

## BOTTOM-UP APPROACH TO CLASSIFICATION OF TOURIST ATTRACTIONS: A CASE STUDY OF CROATIA

**Zoran Klarić**

*Institute for tourism Zagreb, Croatia*

---

*This article discusses methodologies of identification and classification of tourist attractions based on the evaluation of attractions implemented in Croatia for the purpose of the Master Plan and Strategy of Tourism Development of the Republic of Croatia. After reviewing the existing methodologies in identification and classification of tourist attractions in the world and in Croatia, the article explains the approach used in the Master Plan, which has resulted in the list of approximately 280 spatially-determined attractions of international and national importance in Croatia. The list of attractions is used as a tool for the bottom-up approach of classification of tourist attractions in Croatia based on their type and importance. A proposal is made for the general classification of tourist attractions on the basis of the classification of attractions in Croatia as an example of a country with numerous and diverse attractions in a relatively small territory.*

---

**Keywords:** *attraction, classification, natural heritage, cultural heritage, Croatia.*

### INTRODUCTION

Tourist attractions are the main reason for visiting tourist destinations and have crucial role in tourism planning and positioning of a country on the tourist market. The additional importance of tourist attractions lies in the fact that the number of visitors or accessibility can be improved by the efforts of the local community and entrepreneurs, while the natural and cultural

---

© University of the Aegean. Print ISSN: 1790-8418, Online ISSN: 1792-6521



Except where otherwise noted, this work is licensed under  
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/>

attractions are in most cases the result of the country's position, geology, climate or history. Therefore, all attractions can be better interpreted or adapted to tourist needs, but the majority of attractions are those that were not made artificially. For Croatia as a Mediterranean tourist destination surrounded by countries offering similar tourist product this is especially important, because the final decision about where to go for a holiday is often dependent on the quality of the main attractions.

This work will use the term tourist attraction instead of visitor attraction, because the main sources for the original research come from the various studies dealing with the tourist attractions in Croatia, and because in the Croatian language the original English term "visitor attraction" is translated as "turistička atrakcija", i.e. "tourist attraction". The most important source was the Master Plan and Strategy of Tourism Development of the Republic of Croatia (Master Plan, 2011), produced by a group of authors from the Institute for Tourism Zagreb. It covered all aspects of tourism development of Croatia in thirteen reports, and resulted in concise document "Tourism Development Strategy for the Republic of Croatia until 2020", accepted by the Croatian Parliament on 26 April 2013. One of the tasks of this plan was identification of the main tourist attractions that are the reason why tourists are coming to Croatia, because it is estimated that investing in their accessibility and interpretation could improve the overall quality of Croatian tourism. Another reason was that all relevant research indicated that attractive natural and cultural heritage is the best-valued element of Croatian tourism and the main reason why tourists are visiting Croatia (Tomas Ijeto, 2011).

In order to identify the most important tourist attractions it was necessary to further the research, because existing lists of main attractions in Croatia were not useful for the purpose of the Master Plan. Those lists were either too extensive, embracing hundreds of various attractions in particular regions, or too subjective, dependent on the source of their creation – tourist associations, travel agencies, nature lovers, art historians, etc. Besides identification and evaluation, the issue was also in classifying those attractions caused by the diversity of Croatian tourism resources including various natural and cultural attractions and diverse markets regarding country of origin, age, social background, etc. International experiences in identification and classification of tourist attractions

proved as only partially applicable to Croatia, because each country has some specificities in their approach considering their heritage, overall development, tourism market orientation etc. That was especially the case when comparing Croatia with the most developed countries in tourism terms and those producing the most important theoretical works dealing with the phenomenology of tourism attractions, such as the United Kingdom or the United States.

The most important characteristics distinguishing Croatia from those countries that are related to attractions include:

a) Extremely high orientation on seasonal “sun and sea” tourism, with a consequence that 95% of total 65.862.680 tourist overnight stays refer to seven coastal counties and 86% were made from June 1 to September 30 (First release, 2016),

b) High dependence on foreign market (92%), which is at the same time very diverse - Germany 24%, Slovenia 10%, Austria 9%, Czech Republic 7%, Italy 7%, Poland 7%, all other countries 36% (First release, 2016);

c) Absence of big cities and large artificial attractions such as theme parks and amusement parks;

d) Natural heritage plays a more important role in attracting tourists than man-made attractions.

Such circumstances cause low utilization of existing attractions in comparison with countries more oriented towards cultural or city tourism due to high costs of maintenance and interpretation of attractions caused by seasonality of tourism, multilingual tourist demand and small domestic market. Additional problem is imbalance in the utilization level of tourist attractions between the coastal parts of Croatia, characterized with generally well-equipped and frequently-visited attractions, and the continental part with many potential attractions not prepared for tourist usage at all.

Since the majority of tourists are foreigners on summer holiday near the sea, for Croatia it is difficult to measure the “international importance” of attractions, usually represented in the share of visitors from abroad. Considering imbalances in the presence of tourists in coastal versus continental parts of Croatia, the number of visitors also cannot function as indicator of a real value of certain attraction. High fragmentation of the Croatian tourism market regarding nationality, education, purchasing power and family status

makes the evaluation of attractions even more difficult, because more educated tourists and those coming from more distant countries like the United States or Japan value Croatian heritage generally higher than less-educated tourists and those coming from neighbouring countries such as Austria or Italy.

The situation is additionally complicated because additional preferences of the tourists regarding types of attractions they'll like to visit are also different. For example, the Northern Adriatic coast is popular in rural and cycling tourism, the Central Adriatic coast in ecotourism and nautical tourism, while the Southern Adriatic coast is popular in cultural tourism. Diversity is highlighted by the fact that in a radius of less than 100 kilometres it is possible to see preserved renaissance Mediterranean towns, typically Central-European baroque churches, secluded beaches, virgin forests or rocky mountains. Therefore the territory of Croatia represent a good model for the evaluation of the methodologies for the classification of tourist attractions. In the Master for Croatia the classification of attractions was performed by using a methodology of bottom-up approach, what resulted in interesting findings about the phenomena of tourist attractions.

## **LITERATURE REVIEW**

Although there are many articles and books dealing with the phenomena of tourist/visitor attractions, the majority of them deal with already recognized and the most important attractions (Weidenfeld, 2010). Few authors focused on evaluation and classification of partly developed attractions, and the methodologies used are different, depending on the country of origin. In more developed countries like Great Britain (Leask 2010) or Australia (Benckendorff & Pearce, 2003) the interest was focused more on the developed attractions, and in less developed countries like Turkey (Alaeddinoglu & Selcuk Can, 2010) or Croatia (Kušen, 2002) also on potential attractions. Many authors noted the deficiency of theoretical works, stressing that many articles dealing with the phenomenology of attractions suffer from a lack of theoretical depth and empirical foundation (Richards, 2002). Therefore the term attraction is interpreted in various ways by different authors.

According to Richards (2002, pp. 1048) attractions are “central to the tourism process, providing activities and experiences and a means of collecting consumption statistics”, and according to Hu & Wall (2005) a permanent resource, which is developed and managed for the primary purpose of attracting visitors. Similarly, Middleton and Clarke (2001) define attractions as permanent resources managed for the visitor’s enjoyment, entertainment and education and Boniface and Cooper (2001) as “raison d’être”, or main purpose of tourism, which give rise to excursion circuits and create an industry of their own. There are some more complex definitions like the one that defines attractions as physical or cultural features of a particular place that individual travellers perceive as capable of meeting one or more of their specific leisure-related needs (Harris and Howard, 1996).

Tourist attractions are sometimes defined by institutions. For example, the British Tourist Authority defines an attraction “as a place where it is feasible to charge admission for the whole purpose of sight-seeing, with remark that such attraction must be open to public without prior booking for published periods each year and must be a single business under a single management” (Visitor Attraction Trends in England 2013, pp. 2). Such precise definition insinuates that Great Britain is a country abundant with well-developed tourist attractions, where it is necessary to limit the term attraction only for the fully-equipped locations. Therefore, many authors do not treat as attractions those that are not subject to fees or have an insufficient number of international visitors (Benckendorff P. & Pearce P., 2003) or temporary attractions such as festivals and sport manifestations (Swarbrooke J., 2001).

For countries having many undeveloped attractions or very few charging fees, such an approach will result in the exclusion of many important attractions. In a case of Croatia it would result in the exclusion of top attractions such as the old towns of Dubrovnik and Split, both protected as UNESCO World Heritage sites. Although there are no official numbers, according to estimations based on the number of tourist visitors (First release, 2016), the number of cruise passengers (Dubrovnik and Split port authorities, 2015) and approximation by the author of the number of excursionists and transit passengers, the total number of visitors is about two million per year in Split and more than three million in Dubrovnik. An

additional reason for a more broad view when using the term “attraction” in Croatia lies in the fact that sun/beach holiday makers are much less oriented on visiting attractions than tourists on cultural holidays or city breaks (Richards, 2002).

A different approach can be seen also in the definition of attractions by Croatian State Bureau of Statistics, defining them as “an attractive element in a certain tourist destination, such as a cultural-historical heritage, natural entity or phenomenon, performance or event, which either attracts future tourists or is a mainstay of the development of tourism on that destination” (First release 4.3.2/11). In the most important work on the methodology of evaluation and classification of tourist attractions in Croatia by Kušen (2010), the system of tourist attractions included also elements like climate, sea, wildlife or the culture of life and work. Kušen (2015) stressed the problem of the fact that the same type of feature like cave, waterfall, fortress or church can function as important tourist attraction subject to fee, or just as a potential resource, dependent on accessibility, marketing position, available funds for visitor facilities etc. Therefore in some remote areas far from tourist flows some resources will need to be identified first in order to be utilized as tourist attractions (Alaeddinoglu, & Selcuk, 2010).

## **THE PROBLEMS IN EVALUATION AND CLASSIFICATION OF ATTRACTIONS**

Besides the difficulties in identifying attractions, there is also a problem in evaluating their importance, usually those of international, national, regional or local. Generally, the term international is used for attractions that are drawing international visitors from longer distances and are fully equipped with service and interpretative facilities, while the term national is used mainly for attractions that involve visits lasting half a day or less which are equipped with basic facilities (Fyall A., Garrod B., Leask A., 2008). Attractions of regional and local importance are even less important and equipped, with remark that the same attractions can be differently evaluated depending on the source

There is a problem also in classification of attractions by type. Although basic classification into natural and man-made is accepted worldwide, when it comes to more detailed classifications there are

many differences. For example, in Great Britain the main features considered under the term “natural attractions” are gardens, national parks and forests (Leask A., 2010), and there are no special categories for geological phenomena that are the most important natural attractions in Croatia. Therefore, E. Kušen lists geology, water, climate, flora and wildlife as the five main categories of natural attractions, with forests and parks being just subcategories of flora (Kušen 2010). Similarly, artificial attractions such as theme parks are highlighted as one of the most important types of attractions in Great Britain (Leask, 2010), but in Croatia they play marginal roles and are therefore treated just as a part of supporting tourist facilities as well as casinos (Kušen 2010).

In the Master Plan of Croatian tourism the focus was on attractions which can be spatially defined, because even spatially undefined attractions such as climate or a way of life also consist of attractions that are represented in a physical form - warm sea through beautiful beaches, vibrant lifestyle through well-known festivals, etc. Large attractive areas are similarly represented with landmarks or key attractions - in Plitvice Lakes NP it is a small zone near waterfalls, in Dubrovnik the small area surrounded by city walls, similarly like the Old Faithful geyser in Yellowstone NP or Western Wall in the old town of Jerusalem (Shoval N., Raveh A., 2004).

Although Kušen’s (2015) system of tourist attractions based on 16 main categories and 270 subcategories was used for the identification of main attractions in Croatia, it proved not useful for their classification due to the huge imbalances of particular categories. For example, in four of a total 16 categories (climate, the culture of life and work, attractions for attractions, para-attractions) it was not possible to identify a single attraction in Croatia of international or national importance, and in eight categories there were only one or two attractions (Kušen 2010). Two categories (geological features and cultural/religious institutions) cover almost all important attractions in Croatia and overlap with the remaining two categories (protected natural heritage and protected cultural heritage). Therefore a bottom-up approach as a tool for the classification of tourist attractions proved as more useful for the purposes Master plan, especially for the designation of tourist

attractions that should be equipped with necessary service and interpretative facilities.

## **IDENTIFICATION OF MAIN TOURIST ATTRACTIONS IN CROATIA**

Besides the necessity for finding a new model of classification of attractions, there was a need for an objective approach to the process of establishing criteria for their evaluation. In the case of Croatia the main problem was that the majority of potential objective indicators, like the number of visitors, share of foreign tourists or equipment for visitors, proved as not useful.

- The precise number of visitors is not available for the majority of attractions, and even if it is it can give the wrong impression due to its high dependence on the location. For example, the old towns of Rovinj and Poreč in Istria are well visited due to the high number of tourists residing in the surrounding areas (round 500.000 during the year each), although they are as attractions not superior to relatively remote island towns of Hvar with 150.000 and Korčula with only 70.000 tourists (First release, 2016).
- The same types of attractions are more visited in the areas with developed coastal tourism. For example, among 15 underground caves in Croatia equipped for tourist visits, two most visited are Biserujka on the island of Krk and Baredine in Istria, both having slightly more than 30.000 visitors (First release, 2012), and located near the big tourism resorts. At the same time the most attractive but remote Cerovac Caves in mountain region of Lika have only about 10.000 visitors. The same rule applies to important churches, palaces, museums, etc.
- The profits generated by attractions can be used as an indicator only in few cases where visitation fees are applicable, and for the majority of cultural attractions like historic towns, churches and monuments this is not the case. Another problem is that ticket prices are not an indicator of the real value of attraction, because higher fees are usually a consequence of additional services, location and especially the season - the ticket prices in summer are sometimes two times more expensive than in winter period.



- The share of foreigners as an indicator of international importance of particular attraction is irrelevant due to the fact that in coastal part of Croatia foreigners represent more than 90% of all tourists. Since the share of foreign tourists is lower than 45% in the majority of continental counties (First release 4.3.2, 2013), it can produce wrong impression that attractions in Continental Croatia are less important in general.
- The equipment of attractions with parking, information and interpretation facilities is often not useful as an indicator of their tourist importance, because it is more dependent on the funds available in local community, then on the attractiveness of the site. Therefore in coastal areas almost all interesting sites are well equipped and in Continental Croatia even some attractions of great value have no basic facilities.
- Various subjects involved in the evaluation of main attractions in Croatia shown different views regarding which attractions are the most important, especially domestic versus foreign sources. For example, In Croatia's capital Zagreb the most popular museum is the Technical Museum with 160.000 visitors per year, but in the edition of Lonely Planet Croatia from 2013 it was not mentioned as an important site at all. At the same time the innovative Museum of Broken Relationships is listed by Lonely Planet as the top museum attraction in Zagreb, although it was visited by less than 80.000 visitors.

Official international recognition of attractions, such as UNESCO World Heritage status, proved also as irrelevant, because some sites like Monument of land division Stari Grad Plain on the island of Hvar are not subject to fee and attract only small number of visitors, and some attractions not on the UNESCO list like Roman amphitheatre in Pula has almost 300.000 visitors per year.

**Table 1.** Croatian attractions subject to fee with more than 50.000 visitors in 2011/2014

PROTECTED AREAS	visitors in 2011	MUSEUMS	visitors in 2014	OTHER ATTRACTIONS	visitors in 2011
Plitvice Lakes National Park	1.083.451	Museums in Dubrovnik	377.630	Dubrovnik city walls	723.125
Krka National Park	683.739 *)	Diocletian palace cellars in Split	218.528	Pula Amphitheatre	285.982
Lokrum Island Special Reserve	203.868	Museums of Croatian Zagorje	168.532	Zagreb ZOO	253.394
Brijuni National Park	156.549	Technical Museum "Nikola Tesla" Zagreb	163.312	Osijek ZOO	89.500
Paklenica National Park	118.288 *)	Museum of Arts and Crafts Zagreb	126.243	Trakošćan Castle	70.975
Telašćica Nature Park	103.181*)	Šibenik City Museum	112.382	Dubrovnik Aquarium	57.013
Mljet National Park	95.498	Museum of Contemporary Art Zagreb	104.169	Saint Donatus Church Zadar	53.869
Kornati National Park	91.780 *)	Modern Gallery Zagreb	99.633		
Vransko Lake Nature Park	62.040 *)	Archaeological museum Zadar	96.645		
		Zagreb City Museum	74.032		
		Croatian Museum of Tourism Opatija	59.415		

\*) Parts of the national/nature park area can be visited without paying a fee

Sources: First release number 4.4.8/4 (2012) and Museum Documentation Center Web Site (2015); for protected areas and other attractions newer data was not available, since the Croatian Bureau of Statistics stopped collecting such data after 2012

Bearing in mind all mentioned problems, it was obvious that it is almost impossible to designate objective and measurable criteria that can be used for the identification of the main attractions. Usage of expert opinion methodology based on scoring, like in case of Van Lake in Turkey (Alaeddinoglu A, & Selcuk Can A., 2010), was

considered as a good solution, but difficult to apply for the whole of Croatia and for so many different types of attractions. Therefore it was decided that the work on identification and evaluation of attractions should include a combination of all available resources and materials, filtered by the experts of the Institute of Tourism. The choice of main attractions was then bolstered by the suggestions made by representatives of 21 Croatian county tourist offices and other tourism experts.

## **THE MATERIALS USED FOR THE EVALUATION OF ATTRACTIONS**

Having in mind the problems in identification of main attractions in Croatia, various sources were used in order to highlight those of international and national importance. The materials consisted of four main groups:

1. Materials produced by relevant institutions dealing with the heritage protection, primarily lists of natural and cultural heritage by the Croatian Ministry of Environment and Nature Protection and Ministry of Culture;
2. Materials produced by relevant institutions responsible for organizing tourist activities, primarily by the national and regional tourist boards and unions of tourist guides;
3. All other domestic and foreign materials dealing with tourist attractions in Croatia like tourist brochures, tourist guides, web sites; and
4. Materials of the Institute for tourism dealing with tourist attractions.

Especially important sources were studies dealing with the identification of tourist attractions that should be sign-posted with “brown” signs. The preparation of those studies between 1999 and 2005 was supported by the Croatian National Tourist Organization in order to improve tourist signage that was at that time very rare in Croatia. The work included ten of a total of 21 Croatian counties – Varaždin, Krapina-Zagorje, Karlovac, Međimurje, Zagreb, Primorje-Gorski kotar, Šibenik-Knin, Zadarska, Dubrovnik-Neretva and Osijek-Baranya. Having in mind limited funds, in those studies it was decided that only attractions with international or national

importance should be included in the sign-posting plans and have priority in equipment with the minimum of infrastructural and interpretative facilities.

The decision which attractions meet those criteria was made by experts from the Institute of Tourism and county tourist associations after visiting the attractions in particular county. Since the counties were different in size and regarding their resource basis, the number of attractions chosen for marking with “brown” signs was ranging from seven attractions in the smallest continental Međimurje County to 45 attractions in the largest and most complex coastal Primorje-Gorski Kotar County. Although some important attractions were not included in the sign-posting system on main roads, like attractions on the small islands and in the central areas of larger towns, the methodology used in those studies proved useful for the identification of main attractions. Its application on the remaining 11 counties resulted with approximately 90 international and 190 national attractions in Croatia and they were almost all visited by the author of this work between the years 1999 and 2015.

## **CLASSIFICATION OF TOURIST ATTRACTIONS**

Considering big number of attractions, in the Master plan (2011) it was necessary to organize them into few easily understandable categories. Three basic types included nature based attractions, culture based attractions and manifestations, and further division 13 thematic subgroups, as seen in Table 2. Especially important types of attractions for Croatia like Water in Karst that includes the two most popular Croatian national parks Plitvice Lakes were separated as independent thematic subgroup, and themes without representative attraction of a higher degree in Croatia like amusement parks or winter resorts were omitted.

Having in mind the bottom-up approach of classifying Croatian attractions, it can be interesting to see how this classification can be applicable as a model for other countries. The main issue was the addition of attractions that are inexistent in Croatia due to its climate conditions such as glaciers, fjords and coral reefs, or due to its different cultural heritage such as Buddhist temples or Indian shrines. It was also necessary to add attractions like skyscrapers or theme parks that are inexistent or poorly represented in Croatia. In spite of those additions, there were few attractions that need to be

put in a group not represented in Croatia, because fjords and coral reefs are type of coastal forms, as well as shrines and temples are religious objects like churches and mosques. As presented in Table 3, the only types of attractions that are not present in Croatia are glaciers and city skylines, while some other types are present, but without a singular attraction of international or national importance.

**Table 2.** Main spatially-defined attractions in Croatia classified by theme

	theme	attractions
	sea and coast	island national and nature parks (Brijuni, Kornati, Mljet) attractive beaches (Zlatni Rat, Makarska Riviera) the whole Croatian Adriatic Sea as nautical destination
	water in	national parks Plitvice and Krka with their waterfalls

nature based attractions	karst	attractive rivers in karst (Mrežnica, Zrmanja, Cetina) Imotski lakes, Gacka springs and other lakes and springs	
	attractive ter-rain features with forests	karst mountain parks (Veľebit, Paklenica, Biokovo) Papuk, Medvednica and other continental mountains	
		attractive caves (Blue Cave Biševo, Cerovac, Grabovača)	
	lowland rivers and swamps	Kopački Rit and Lonjsko Polje nature parks big rivers of Pannonian plain (Danube, Sava and Drava)	
		other natural attractions	city parks and arboretums (Trsteno, Zagreb, Split) landscapes and wine routes (Istra, Pelješac, Međimurje) thermal springs (Tuhelj, Sveti Martin, Naftalan Ivanić)
	culture based attractions	ancient and prehistoric heritage	Diocletian's Palace in Split, Pula amphitheater and other archeologic sites (Stari Grad, Issa, Salona, Narona) Hušnjakovo, Vučedol and other prehistoric sites
medieval heri-tage of the Adriatic area		old towns Dubrovnik, Trogir, Zadar and others Šibenik and Poreč basilica, and other attractive churches	
		rural heritage (Motovun, Lubenice, Primošten, Ston)	
baroque heri-tage of conti-nental Croatia		Upper and Lower Town in Zagreb, "Tvrdā" in Osijek and other (Varaždin, Samobor, Karlovac, Požega, Ilok) castles of continental Croatia (Trakošćan, Veliki Tabor)	
other cultural attractions		fortresses (Senj, Šibenik, Knin, Klis, Slavonski Brod) Opatija coastal promenade memorials (Vukovar, Jasenovac)	
		museums and galleries	special museums (Krapina Neanderthals, Nikola Tesla museum in Smiljan, "Old village" Kumrovec) art and history museums (Zagreb, Dubrovnik, Split)
other attractions (manife-stations)	culture and art manifestations	theatre festivals (Dubrovnik, Split, Zagreb) classic musical events (Varaždin, Osor, Zadar) film festivals (Motovun, Pula, Zagreb, Vukovar)	
		religious and ethnographic events	religious events (Marija Bistrica, Trsat, Sinj, Aljmaš) folklore events (Đakovo, Vinkovci, Varaždin, Sinj) Rijeka carnival and other (Dubrovnik, Samobor)
			other events and manifestations

Source: Master Plan and Strategy of Tourism Development of the Republic of Croatia – Book 3 (2011). Croatian tourism and its competitive environment, Institute for Tourism Zagreb

Almost every larger country can fit in proposed structure with representatives in all important types of attractions – geological forms, scenic rivers, historic towns, religious objects, museums, art festivals. For example, on the similar list of Bulgaria with 525 main attractions (Bulgaria in Photos, 2012) all attractions fit in this scheme, only museums, churches and monuments have stronger presence than in a case of Croatia, probably due to the intention of the publisher to motivate tourists visiting attractions subject to fees. The only exceptions that cannot fit in the structure are smaller countries and those with only a few equipped attractions. Therefore the lack of representatives in certain categories can be a signal that it is necessary to improve this category of tourism, as it was a case of Croatia with theme parks.

**Table 3.** Proposed general classification of attractions

basic groups of attractions	subgroups of attractions	types of attractions	attractions in Croatia
Natural Heritage	Mainland Features	mountains and hills	8
		unique geological forms	9
		caves and holes	7
	Coastal Features	attractive coasts and islands	13
		beaches	15
	Inland Water	scenic rivers	11
		canyons and gorges	10
		waterfalls and springheads	8
		scenic lakes	4
		glaciers	-
	Natural Environment	mineral waters and geysers	0
		swamps and marshes	4
		forests	6
	Landscaped Environment	grasslands and deserts	0
parks and gardens		13	
zoos and aquariums		5	
		cultural landscapes	7
Cultural Heritage (Man-Made Attractions)	Urban and Rural Complexes	historic towns	23
		authentic rural areas	14
		archaeological and prehistoric sites	11
		big cities / skylines	-
	Individual Monuments	religious objects	26
		fortified structures	10
		castles and palaces	8
		infrastructural and productive objects	3
	Cultural Institutions and Memorials	offices and residential buildings	0
		museums and galleries	12
memorials and monuments		7	
		theatres, operas and concert halls	2
Other Attractions (Tourist Infrastructure and Events)	Events and Manifestations	art festivals	4
		folklore and gastronomic events	5
		religious events	3
		historic events and carnivals	3
		entertainment events and festivals	6
		business events	0
		sports events	1
	Health, Sports and Amusement Facilities	hotels and other accommodation	8
		health resorts and spas	3
		winter resorts	0
		stadiums and sport halls	2
	Tourist paths	amusement parks, casinos	0
		hiking and educational trails	3
		cycling and equestrian trails	2
		panoramic roads and railroads	1

## CONCLUSIONS



Tourist attractions are understood differently in various countries and cultures and the approach to these phenomena is different depending on the overall approach. Many differences are the result of various levels of tourist utilization of attractions, which is a consequence of the overall development of the area, accessibility, closeness to the tourist market etc. In the widest view tourist attractions are seen as phenomena covering all aspects of attractiveness, such as climate conditions or safety, and in the narrowest view attractions refer only to places designed for tourists that charge admission. Besides the nonexistence of a clear definition of what a tourist attraction really is, there is no unique approach regarding the identification, evaluation and classification of attractions. This is caused by the impossibility of precise measuring the importance of attractions, since for only a few attractions there is available data about the number of visitors. At the same time objective qualitative evaluation is difficult because various subjects have different opinions about the importance of particular attractions dependent of their profession, age, nationality, etc.

In spite of various approaches towards the phenomena of tourist attractions it is in most cases possible to reduce the term attraction to relatively small features visible in space. That can be done because large spatial or linear attractions such as national parks, scenic rivers or historic towns consist of landmarks and sites like unique rocks, canyons, churches, castles. Even non-spatial forms of attractions such as climate or the way of life are based on concrete attractions like equipped beaches or inspiring events. How many attractions in particular country or region will deserve status of international or national importance is a difficult task, but the only way to minimize subjectivity is consultation of all the possible sources and visitation of all attractions that should be evaluated.

The classification of attractions demands a different approach concerning specific circumstances in each country or region, and very often it is not possible to use previously-formulated models designed elsewhere. Therefore, the bottom-up approach based on adaptation of the methodology of classification on the existing attractions in particular country is more useful, although it will result in different models of classifications in each area. The biggest differences can be expected between countries predominantly oriented toward beach tourism and those mainly oriented toward

city tourism. Since almost all basic types of attractions are present everywhere, a structure of main types of tourist attractions presented in this work can be applied with some modifications also outside Croatia. Such classification can be useful for comparing between countries, especially for the purpose of highlighting strong and weak spots of tourism. Since tourist attractions are the basis of tourism development, comparable methods of their identification, evaluation and classification can be a good tool for tourism planning in general.

## REFERENCES

- Alaeddinoglu F., Selcuk Can A., (2011). Identification and classification of nature-based tourism resources: western Lake Van basin, Turkey, *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, pp.198–207.
- Benckendorff P., Pearce P. (2003). Australian tourism attractions: the links between organizational characteristics and planning. *Journal of Travel Research* 42(1), pp. 24–35.
- Boniface P. and Cooper C. (2001). *Worldwide Destinations: The Geography of Travel and Tourism*, Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Bulgaria in photos and Bulgaria travel map (2012). Domino Ltd, Stara Zagora.
- Deng J., King B., Bauer T., (2002) Evaluating natural attractions for tourism, *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 29, No. 2, pp. 422–438.
- Dubrovnik Port Authority – Statistics 2015, Dubrovnik. [Http://portdubrovnik.hr/statistika/](http://portdubrovnik.hr/statistika/). Accessed the 25 th of November 2015, at 12:00.
- First release No 4.4.8/4. (2012). Visitors to main tourist sights and attractions - Fourth quarter of 2011, Croatian Bureau of Statistics, Zagreb.
- First release No 4.3.2/52. (2016). Tourism – Tourist arrivals and nights in 2015, Croatian Bureau of Statistics, Zagreb.
- Fyall A., Garrod B., Leask A., (2008). *Managing visitor attractions – New directions*, Butterworth-Heinemann Elsevier.
- Harris R. and Howard J., (1996). *Dictionary of Travel & Tourism Hospitality Terms* Melbourne, Hospitality Press.
- Hrvatska – Turistički vodič (1998). *Leksikografski zavod Miroslav Krleža*, Zagreb.
- Hu, W., & Wall, G. (2005). Environmental management, environmental image and the competitive tourist attraction. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 13(6), pp. 617–635.
- Klarić Z., (1992). Establishing tourist regions – the situation in Croatia". *Tourism management* Vol. 13, No. 3, pp. 305-311.

- Kušen E., (2010). A system of tourism attractions, *Tourism review* No 4, Vol. 58, Institute for tourism Zagreb, pp. 409-424.
- Kušen E., (2002). *Turistička atrakcijska osnova* (Tourist attraction basis), Institute for tourism Zagreb.
- Leask A., (2010). Progress in visitor attraction research: Towards more effective management, *Tourism Management* 31, pp. 155–166.
- Lew A.A., (1987). A framework of tourist attraction research, *Annals of tourism research* Vol 14., pp. 553-575.
- Lonely planet Croatia (2013). Lonely planet publications Pty.
- Master plan and strategy of the tourism development of the Republic of Croatia – Book 3 (2011). *Croatian tourism and its competitive environment*, Institute for tourism Zagreb.
- Middleton, V., & Clarke, J. (2001). *Marketing in travel and tourism*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Museum Documentation Center Web Site (2015) [http://www.mdc.hr/files/file/muzeji/statistika/Posjet-hrvatskim-muzejima---statistika-broja-posjeta-\(2014.-g.\).pdf](http://www.mdc.hr/files/file/muzeji/statistika/Posjet-hrvatskim-muzejima---statistika-broja-posjeta-(2014.-g.).pdf) . Accessed the 15th of January 2017, at 14:00.
- Pravilnik o turističkoj i ostaloj signalizaciji na cestama (2002), *Narodne Novine* N0 87 from 23 July 2002, Zagreb.
- Priskin J., (2001). Assessment of natural resources for nature-based tourism: the case of the Central Coast Region of Western Australia, *Tourism Management* 22, pp. 637–648.
- Richards G., (2002). Tourism attraction systems - Exploring Cultural Behavior, *Annals of Tourism Research* Vol. 29, No. 4, pp. 1048–1064.
- Shoval N., Raveh A., (2004). Categorization of tourist attractions and the modeling of tourist cities: based on the co-plot method of multivariate analysis, *Tourism management* 25, pp. 741-750.
- Split Port Authority – Statistics 2015, Split. [Http://portsplit.com/wp-content/uploads/kruzna.pdf](http://portsplit.com/wp-content/uploads/kruzna.pdf). Accessed the 25 th of November 2015, at 12:00.
- Strategija razvoja turizma Republike Hrvatske do 2020. godine, *Narodne Novine* N0 55 from 8 May 2013, Zagreb.
- Swarbrooke J., (2001). Key issues in visitor attraction management in a competitive market, *Tourism issues*.
- Tomas Ijeto (2011). *Stavovi i potrošnja turista u Hrvatskoj*, Institut za turizam, Zagreb.
- Visitor Attraction Trends in England 2013, full report (2014). British tourist authority (VisitBritain).
- Weidenfeld A., (2010). Iconicity and ‘Flagshipness’ of Tourist Attractions, *Annals of Tourism Research* 37, pp. 848–860.

Zoran Klarić

**Zoran Klarić** (zoran.klaric@iztg.hr) is a Senior research fellow at Institute for tourism Zagreb, Vrhovec 5, 10000 Zagreb, Croatia.