups (Vanderheyden et al. 2014). Differences between various cultural groups may be particularly relevant in relation to tourism, as many destinations are visited by tourists from numerous countries. Differences in the evaluation of landscape quality also occur between different recreation user groups. For example, García Pérez (2002) noted the differences between ‘ramblers’ and ‘more casual walkers’, and the differences between recreation user groups in terms of preferences and perceptions have also been highlighted by some older research (e.g., Moeller, MacLachlan, and Morrison 1974; Noe 1988).

This paper is concerned with the attractiveness of the Slovenian landscape as a leisure space, assuming that the visual characteristics of landscape are an important factor in its leisure attractiveness, both in the context of daily recreation and overnight tourist travel. As previously discussed, landscape attractiveness is associated with different landscape features. In this paper, attention is focused on two attractiveness factors that are particularly relevant in relation to tourism and recreation in Slovenia and are also very often highlighted as such. These are landscape diversity and naturalness.
On average, Slovenia is the most diverse of all European countries (Ciglič and Perko 2013; Perko, Ciglič, and Zorn 2020). Perko, Hrvatin and Ciglič (2017) paid special attention to Slovenia’s landscape diversity by identifying the most (landscape hotspots) and the least (landscape coldspots) diverse areas of the country and highlighting the potential of landscape diversity in tourism in particular. Landscape hotspots and coldspots were used as a starting point in this paper as well. Some other authors also pointed out the importance of Slovenian landscape diversity from a tourism perspective (e.g., Cigale and Gosar 2017).

Slovenia is also an above-average natural country, as evidenced by the percentage of forested land, according to which Slovenia ranks third in Europe (Šilc et al. 2020). The importance of the naturalness of the Slovenian landscape for tourism is shown, among other things, by the fact that in the summer of 2019 natural beauties were a very important or important motive for 91.8% of surveyed foreign tourists to come to Slovenia on holiday (Statistical …2021) or by the popularity of protected areas as tourist destinations (Koderman, Opačić, and Marković Vukadin 2020). The Slovenian tourism strategy (Strategija …2017) also points out the important role of naturalness and landscape diversity for Slovenian tourism, and the importance of these two factors also emerges from the travel guides that deal with Slovenia (e.g., Bain and Fallon 2016; Bousfield and Stewart 2017). These landscape features are equally relevant for the Slovenian population and their leisure activities, whether during day trips or on vacation.

Individuals engage in a variety of activities during their leisure trips, and a variety of motives are relevant. Different recreational activities have different spatial requirements. Moreover, (visual) landscape quality is not equally important for all outdoor recreational activities (Jeršič 1985). Also, recreational activities are to varying degrees focused on the environment or the activity itself (Jacob and Schreyer 1980), and to varying degrees related to the more or less natural environment (García Pérez 2002). Accordingly, it is to be expected that members of different recreation user groups have different attitudes towards and valuations of the landscape. Since recreational activities in nature have an above-average importance in Slovenia (Pori and Sila 2010; Cigale 2015), the question of the relationship between the evaluation of visual landscape quality and the attachment of recreational activities to the natural environment is particularly relevant, which is why it is also addressed in this study.

The paper aims to examine the usefulness of landscape hotspots in the context of research on landscape attractiveness, while also exploring the role of diversity and naturalness as factors of attractiveness. The paper focuses on the following three issues:

- Are more diverse landscapes (i.e. landscape hotspots) more attractive?
- Is the leisure attractiveness of landscapes positively related to the presence of those landscape elements that are more natural?
- Is the pursuit of a recreational activity that depends on the natural environment associated with different evaluation of landscape attractiveness?

2 Methods and data

2.1 Selection of (visited) areas and photographs

As in many other studies, photographs were used in this research. They were taken in the field during a visit to different Slovenian areas. The selection of the visited areas was based on landscape hotspots and coldspots as defined by Perko, Hrvatin and Ciglič (2017). For the needs of the fieldwork, it was necessary to select those hotspots and coldspots that were of appropriate size (not too small to justify a field visit, and not too large, otherwise it would not be possible to visit the entire spatial unit in the time available). A total of 39 areas were visited (Figure 1). Of these, 19 were coldspots and 20 were hotspots. Their average size was 381.3 ha. Several sites were visited within individual hotspots/coldspots, so that their internal heterogeneity was also recorded and each hotspot or coldspot was adequately covered.
spatially. At least four photographs were taken at each site, pointing in four different directions. The attractiveness of the landscapes is also related to the time of year (Junge et al. 2015; Pastorella et al. 2017). The influence of this was largely minimized as all photographs were taken over a period of a few weeks in spring 2016.

As a result of the field visits, an extensive database of photographs was created. Later, those that were technically extremely unsuitable (e.g., due to significantly inadequate exposure) were excluded from further analysis, as were those that contained individual highly dominant visual elements that could have a decisive influence on the evaluation of the landscape in the photograph (e.g., an object that occupies a significant portion of the photograph and could influence the perceived visual quality to a much greater extent than the surrounding landscape). Four people (geography students) participated in the process of excluding photographs, and only photographs that all four felt should be excluded were left out. Thus, 620 photographs were included in the further analysis. From these, photographs were subsequently selected and used for a landscape attractiveness survey.

In the survey, one of the key limiting factors was the acceptable length of time to complete the questionnaire, as too many photos would negatively affect the respondents’ focus in evaluating the photos, while at the same time, too long a questionnaire would discourage respondents. Taking into account the expected duration of completing the questionnaire, 115 photos were included in the evaluation. 55 photos were taken within the coldspots and 60 within the hotspots.

The photos were selected from the aforementioned set of 620 photos in such a way that hotspots and coldspots as well as different Slovenian landscape types (Perko and Ciglič 2020) were adequately represented in order to include hotspots and coldspots from different landscape types and thus also to cover the regional diversity of Slovenia. Adequate representation of different landscape types could in fact only be ensured to a limited extent, as the distribution of hotspots and coldspots (especially those of appropriate size) across landscape types is clearly uneven. The result is a modest representation of

Figure 1: Locations of visited hotspots and coldspots.
individual landscape types (Pannonian Plains, Mediterranean Flysch Hills and Mediterranean Karst Plateaus). Due to the location of the hotspots and coldspots, none of the typical tourist areas were visited. Consequently, the areas visited were not commonly known, which contributed to the fact that the assessment of the landscapes shown in the photographs was generally not influenced by the knowledge and possible previous experiences of individuals.

2.2 Diversity and naturalness

Diversity has been identified in a variety of ways in previous research. The approaches used ranged from a set of GIS-based indicators (e.g., Dramstad et al. 2006; Bujosa Bestard and Riera Font 2009) to the use of qualitative methods, i.e. qualitative open-ended interviews (Hunziker 1995). In this paper, as mentioned above, landscape diversity is discussed in connection with the study by Perko, Hrvatin and Ciglič (2017), who determined the most and least diverse areas in Slovenia. In calculating landscape diversity of Slovenia, the authors considered digital data on relief, rocks, and vegetation. Areas with high landscape diversity (one-tenth of the country’s area with the highest landscape diversity) were designated as landscape hotspots, and areas with low landscape diversity were designated as landscape coldspots (one-tenth of the country’s area with the lowest landscape diversity) (Perko, Hrvatin, and Ciglič 2017).

Naturalness was considered according to the presence of more or less natural landscape elements (e.g., types of land use, human-made elements) in the photographs. The analysis of the photographs, the purpose of which was to determine the presence of individual types of land use and some other relevant categories, was carried out independently by four people. The representation of each element was rated on a scale from 0 to 3, where 0 means that the element is not present in the image and 3 means that the element is predominant in the image. Evaluators rated the presence of the following categories: water, grassland, arable land, vineyards, orchards, forest, settlement, transportation infrastructure, energy infrastructure, industrial (and similar) facilities, (supposed) cultural heritage and other. For further analysis, the average for each of the categories was calculated from four estimates. Of these categories, forest is the only one besides water that covers a (potential) natural landscape. The impression of naturalness can also be given by grasslands, but those located within the visited areas, are in fact the result of human influence.

2.3 Differences in the evaluation of landscape attractiveness in regard to recreational activities

Respondents were also asked about the recreational activities they engage in most often on day trips. The questionnaire listed those activities that past research on one-day leisure trips of Slovenian population had identified as more important (Jeršič 1995; 1998; 1999; Cigale 2015). Subsequently, respondents were classified into two groups according to the position of the activities they engage in on trips, within a spectrum ranging from activities most related to the natural landscape to those related to a distinctly transformed, anthropogenic landscape (e.g., Jeršič 1999). Among these activities ‘hiking/mountaineering’ was the one most related to the natural environment. Thus, the question of whether people who frequently spend their leisure time on outdoor recreation in the natural environment (hikers/mountaineers) rate the attractiveness of more diverse (i.e. hotspots) and more natural landscapes differently was explored. With regard to the latter, the photos were divided into two groups for analysis: the first group contains those with above average natural landscapes, the second all others. Among all land use categories present in the photos, forest is the most natural, so the presence of forest was used as an indicator of naturalness. As photos showing a more natural than average landscape were considered those that had an average forest presence estimate of 2.00 and above (median is 1.75). The number of images that were more natural than average was 50, and the number of others (i.e. less natural) was 65.
2.4 Web survey

Photographs taken in the field were used for an online survey of adult (at least 18 years old) residents of Slovenia, conducted in 2017. A combination of convenience sampling and snowball sampling was employed. Invitations to participate were sent via email and social media, with a request to further share the link where the questionnaire was located. The online questionnaire contained a few questions about respondents’ leisure behaviour and basic socio-demographic characteristics. The largest part of the questionnaire included a rating of the attractiveness of 115 photographs. Some characteristic examples can be seen in the Figures 2–5. Respondents were asked to look at the landscapes in the photographs and rate on a scale from 1 (slightly attractive) to 5 (very attractive) how attractive they found them as destinations for leisure trips. They were also asked to rate the attractiveness of the landscape in the photograph rather than the photograph or its quality. 149 useful questionnaire responses were included in the analysis. Attention was focused on day trips (rather than holiday trips) because their destinations are mostly within Slovenia, as opposed to holiday trips where the main destinations are coastal resorts, mainly in neighbouring Croatia (Statistical … 2020b). For day trips, the site choice is focused on geographically closer destinations due to limited free time, so the space within the national borders is particularly important, as trips with destinations outside the 100 km radius are relatively rare (Jeršič 1971; Cigale 2015).

Statistical analysis included the use of a \textit{t-test} (to determine differences between hotspot and coldspot ratings and differences between groups of hikers and others) and a Pearson correlation coefficient (to determine the correlation between attractiveness ratings and the presence of individual landscape elements).

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{example_photo.jpg}
\caption{Example of highly rated photograph taken in a hotspot.}
\end{figure}
Figure 3: Example of highly rated photograph taken in a coldspot.

Figure 4: Example of poorly rated photograph taken in a hotspot.
3 Results

3.1 Characteristics of respondents and their leisure behaviour

It is characteristic of the sample that younger respondents are clearly over-represented. Thus 43.8% of the respondents are under 25 years of age, 33.9% 25 to 44 years old and 22.3% 45 years and older. The gender breakdown is also inadequate, with only 38.0% men and 62.0% women. It should be noted that similar discrepancies (above-average percentage of younger and female respondents) were also observed in some other online surveys where photos were used (Svobodova et al. 2012; Smrekar, Polajnar Horvat, and Erhartič 2016; Pastorella et al. 2017).

The spatial distribution of respondents is more in line with the spatial distribution of the population of Slovenia. Respondents live in all parts of Slovenia, but there is a greater concentration in Central Slovenia. 16.5% of respondents come from the municipality of Ljubljana alone, but this share is quite close to the share of the population of Ljubljana in the Slovenian population (14.0% in 2017; Statistical … 2020a). 43.6% of respondents come from the Osrednjeslovenska region (the corresponding share in the population of Slovenia in 2017 was 26.1%). The same proportions of respondents (5.4%) come from the regions of Gorenjska, Savinjska and Obalno-kraška. The shares of respondents from other regions are lower.

Respondents were asked which characteristics were important to them when selecting destination for a day trip. Among these characteristics (Table 1), attractive landscape was ranked first, mentioned by 70.47% of the respondents (up to three answers could be selected). The second most frequent response also relates, at least in part, to the visual characteristics of the landscape, as ‘the presence of various attractions worth seeing’ was mentioned by 48.32% of the respondents. In third place is the characteristic directly related to the ‘technical’ recreational suitability of a particular landscape or area, i.e. the possibility to practice favourite sports activities. Other characteristics were chosen by less than 30% of the respondents.
The most frequent activities of the respondents on day trips (Table 2) are visiting natural and cultural sights (55.03% of respondents) and taking a walk (52.35% of respondents), which are also the only ones frequently undertaken by more than half of the respondents. They are followed by ‘hiking/mountaineering’ with 40.27%. Respondents had the option to choose up to three activities.

Thus, the focus is on activities that the majority can engage in, as they do not set any special requirements for the individual (e.g., high costs, special physical abilities). At the same time, these are activities that can be approached in different ways, with varying degrees of intensity, dedication, time commitment etc. These activities have also been identified as the most important in some other studies (Cigale 2015).

### 3.2 Attractiveness of landscape in regard to diversity and naturalness

Considering that many of the aforementioned studies have found that diversity is positively related to landscape attractiveness (e.g., Bujosa Bestard and Riera Font 2009; Schirpke et al. 2013; 2019),

#### Table 1: Characteristics of the area that are important for the respondents when choosing the destinations of day trips (note: respondents were given the opportunity to choose up to 3 characteristics of the area).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of responses</th>
<th>% of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attractive landscape</td>
<td>105 70.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The presence of various attractions worth seeing</td>
<td>72 48.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The possibility to practice favourite sports activities</td>
<td>57 38.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possibilities for a pleasant walk</td>
<td>41 27.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to the area</td>
<td>36 24.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That I haven't been there yet</td>
<td>36 24.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low costs</td>
<td>33 22.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good catering offer</td>
<td>24 16.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting events</td>
<td>18 12.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3 2.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 2: Activities most frequently undertaken by respondents on day trips (note: respondents were given the opportunity to choose up to 3 activities of the area).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of responses</th>
<th>% of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visiting natural and cultural sights</td>
<td>82 55.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking a walk</td>
<td>78 52.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiking/mountaineering</td>
<td>60 40.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming, bathing</td>
<td>50 33.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting a restaurant</td>
<td>38 25.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling</td>
<td>32 21.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpine skiing</td>
<td>27 18.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting friends, relatives, acquaintances</td>
<td>20 13.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping</td>
<td>10 6.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jogging</td>
<td>7 4.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other sports activities</td>
<td>7 4.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4 2.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
one might expect hotspots to be more attractive than coldspots, since the former have the greatest diversity. The average rating of photos taken in coldspots was 3.04 and in hotspots 3.10 (Table 3). Thus, photos taken in hotspots were rated slightly higher. However, the *t*-test showed no statistically significant difference between the two groups (t = 0.69, p = 0.49). Therefore, it cannot be concluded that hotspots are more attractive than coldspots.

The calculation of the correlation (Pearson’s *r*) between the average rating of the presence of individual landscape elements (rated on a scale from 0 to 3) and the average rating of photographs (on a scale from 1 to 5) showed a positive correlation with the presence of forest (*r* = 0.33, *p* = 0.000; Table 4), grassland (*r* = 0.19, *p* = 0.048) and water (*r* = 0.25, *p* = 0.008), although in the latter case there was a very modest number of photographs (14) in which water was present. On the other hand, a negative correlation is found with respect to the presence of transport infrastructure (*r* = −0.39, *p* = 0.000) and settlements (*r* = −0.27, *p* = 0.004), as well as industrial facilities (which are present in only 9 photographs; *r* = −0.37, *p* = 0.000).

The presence of forest, which is relatively the most ‘natural’ type of land cover, thus has the most positive effect on attractiveness. Grassy areas, which are also found to be positively related to attractiveness, can also give the impression of naturalness, although in the case of the photographs used in the study, they are not native vegetation. The results therefore clearly indicate the greater attractiveness of landscapes in which relatively natural landscape elements predominate, while human-made elements generally have a negative influence on leisure attractiveness of landscapes. The latter is also related to the fact that the photographs mostly showed »average« landscapes, in which visually particularly high-quality anthropogenic elements (e.g. highly attractive agricultural landscape, cultural heritage objects), which have a positive effect on perceived attractiveness, are only modestly represented.

*Table 3: Mean ratings of photographs taken at hotspots and coldspots.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of photos</th>
<th>Mean rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hotspots</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coldspots</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4: Correlations between rated attractiveness and the presence of landscape elements.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pearson’s <em>r</em></th>
<th>Significance (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grassland</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arable land</td>
<td>−0.03</td>
<td>0.725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vineyard</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchard</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>−0.27</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport infrastructure</td>
<td>−0.39</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy infrastructure</td>
<td>−0.14</td>
<td>0.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial and similar facilities</td>
<td>−0.37</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other disturbing objects</td>
<td>−0.10</td>
<td>0.293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Supposed) cultural heritage</td>
<td>−0.13</td>
<td>0.177</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3 Differences between hikers/mountaineers and others in the evaluation of landscape attractiveness

In general, hikers/mountaineers rate the attractiveness of images higher (hikers/mountaineers 3.30, others 2.92; t = 3.91, p = 0.000; Table 5), which could be related to the above-average focus of their activity on landscape. Hikers rate both less natural (t = 2.48, p = 0.012) and more natural photos (t = 5.21, p = 0.000) higher, with the difference between the two groups significantly larger in regard to the latter, indicating that hikers have a particularly positive attitude towards the natural landscape, which is also especially suitable for their preferred recreational activity.

Table 5: The average rating of the attractiveness of photos in hikers/mountaineers and others.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Above-average natural</th>
<th>Other photos</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hikers/mountaineers</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Such a result is consistent with the fact that for hikers, the main motive for hiking is to experience the landscape (Muhar et al. 2007; Brämer 2009). The above-average attachment of hikers/mountaineers to the aesthetically high quality (attractive) landscape is also reflected in the fact that among them the percentage of those who chose attractive landscape as a feature of the area that is important when choosing destinations for day trips, was 80.0%, while among all respondents it was 70.47%.

4 Discussion

The results are largely consistent with the results of other studies (e.g., Schüpbach, Zgraggen, and Szerencsits 2008; Lindemann-Mathies et al. 2010; de Vries et al. 2013; Junge et al. 2015; Pastorella et al. 2017; Fraiz et al. 2020), but there are some differences. For example, no differences were found in landscape attractiveness in terms of landscape diversity as discussed in this study, i.e. by considering landscape hotspots and coldspots as the most and least diverse areas. The attractiveness of the landscapes shown in the photographs did not differ depending on whether they were in a hotspot or coldspot. However, this does not mean that the results suggest that diversity is not relevant as an influencing factor in landscape attractiveness. The reason for the results obtained may be in the conceptualization of diversity that served as the basis for determining hotspots. Hotspots as the most diverse areas were identified by considering relief, lithology and vegetation, but such diversity is not necessarily reflected in the perceived diversity. In addition, it should be noted that related research has mostly focused on relatively homogeneous areas (e.g., alpine landscapes). This study covered a variety of landscape types, so the influence of factors not directly included in the analysis might be expected. This may have contributed to the fact that the influence of diversity as a factor of landscape attractiveness was not obvious. From this perspective, it would be useful to examine the applicability of landscape hotspots in the context of assessing landscape attractiveness within individual landscape types to reduce the potential influence of intervening factors that may obscure the diversity effect. It would also be useful to examine the relationship between diversity as reflected in hotspots (the most diverse landscapes according to the criteria used) and perceived diversity (whether individuals perceive hotspots to be more diverse).

Thus, diversity as a landscape attribute is not sufficient by itself to explain landscape attractiveness, as it may also include those elements that have a negative impact on it. That the role of diversity in assessing landscape attractiveness is quite complex and by no means unambiguous is also shown by the study of Dramstad et al. (2006) that found the influence of diversity only in relation to certain indicators (e.g.,
number of land types and number of patches, but not heterogeneity index) and only for one group (non-local students, but not for the local population).

The present study demonstrated a positive influence of naturalness (more natural vegetation or land use) on landscape attractiveness, again indicating the importance of a relatively natural landscape in a recreational context. The largest positive relationship was between attractiveness and the presence of forest. However, the forest does not necessarily act as a factor of landscape attractiveness in all cases (e.g., Fyhri, Jacobsen, and Tommervik 2009; Smrekar, Polajnar Horvat, and Erhartič 2016). In this study, forest was the most natural landscape element, but areas with other types of natural vegetation (e.g., mountain areas above the forest line) were not considered.

Previous research has highlighted differences in the evaluation of visual landscape quality between different socio-demographic groups. This paper discussed the differences between recreation user groups, focusing specifically on hikers/mountaineers (as a group that relies on natural landscape for recreation) and comparing them to others. The results showed that the evaluation of visual landscape quality is related to a favourite recreational activity. Engaging in more ‘natural’ forms of outdoor recreation may be associated with different notions of what constitutes an attractive landscape. In addition, hiking/mountaineering itself is more focused on the landscape. Hikers’ preference for the natural landscape may also be a consequence of the functional evaluation of the landscape (hikers need the natural landscape, so they perceive it as more attractive), but it cannot be excluded that an individual’s positive attitude towards the natural landscape is among the reasons for hiking and similar activities.

The research referred to respondents as potential day visitors rather than holidaymakers. Nevertheless, it can be assumed that the results are largely relevant in other contexts as well. It should be borne in mind that tourism and recreation are closely intertwined. Most tourism is linked to leisure. Many areas are visited by both overnight tourists and day visitors, and often both groups have similar behaviours (Carr 2002; Pomfret and Bramwell 2016). Because of these similarities, it can be assumed that the findings can largely apply to overnight tourists as well. At the same time, however, it should not be overlooked that there are differences between the two groups. A tourist trip is also about the tourist breaking with routine, of which the everyday environment is a part. At least to some extent, tourist trips are also related to different motives, which may include the search for different, exotic landscapes.

It is also worth mentioning some of the limitations of the present study, which are mainly related to the characteristics of the (non-random) sample, which differs in its characteristics from the characteristics of the population of Slovenia.

5 Conclusion

The results shed light on some aspects of the role of naturalness and diversity as factors of landscape attractiveness. At the same time, they provide insight into the differences in landscape preferences in relation to recreational activities, specifically also in relation to outdoor recreation in the natural environment. The results underline the importance of relatively natural landscape in the recreational context. Such a landscape in Slovenia is mainly the forest. Its area has been increasing in the long term. These changes are valued differently by individuals. The results indicate that the landscape resulting from such processes would be assessed relatively positively by a significant part of the population.

Understanding landscape preferences of recreationists is important as landscape features are crucial for tourism and recreational use. Decisions concerning land use and development also influence visual landscape change and therefore the attractiveness of the landscape and the quality of tourist and recreational experience. This can have a significant impact on the satisfaction of recreationists and tourists and might affect tourist visitation.

This study did not take into account the possibly different attitudes towards and different evaluation of familiar landscapes that arise from the frequent contact with place and detailed local knowledge.
of day visitors and overnight tourists who repeatedly visit a particular area. In the present paper, this aspect was not considered due to the selection of areas (hotspots/coldspots), which did not include more heavily visited recreation and tourism areas. Nonetheless, this is a topic that deserves attention in future research, as a good portion of leisure travel (including vacation travel) has destinations in relatively nearby and often visited areas.
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ANALIZA VIDNIH ELEMENTOV PROSTOČASNE PRIVLAČNOSTI SLOVENSKIH POKRAJIN

1 Uvod


Velik del vrednotenj znotraj področja subjektivistične (Lothian 1999) paradigme je temeljil na uporabi fotografij, kar velja tudi za vrednotenje privlačnosti pokrajine z vidika turizma. Takšen pristop ima številne prednosti, med katerimi so na primer nižji stroški, nadzor nad eksperimentalnim kontekstom, terenski obiski so le redko izvedljivi, če gre za večje število anketirancev (Daniel in Meitner 2001; Jacobsen 2007; Pastorella in sod. 2017).


Na drugi strani so pretekle raziskave prepoznałe tiste značilnosti, ki negativno vplivajo na pokrajinsko privlačnost in so pogosto povezane s človekovimi posegi. Zaznana pokrajinska kakovost upada s prisotnostjo negativnih antropogenih elementov, kot so ceste in zgradbe (Wu in sod. 2006) ali vetrne turbine (Broekel in Alfken 2015; Sæþórsdóttir in Ólafsdóttir 2020). Tudi intenzivna kmetijska raba je negativno povezana z vidno kakovostjo pokrajine (Lindemann-Mathies in sod. 2010; Schirpke in sod. 2013; 2019).


Ta prispevek obravnava privlačnost slovenske pokrajine kot prostočasnega prostora, pri čemer izhaja iz domneve, da so vidne značilnosti pokrajine pomemben dejavnik njene pokrajinske privlačnosti tako v okviru vsakodneve rekreacije kot kot turističnih potovanj s prenočevanjem. Kot je bilo predhodno omenjeno, je pokrajinska privlačnost povezana z različnimi pokrajinskimi značilnostmi. V tem...
prispevku je pozornost osredotočena na dva dejavnika privlačnosti, ki sta še posebej pomembna v povezavi s turizmom in rekreacijo v Sloveniji in sta kot takšna pogosto poudarjena. To sta pokrajinska raznolikost in naravnost.

Slovenija je v povprečju najbolj pokrajinsko raznolika od vseh evropskih držav (Ciglič in Perko 2013; Perko, Ciglič in Zorn 2020). Pokrajinski raznolikosti Slovenije so namenili posebno pozornost Perko, Hrvatin in Ciglič (2017), ki so identificirali najbolj (pokrajinske vroče točke) in najmanj (pokrajinske mrzle točke) raznolika območja v državi, opozorili pa so tudi na potencial pokrajinske raznolikosti v okviru turizma. Pokrajinske vroče in mrzle točke so bile uporabljene kot izhodišče tudi v tem prispevku. Tudi nekateri drugi avtorji so opozorili na pomen raznolikosti slovenske pokrajine z vidika turizma (na primer Cigale in Gosar 2017).

Slovenija je tudi nadpovprečno naravna država, kar dokazuje velik delež gozda, po katerem je Slovenija na tretjem mestu v Evropi (Šilc in sod. 2020). Pomen naravnosti slovenske pokrajine za turizem kaže, med drugim, tudi dejstvo, da so bile poleti leta 2019 naravne lepote pomemben ali zelo pomemben motiv za prihod na počitnice v Slovenijo za 91,8 % anketiranih tujih turistov (Statistical ...2021), ter priljubljenost zavarovanih območij kot turističnih destinacij (Koderman, Opačić in Marković Vukadin 2020). Tudi slovenska turistična strategija (Strategija ...2017) opozarja na pomembno vlogo naravnosti in pokrajinske raznolikosti za slovenski turizem, pomen teh dveh dejavnikov pa je razviden tudi iz drugih izvorcev (na primer Bain in Fallon 2016; Bousfield in Stewart 2017).

Te pokrajinske značilnosti so enako pomembne tudi za slovensko prebivalstvo in njegove prostočasne dejavnosti, tako v okviru enodnevnih izletov kot počitniških potovanj.


Namen prispevka je torej proučiti uporabnost pokrajinskih vročih točk v okviru proučevanja pokrajinske privlačnosti, hkrati pa tudi osvetlitvi raznolikosti in naravnosti kot dejavnikov privlačnosti. Prispevek se bo osredotočil na naslednja tri vprašanja:

• Ali so bolj raznolike pokrajine (tj. pokrajinske vroče točke) bolj privlačne?
• Ali je prostočasna privlačnost pokrajin pozitivno povezana s prisotnostjo tistih pokrajinskih elementov, ki so bolj naravni?
• Ali je ukvarjanje z rekreacijskimi dejavnostmi, ki so navezane na naravno okolje, povezano z različnim vrednotenjem pokrajinske privlačnosti?

2 Metode in podatki
2.1 Izbor (obiskanih) območij in fotografij

Tako kot v številnih drugih raziskavah so bile tudi v tej uporabljene fotografije. Posnete so bile na terenu med obiskom različnih slovenskih območij. Izbor obiskanih območij je temeljil na pokrajinskih vročih in mrzlih točkah, ki so jih opredelili Perko, Hrvatin in Ciglič (2017). Za potrebe terenskega dela je bilo treba izbrati takšne vroče in mrzle točke, ki so bile ustreznih velikosti (ne premajhne, da so upravičile terenski obisk, in ne prevelike, saj drugače v razpoložljivem času ne bi bilo mogoče obiskati cele

Kot rezultat terenskih obiskov je nastala obsežna zbirka fotografij. Kasneje so bile tiste, ki so bile tehnično zelo neprimerne (na primer zaradi zelo neustrezne osvetlitve), izključene iz nadaljnje analize, tako kot tudi tiste, ki so vsebovala posamezne izrazitosti vodne površine, ki bi lahko odločilno vplival na vrednotenje pokrajine na fotografijah (na primer območje, ki zavzema pomemben del fotografije in bi lahko vplivalo na zaznanje krajin v zelo visokosti v dosti večjih območjih kot okoliška pokrajina). Štiri posamezniki (študenti geografije) so sodelovali v procesu izločanja fotografij, pri čemer so bile izločene zgolj tiste fotografije, za katere so vsi štirje menili, da so to zaslužene. Tako je bilo v nadaljnjo analizo vključeval 620 fotografij. Izmed teh so bile v nadaljevanju izbrane tiste, ki so bile uporabljene v anketni raziskavi o pokrajinski privlačnosti.

V okviru anketne raziskave je bil eden ključnih omejitvenih dejavnikov še sprejemljiv čas za izpolnjevanje vprašalnika, saj bi preveliko število fotografij negativno vplivalo na zbranost anketirancev pri ocenjevanju fotografij, hkrati pa bi predolg vprašalnik odvračal anketirance. Ob upoštevanju pričakovane trajanja izpolnjevanja vprašalnika je bilo v ocenjevanje vključenih 115 fotografij; 55 fotografij je bilo posnetih znotraj mrzlih, 60 pa znotraj vročih točk.

Fotografije so bile izbrane, iz prej omenjene množice 620 fotografij, na način, da so bile ustrezno zastopane vroče in mrzle točke, pa tudi različni slovenski pokrajinski tipi (Perko in Ciglič 2020). Tako so bile vključene vroče in mrzle točke iz različnih pokrajinskih tipov ter s tem v večjih meri zajeta pokrajinala. Slika 1: Lokacije obiskanih vročih in mrzlih točk.
jinska raznolikost Slovenije. Ustrezno zastopanost različnih pokrajinskih tipov je bilo v resnici mogoče zagotoviti samo v omejeni meri, saj je razporeditev vročih in mrzlih točk (zlasti tistih, ki so ustrezne velikosti) po pokrajinskih tipih izrazito neenakomerna. Posledica tega je skromna zastopanost nekaterih pokrajinskih tipov (na primer panonske ravnine, sredozemska flišna brda in sredozemske kraške planote). Zaradi lokacije vročih in mrzlih točk ni bilo obiskano nobeno izmed tipičnih turističnih območij. Posledica tega je, da obiskana območja niso splošno poznana, kar je prispevalo k temu, da v splošnem na ocenjevanje fotografij niso vplivali poznavanje in morebitne predhodne izkušnje posameznikov.

2.2 Raznolikost in naravnost


Naravnost je bila obravnavana glede na prisotnost bolj ali manj naravnih pokrajinskih elementov (na primer rabe tal, antropogenih elementov) na fotografijah. Analizo fotografij, katere namen je bil določiti prisotnost posameznih tipov rabe tal in nekaterih drugih relevantnih kategorij, so neodvisno eden od drugega izvedli štirje posamezniki. Prisotnost vsakega elementa je bila ocenjena na lestvici od 0 do 3, kjer je 0 pomenilo, da element ni prisoten na sliki, 3 pa je pomenilo, da element na sliki prevladuje. Ocenjevalci so ocenjevali prisotnost naslednjih kategorij: voda, travnate površine, njive, vinogradi, sadovnjaki, gozd, poselitve, prometna infrastruktura, energetska infrastruktura, industrijski (in podobni) objekti, (domnevna) kulturna dediščina in drugo. Za nadaljnjo analizo je bilo za vsako kategorijo izračunano povprečje štirih ocen. Med temi kategorijami je bil gozd (poleg vode) edini, ki predstavljal (potencialno) naravno pokrajino. Vtis naravnosti lahko dajejo tudi travnata zemljišča, vendar so ta, ki se nahajajo na obiskanih območjih, v resnici rezultat človekovih vplivov.

2.3 Razlike v vrednotenju pokrajinske privlačnosti glede na rekreacijske dejavnosti

Anketiranci so bili vprašani tudi po rekreacijskih dejavnostih, s katerimi se na izletih najpogosteje ukvarjajo. V vprašalniku so bile navedene tiste dejavnosti, ki so jih pretekle raziskave izletniškega ravnanja (Jeršič 1995; 1998; 1999; Cigale 2015) prepoznale kot bolj pomembne. V nadaljevanju so bili anketiranci razvrščeni v dve skupini glede na izpovede, ki so najbolj navezane na naravno pokrajino, do tistih, ki so navezane na raziskavo Perka, Hrvatina in Cigliča (2017). Med temi dejavnostmi je bilo »pohodništvo/planinarjenje« tista, ki je najbolj navezana na naravno okolje. Tako je bilo proučeno tudi vprašanje, ali posamezniki, ki se pogosto v svojem prostem času ukvarjajo z rekreacijo v naravno okolju (pohodniki/planinci), drugače ocenjujejo privlačnost bolj raznolikih (tj. vročih točk) in bolj naravnih pokrajin. V povezavi s vedno večjo slednjo so bile fotografije za analizo razdeljene v dve skupini: prva skupina je vsebovala tiste, ki so prikazovale nadpovprečno naravne pokrajine, druga pa vse ostale. Med kategorijami rabe tal, ki so jih prikazovale fotografije, je bil gozd najbolj naraven, tako da je bila prisotnost gozda uporabljena kot kazalnik naravnosti. Kot fotografije, ki so prikazovale nadpovprečno naravne pokrajine, so bile upoštevane tiste, ki so imele povprečno oceno prisotnosti gozda 2,00 in več (mediana je 1,75). Slik, ki so bile nadpovprečno naravne, je bilo 50, ostalih (tj. manj naravnih) pa 65.
2.4 Spletna anketna raziskava


Slika 4: Primer slabo ocenjene fotografije, posnete znotraj vroče točke. Glej angleško različico besedila.

Slika 5: Primer slabo ocenjene fotografije, posnete znotraj mrzle točke. Glej angleško različico besedila.

Statistična analiza je vključevala uporabo t-testa (za ugotavljanje razlik med ocenami vročih in mrzlih točk ter razlik med pohodniki/planinci in drugimi) in Pearsonovega koeficienta korelacije (za računanje korelacije med ocenami privlačnosti ter prisotnostjo posameznih pokrajinskih elementov).

3 Rezultati

3.1 Značilnosti anketirancev in njihovega prostočasnega ravnanja

Značilnost vzorca je prevelika zastopanost mlajših anketirancev; 43,8 % anketirancev je mlajših od 25 let, 33,9 % je starih med 25 in 44 let, 22,3 % pa je starih 45 in več. Tudi zastopanost spolov ni ustrezena, saj je 38,0 % anketirancev moških in 62,0 % žensk. Omeniti kaže, da so podobna neskladja (nadvpovprečna zastopanost mlajših in ženskih anketirancev) bila opažena tudi pri nekaterih drugih spletnih anketnih raziskavah, pri katerih so bile uporabljene fotografije (Svobodova in sod. 2012; Smrekar, Polajnar Horvat in Erhartič 2016; Pastorella in sod. 2017). Prostorska distribucija krajev bivanja anketirancev je bolj v skladu s prostorsko distribucijo slovenskega prebivalstva. Anketiranci živijo v vseh delih Slovenije, vendar je njihova največja zgostitev v osrednji Sloveniji. 16,5 % anketirancev prihaja samo iz Ljubljane, kar pa je blizu deleža prebivalstva Ljubljane v slovenskem prebivalstvu (14,0 % leta 2017; Statistical…2020a). 43,6 % anketirancev prihaja iz osrednjeslovenske...
regije (ustrezen delež v prebivalstvu Slovenije leta 2017 je bil 26,1 %). Enaki deleži anketirancev (5,4 %) prihajajo iz gorenjske, savinjske in obalno-kraške regije. Deleži anketirancev iz drugih regij so nižji.

Anketiranci so bili vprašani o tem, katere značilnosti so pomembne za njih pri izbiri cilja izleta. Med temi značilnostmi (preglednica 1) je bila na prvem mestu privlačna pokrajina, ki jo je omenilo 70,47 % anketirancev (izbrati je bilo mogoče do tri odgovore). Tudi drugi najpogostejši odgovor se je vsaj deloma nanašal na vidne značilnosti pokrajine, saj je »prisotnost različnih zanimivost, vrednih ogleda« omenilo 48,32 % anketirancev. Na tretjem mestu je značilnost, ki je neposredno povezana s »tehnično« rekreacijsko primernostjo pokrajine oziroma območja, tj. možnost ukvarjanja s priljubljenimi športnimi dejavnostmi. Druge odgovore je izbralo manj kot 30 % anketirancev.

Najbolj pogosti dejavnosti anketirancev na izletih (preglednica 2) sta ogledovanje naravnih in kulturnih znamenitost (55,03 % anketirancev) ter sprehodi (52,35 % anketirancev), ki sta tudi edini med dejavnostmi, s katerimi se pogosto ukvarja več kot polovica anketirancev. Za njima je pohodništvo/planinarjenje s 40,27 %. Anketiranci so lahko izbrali do tri odgovore.

Preglednica 1: Značilnosti območja, ki so pomembne za anketirance pri izbiri ciljev izletov (opomba: anketiranci so lahko izbrali do tri odgovore).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>značilnost območja</th>
<th>število odgovorov</th>
<th>% anketirancev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>privlačna pokrajina</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>70,47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prisotnost različnih zanimivost, vrednih ogleda</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>48,32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>možnost za ukvarjanje s priljubljenimi športnimi dejavnostmi</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>38,26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>možnosti za prijeten sprehod</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>27,52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bližina območja</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24,16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>da tam še nisem bil</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24,16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nizki stroški</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>22,15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dobra gostinska ponudba</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16,11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zanimive prireditve, dogodki</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12,08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drugo</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Preglednica 2: Dejavnosti, s katerimi se anketiranci najpogostejše ukvarjajo na izletih (opomba: anketiranci so lahko izbrali do tri odgovore).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>dejavnost</th>
<th>število odgovorov</th>
<th>% anketirancev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ogledovanje naravnih in kulturnih znamenitost</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>55,03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sprehodi</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>52,35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pohodništvo/planinarjenje</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40,27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kopanje, plavanje</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>33,56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obisk gostinskega lokala</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>25,50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kolesarjenje</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21,48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alpsko smučanje</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18,12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obisk prijateljev, sorodnikov, znancev</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13,42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nakupovanje</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6,71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tek</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4,70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>druge športne dejavnosti</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4,70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drugo</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2,68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Težišče je potemtakem na dejavnostih, s katerimi se lahko ukvarja večina, saj posamezniku ne postavljajo posebnih zahtev (na primer visoki stroški, posebne fizične sposobnosti). Poleg tega se je mogoče s temi dejavnostmi ukvarjati na različne načine, z različno mero intenzivnosti, predanosti, porabe časa in podobno. Te dejavnosti so bile prepoznane kot najpomembnejše tudi v nekaterih drugih raziskavah (Cigale 2015).

3.2 Privlačnost pokrajine glede na raznolikost in naravnost

Glede na to, da so številne predhodno omenjene raziskave ugotovile, da je raznolikost pozitivno povezana s pokrajinsko privlačnostjo (na primer Bujosa Bestard in Riera Font 2009; Schirpke in sod. 2013; 2019), bi bilo mogoče pričakovati večjo privlačnost vročih kot mrzlih točk, saj so bolj raznolike. Povprečna ocena fotografij, posnetih v mrljih točkah, je bila 3,04, v vročih točkah pa 3,10 (preglednica 3). Potemtakem so bile fotografije, posnete v vročih točkah, ocenjene nekoliko višje, vendar pa t-test ni pokazal statistično značilnih razlik med obema skupinama (t = 0,69, p = 0,49). Potemtakem ni mogoče skleniti, da so vroče točke bolj privlačne kot mrzle točke.

Izračun korelacije (Pearsonov r) med povprečno oceno prisotnosti posameznih pokrajinskih elementov (na lestvici od 0 do 3) in povprečno oceno fotografije (na lestvici od 1 do 5) je pokazal pozitivno povezanost s prisotnostjo gozda (r = 0,33, p = 0,000; preglednica 4), travnatih površin (r = 0,19, p = 0,048) in vode (r = 0,25, p = 0,008), čeprav je v sedanjem primeru šlo za skromno število fotografij (14), na katerih je voda prisotna. Na drugi strani je negativna povezanost opazna v primeru prisotnosti prometne infrastrukture (r = −0,39, p = 0,000) in poselitve (r = −0,27, p = 0,004), pa tudi v primeru industrijskih objektov (r = −0,37, p = 0,000), ki pa so prisotni le na 9 fotografijah.

Preglednica 3: Srednje ocene fotografij, posnetih v vročih in mrljih točkah.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>število fotografij</th>
<th>srednja ocena</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vroče točke</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mrzle točke</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skupaj</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Preglednica 4: Korelacije med ocenjeno privlačnostjo in prisotnostjo pokrajinskih elementov.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pearsonov r</th>
<th>značilnost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>voda</td>
<td>0,25</td>
<td>0,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>travnate površine</td>
<td>0,19</td>
<td>0,048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>njive</td>
<td>−0,03</td>
<td>0,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vinogradi</td>
<td>0,10</td>
<td>0,303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sadovniki</td>
<td>0,00</td>
<td>0,984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gozd</td>
<td>0,33</td>
<td>0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poselitve</td>
<td>−0,27</td>
<td>0,004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prometna infrastruktura</td>
<td>−0,39</td>
<td>0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>energetska infrastruktura</td>
<td>−0,14</td>
<td>0,126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>industrijski in podobni objekti</td>
<td>−0,37</td>
<td>0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drugi moteči objekti</td>
<td>−0,10</td>
<td>0,293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(domnevna) kulturna dediščina</td>
<td>−0,13</td>
<td>0,177</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Prisotnost gozda, ki predstavlja relativno najbolj »naravno« obliko rabe tal, potemtakem najbolj pozitivno vpliva na privlačnost. Tudi travnate površine, pri katerih je ravno tako opazna pozitivna povezanost s privlačnostjo, lahko dajajo vsi naravnosti, čeprav v primeru raziskavi uporabljenih fotografij ne gre za avtohtono rastlinstvo. Rezultati torej jasno opozarjajo na večjo privlačnost pokrajin, v katerih prevladujejo relativno naravni pokrajinski elementi, antropogeni elementi pa na prostočasno privlačnost pokrajin v splošnem delujejo negativno. Slednje je povezano tudi z dejstvom, da so fotografije večinoma prikazovale »povprečne« pokrajine, v katerih so le skromno zastopane vizualno posebej kakovostni antropogeni elementi (na primer izrazito privlačna agrarna pokrajina, objekti kulturne dediščine), ki na zaznano privlačnost delujejo pozitivno.

3.3 Razlike med pohodniki/planinci in drugimi v vrednotenju pokrajinske privlačnosti

Na splošno pohodniki/planinci više ocenjujejo privlačnost fotografij (pohodniki/planinci 3,30 : drugi 2,92; t = 3,91, p = 0,000; preglednica 5), kar bi lahko povezali z nadpovprečno osredotočenostjo njihove dejavnosti na pokrajino. Pohodniki višje ocenjujejo tako Manj naravne (t = 2,48, p = 0,012) kot bolj naravne fotografije (t = 5,21, p = 0,000), in je pri slednjih razlika med obojimi precej večja, kar kaže, da imajo pohodniki še posebej pozitiven odnos do naravne pokrajine, ki je hkrati tudi nadpovprečno primera za ukvarjanje z njihovo priljubljeno rekreacijsko dejavnostjo.

Preglednica 5: Povprečna ocena privlačnosti fotografij pri pohodnikih/planincih in drugih.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>nadpovprečno naravne</th>
<th>druge fotografije</th>
<th>skupaj</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pohodniki/planinci</td>
<td>3,57</td>
<td>3,10</td>
<td>3,30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drugi</td>
<td>3,00</td>
<td>2,86</td>
<td>2,92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Takšen rezultat se sklada z dejstvom, da je za pohodnike glavni motiv za ukvarjanje z njihovo priljubljeno dejavnostjo doživljanje pokrajine (Muhar in sod. 2007; Brämer 2009). O nadpovprečni navezanosti pohodnikov/planincev na estetsko kakovostno (privlačno) pokrajino priča tudi to, da je bil med njimi delež tistih, ki so izbrali privlačno pokrajino kot značilnost območja, ki je pomembna pri izbihi ciljev enodnevnih izletov, 80,0 %, med vsemi anketiranci pa 70,47 %.

4 Razprava


Poleg tega je k takšnemu rezultatu lahko prispevalo to, da so se sorodne raziskave večinoma osredotočale na razmeroma homogena območja (na primer alpske pokrajine), v tem prispevku pa so bili v raziskavo vključeni različni pokrajinski tipi, zato je mogoče pričakovati tudi vpliv dejavnikov, ki niso
bili neposredno zajeti v analizo, a so lahko prispevali k temu, da vpliv raznolikosti kot dejavnika pokrajinske privlačnosti ni bil razviden. S tega vidika bi bila koristna proučitev uporabnosti pokrajinskih vročih točk v okviru vrednotenja pokrajinske privlačnosti znotraj posameznih pokrajinskih tipov, da bi tako zmanjšali morebiten vpliv dejavnikov, ki lahko zabrišejo učinek raznolikosti. Koristno bi bila tudi proučitev uporabnosti pokrajinskih vročih točk v okviru vrednotenja pokrajinske privlačnosti znotraj posameznih pokrajinskih tipov, da bi tako zmanjšali morebiten vpliv dejavnikov, ki lahko zabrišejo učinek raznolikosti. S tega vidika bi bila koristna proučitev uporabnosti pokrajinskih vročih točk v okviru vrednotenja pokrajinske privlačnosti znotraj posameznih pokrajinskih tipov, da bi tako zmanjšali morebiten vpliv dejavnikov, ki lahko zabrišejo učinek raznolikosti. S tega vidika bi bila koristna proučitev uporabnosti pokrajinskih vročih točk v okviru vrednotenja pokrajinske privlačnosti znotraj posameznih pokrajinskih tipov, da bi tako zmanjšali morebiten vpliv dejavnikov, ki lahko zabrišejo učinek raznolikosti. S tega vidika bi bila koristna proučitev uporabnosti pokrajinskih vročih točk v okviru vrednotenja pokrajinske privlačnosti znotraj posameznih pokrajinskih tipov, da bi tako zmanjšali morebiten vpliv dejavnikov, ki lahko zabrišejo učinek raznolikosti. S tega vidika bi bila koristna proučitev uporabnosti pokrajinskih vročih točk v okviru vrednotenja pokrajinske privlačnosti znotraj posameznih pokrajinskih tipov, da bi tako zmanjšali morebiten vpliv dejavnikov, ki lahko zabrišejo učinek raznolikosti. S tega vidika bi bila koristna proučitev uporabnosti pokrajinskih vročih točk v okviru vrednotenja pokrajinske privlačnosti znotraj posameznih pokrajinskih tipov, da bi tako zmanjšali morebiten vpliv dejavnikov, ki lahko zabrišejo učinek raznolikosti. S tega vidika bi bila koristna proučitev uporabnosti pokrajinskih vročih točk v okviru vrednotenja pokrajinske privlačnosti znotraj posameznih pokrajinskih tipov, da bi tako zmanjšali morebiten vpliv dejavnikov, ki lahko zabrišejo učinek raznolikosti. S tega vidika bi bila koristna proučitev uporabnosti pokrajinskih vročih točk v okviru vrednotenja pokrajinske privlačnosti znotraj posameznih pokrajinskih tipov, da bi tako zmanjšali morebiten vpliv dejavnikov, ki lahko zabrišejo učinek raznolikosti.

Prienam raznolikost kot pokrajinski atribut sama po sebi še ne zadošča, da bi pojasnjevala pokrajinsko privlačnost, saj lahko vključuje tiste elemente, ki na privlačnost delujejo negativno. Da je vloga raznolikosti pri vrednotenju pokrajinske privlačnosti precej kompleksna in nikakor ne enoznačna, je pokazala tudi raziskava Dramstada in sodelavcev (2006), ki je ugotovila vpliv raznolikosti le v povezavi z nekaterimi kazalniki (na primer število pokrajinskih tipov in število zaplat, ne pa tudi indeks heterogenosti) in samo za eno skupino (nelokalni študenti, ne pa tudi domačini).


Opozoriti kaže tudi na nekatere omejitve pričujoče raziskave, ki so povezane predvsem s značilnostmi (neslučajnega) vzorca, ki se je po svojih značilnostih razlikoval od značilnosti slovenskega prebivalstva.

5 Sklep

Raziskava je osvetlila nekatere vidike vloge naravnosti in raznolikosti kot dejavnika pokrajinske privlačnosti. Obenem je ponudila vpogled v razlike v pokrajinskih preferencah glede na rekreačne dejavnosti, še zlasti v navedi na rekreacijo na prostem v naravem okolju. Opozorila je na pomen
razmeroma naravne pokrajine v rekreacijskem kontekstu. Takšna pokrajina je v Sloveniji zlasti gozd, katerega obseg dolgoročno narašča. Te spremembe posamezniki različno vrednotijo. Rezultati kažejo, da bi pokrajino, ki je rezultat takšnih procesov, pomemben del posameznikov vrednotil razmeroma pozitivno.

Razumevanje pokrajinskih preferenc rekreativcev je pomembno, saj so pokrajinske značilnosti ključnega pomena za turistično in rekreacijsko rabo. Odločitve, ki zadevajo rabo tal in razvoj, vplivajo tudi na vidne pokrajinske spremembe in potemtakem na privlačnost pokrajine ter na kakovost turističnega in rekreacijskega doživetja. To ima lahko pomemben vpliv na zadovoljstvo rekreativcev in turistov ter lahko vpliva na turistični obisk.

Raziskava ni upoštevala potencialno drugačnega odnosa do poznanih pokrajin in njihovega drugačnega vrednotenja, ki je posledica pogostega stika s krajem ter njegovega podrobnega poznavanja pri enodnevnih obiskovalcih ter turistih, ki pogosto obiskujejo določeno območje. V tem prispevku ta vidik ni bil upoštevan zaradi izbora območij (vročih in mrzlih točk), ki niso vključevala bolj obiskanih rekreacijskih in turističnih območij. Kljub temu gre za vprašanje, ki si zasluži pozornost v prihodnjih raziskavah, saj ima dobršen del prostočasnih potovanj (vključno s počitniškimi potovanji) svoj cilj na razmeroma bližnjih in pogosto obiskovanih območjih.


6 Viri in literatura

Glej angleško različico besedila.