

# SEFARDSKA BAŠTINA U HRVATSKOJ. PROFIL POSJETITELJA U SPLITU I DUBROVNIKU

## SEPHARDIC HERITAGE IN CROATIA. VISITORS PROFILE IN SPLIT AND DUBROVNIK

ANITA FIKET<sup>1\*</sup>, VUK TVRTKO OPAČIĆ<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Sveučilište u Zagrebu, Filozofski fakultet, Centar za židovske studije i istraživanje Holokausta, Ivana Lučića 3, 10000, Zagreb, Hrvatska / *University of Zagreb, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Center for Jewish and Holocaust studies, Zagreb, Croatia*, e-mail: afiket@m.ffzg.hr

<sup>2</sup> Sveučilište u Zagrebu, Prirodoslovno-matematički fakultet, Geografski odsjek, Trg Marka Marulića 19/II, 10000, Zagreb, Hrvatska / *University of Zagreb, Faculty of Science, Department of Geography, Zagreb, Croatia*, e-mail: vtopacic@geog.pmf.hr, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9483-3609>

\* dopisni autor / *corresponding author*

DOI: 10.15291/geoadria.4717

Pregledni rad / *Review*

Primljeno / *Received*: 19-2-2025

Prihvaćeno / *Accepted*: 09-6-2025



Autori zadržavaju autorska prava nad svojim radom i pravom na objavljivanje bez ograničenja. Rad se licencira pod CC BY licencom što znači da članci mogu biti ponovno korišteni i distribuirani bez ograničenja dokle god je izvorni sadržaj ispravno citiran.



Authors retain unrestricted copyright to their work and publishing rights. Work is licensed under the CC BY licence which allows articles to be re-used and re-distributed without restriction, as long as the original work is correctly cited.

Sefardska baština odnosi se na naslijeđe židovske zajednice protjerane 1492. godine s Iberskog poluotoka, koja se potom većinom raselila po Mediteranu. U Hrvatskoj su se sefardski Židovi naselili u Splitu i Dubrovniku, gdje su pridonijeli društvenom, gospodarskom i kulturnom razvoju tih gradova. Danas te zajednice još uvijek postoje, a njihova je baština sačuvana. Groblja i sinagoge su očuvane i u funkciji, ali nisu aktivno korištene. Razvoj turizma u Splitu i Dubrovniku omogućuje da se sefardska baština aktivno uključuje u turističku ponudu gradova. Cilj istraživanja je utvrditi profil posjetitelja sefardske baštine i njihovo zadovoljstvo posjećenim lokalitetima u Splitu i Dubrovniku. U tu svrhu provedeno je anketno istraživanje 2022. i 2023. godine na uzorku od 264 posjetitelja na židovskom groblju u Splitu i sinagogi u Dubrovniku. Primijenjene su metode deskriptivne statistike i multivarijatna analiza varijance (MANOVA). Uz multivarijatnu analizu varijance provedene su i dodatne analize s pomoću hi-kvadrat testa. Rezultati su pokazali da su posjetitelji sefardske baštine tipični kulturni turisti iako postoje razlike među posjetiteljima u Splitu i Dubrovniku, što se pripisuje položaju lokaliteta u gradu.

**KLJUČNE RIJEČI:** Sefardi, židovska baština, turizam židovske baštine, Hrvatska

Sephardic heritage represents the heritage of the Jewish community expelled from the Iberian Peninsula in 1492, which then largely dispersed across the Mediterranean. In Croatia, Sephardic Jews settled in Split and Dubrovnik, where they participated in the social, economic and cultural progress of these cities. Today, these communities still exist, and their heritage has been preserved. Cemeteries and synagogues are functional, but not active. The development of tourism in Split and Dubrovnik allows Sephardic heritage to be actively included in the tourism supply of the cities. The objective of the research is to determine the profile of visitors to Sephardic heritage sites and their satisfaction with the sites visited in Split and Dubrovnik. For this purpose, a survey was conducted among visitors to the Jewish cemetery in Split and the synagogue in Dubrovnik. The research was conducted in 2022 and 2023 on a sample of 264 visitors. Descriptive statistics and multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) methods were used. In addition to the multivariate analysis of variance, additional analyses using the chi-square test were conducted. The results showed that visitors to Sephardic heritage sites are typical cultural tourists, although there are differences between visitors in Split and Dubrovnik, which is attributed to the location of the sites in the city.

**KEYWORDS:** Sephardim, Jewish heritage, Jewish heritage tourism, Croatia

## UVOD

Židovska dijaspora dijeli se na dvije velike skupine koje su ključne za oblikovanje židovske kulture: Sefarde i Aškenaze (Koš, 1999). Sefardi su potomci Židova koji su živjeli u Španjolskoj i Portugalu prije progona 1492., odnosno 1496. godine. Govore judeošpanjolskim jezikom te su raseljeni po Mediteranu, Jugoistočnoj Europi, Južnoj i Sjevernoj Americi. Naziv Sefardi pojavio se nakon izгона kao izraz nostalgije za Španjolskom i Portugalom. Aškenazi su Židovi podrijetlom iz Srednje i Istočne Europe koji govore jidiš (Skolnik, 2007). Te se dvije skupine razlikuju ne samo po jeziku, već i po kulturi, običajima i vjerskoj tradiciji.

Židovi prostor Iberskog poluotoka naseljavaju od 2. stoljeća (Jacobs, 2008) koji je tijekom muslimanske vladavine postao tadašnji centar židovske dijasporе. Nakon tzv. zlatnog doba židovske kulture, s kršćanskim osvajanjem poluotoka dolazi do inkvizicije čiji je vrhunac bio 1492. godine kada su Židovi protjerani iz zemalja španjolske krune te ih se najviše seli prema istoku Mediterana, u Osmansko Carstvo (Gerber, 1992).

S obzirom na to da se na putu prema Osman-skom Carstvu dio prognanih Židova doselio na područje današnje Hrvatske, ovaj rad istražuje sefardsku baštinu u Hrvatskoj, to jest u gradovima u kojima su se Sefardi naselili u većem broju – u Splitu i Dubrovniku. Cilj rada je istražiti motivaciju i način putovanja posjetitelja sefardske baštine u Hrvatskoj pri čemu te istaknuti razlike između posjetitelja u Splitu i Dubrovniku. Istraživanje je provedeno putem anketnog upitnika na odabranim lokacijama: na židovskom groblju u Splitu i u muzeju/sinagogi u Dubrovniku. Židovsko groblje u Splitu nalazi se na brdu Marjan, blizu Prve vidilice, te danas nije u funkciji. Osobe židovske vjeroispovijesti pokapaju se na židovskom dijelu gradskoga groblja Lovrinac. Sinagoga u Dubrovniku nalazi se u Žudioskoj ulici te je u povremenoj funkciji. U sklopu sinagoge otvoren je i židovski muzej te se posjet naplaćuje, što, prema Krakoveru (2017), znači da je židovska baština institucionalizirana.

U radu se definira baština sefardskih Židova te se na primjerima iz Hrvatske (Split, Dubrovnik)

## INTRODUCTION

The Jewish diaspora is divided into two large groups that significantly characterize Jewish culture. On the one hand they are the Sephardim, and on the other, the Ashkenazim (Koš, 1999). The Sephardim are descendants of Jews who lived in Spain or Portugal before the expulsion in 1492 and 1496, respectively, they speak the Judeo-Spanish language and were displaced throughout the Mediterranean, South-Eastern Europe and the Americas. The term Sephardim appeared after the expulsion as a feeling of nostalgia for that country. The Ashkenazim are Jews from Central and Eastern Europe who speak Yiddish (Skolnik, 2007). These groups are distinguished from each other not only in language, but also in culture, customs and religious tradition.

Jews were settling in the Iberian Peninsula since the 2nd century (Jacobs, 2008), which became the centre of the Jewish diaspora during Muslim rule. After the so-called golden age of Jewish culture, with the Christian conquest of the peninsula came the Inquisition, which culminated in 1492 when Jews were expelled from the lands of the Spanish Crown and mostly moved eastward to the Mediterranean, to the Ottoman Empire (Gerber, 1992).

On their way to the Ottoman Empire, some of the expelled Jews settled in the area of present-day Croatia, so this paper will examine Sephardic heritage in Croatia, namely in the cities where Sephardim settled in greater numbers: Split and Dubrovnik. The purpose of the paper is to examine the motivation and travel patterns of Sephardic heritage visitors in Croatia, highlighting the differences between visitors in Split and Dubrovnik. The research was conducted using a questionnaire at selected locations: at the Jewish cemetery in Split and at the museum/synagogue in Dubrovnik. The Jewish cemetery in Split is located on the hill Marjan, near Prva vidilica (First Peak), and is not currently in active use. People of Jewish faith are buried in the Jewish part of the city cemetery Lovrinac. The synagogue in Dubrovnik is located on the street Žudioska ulica and is in occasional use. A Jewish Museum is also open as part of the synagogue, and admission is charged, which according to Krakover (2017) means that Jewish heritage is institutionalised.

The paper defines 'Sephardic Jews', and identi-

identificiraju najvažnija kulturna dobra kao podloga za dosadašnje stanje i potencijalnu turističku valorizaciju sefardske baštine. Prije analize rezultata anketiranja posjetitelja sefardske baštine u Splitu i Dubrovniku, radi teorijskog utemeljenja i kontekstualizacije, ukratko je prikazana povijest sefardskih zajednica u Splitu i Dubrovniku s naglaskom na njihov doprinos u razvoju tih dvaju gradova. Cilj ovoga istraživanja je utvrđivanje profila posjetitelja sefardske baštine u Hrvatskoj i njihovo zadovoljstvo posjećenim lokalitetima u Splitu i Dubrovniku. Identificirani profili posjetitelja sefardske baštine uspoređeni su s tipologijom kulturnih turista u Hrvatskoj kako bi se utvrdile sličnosti i/ili razlike.

Ispitivanje percepcije lokalnih židovskih zajednica izlazi iz okvira ovoga istraživanja. No otvorenost židovskih zajednica prema razvoju toga oblika turizma vidljiva je u ponudi i izboru lokaliteta. Židovska zajednica u Dubrovniku razvija turizam kroz muzej i sinagogu uz naplatu ulaznica te je autorima omogućeno da provedu anketno istraživanje. Sinagoga i muzej u Dubrovniku otvoreni su svakodnevno od travnja do listopada. No sinagoga u Splitu nije otvorena svakodnevno ni tijekom ljetne sezone te se anketno istraživanje nije moglo provesti. Stoga je za anketiranje odabrano židovsko groblje u Splitu, po čemu se i vidi otvorenost odnosno ponuda turizma židovske baštine u Splitu.

## TEORIJSKI OKVIR

### *Židovska baština u kontekstu turizma*

Baština se definira kao „ono što nasljeđujemo iz prošlosti i koristimo u sadašnjosti“ (Timothy, 2021, p. 3). Iako baština pripada prošlosti, upotrebljava se u turizmu, obrazovanju te razvoju zajednice (Timothy, 2021). Geografija i baština su povezane jer je „baština inherentno prostorni fenomen“ (Graham i sur., 2000, p. 4), ali i zato što je „baština od temeljne važnosti za interes suvremene kulturne i historijske geografije, koja se fokusira na značenje, prikaz i ključno pitanje identiteta“ (Graham i sur., 2000, p. 4). Turizam baštine odnosi se na posjete osoba koje ‘vide ili doživljavaju izgrađenu baštinu, živu kulturu ili

ifies the most important cultural assets as a basis for the current state and potential tourism valorisation of Sephardic heritage using examples from Croatia (Split, Dubrovnik). Before analysing the results of the survey of visitors to Sephardic heritage sites in Split and Dubrovnik, for the better theoretical foundation and contextualisation, the history of Sephardic communities in Split and Dubrovnik is briefly presented, with an emphasis on their contribution to the development of these two cities. This research aims to determine the profile of visitors to Sephardic heritage sites in Croatia and their satisfaction with the sites visited in Split and Dubrovnik. The identified profiles of Sephardic heritage visitors were compared with the typology of cultural tourists in Croatia in order to establish similarities and/or differences.

Examining the perceptions of local Jewish communities was beyond the research framework, because the work in that case would have been too long, and therefore it was not conducted. However, the openness of Jewish communities towards the development of this form of tourism is visible in the offer itself and the choice of location. The Jewish community in Dubrovnik develops tourism through a museum and synagogue with entrance fees, and it was possible to conduct a survey. In addition, the synagogue and museum in Dubrovnik are open daily from April to October. Conversely, the synagogue in Split is not open daily, not even during the summer season, and therefore, a survey cannot be conducted. For this reason, the Jewish cemetery in Split was chosen, and this shows the openness and offer of Jewish heritage tourism in Split.

## THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

### *Jewish heritage in tourism*

Heritage can be defined as ‘what we inherit from the past and use in the present day’ (Timothy, 2021, p. 3). Today is past, though heritage used for tourism, as well as education and community development (Timothy, 2021). Geography and heritage are connected because ‘heritage is inherently a space phenomenon’ (Graham et al., 2000, p. 4), but also because heritage and its place can have a meaning, and is part of cultural and historical geography, connected

suvremenu umjetnost' (Timothy, 2021, p. 4), a motivirane su željom da nauče nešto novo, zadovolje svoju znatiželju ili provedu vrijeme s rodbinom, osobito ako dolaze iz dijaspori i žele obnoviti obiteljske veze (Timothy, 2021). Židovska baština dio je kulturne baštine s opipljivim i nematerijalnim elementima. Izvan Izraela židovska baština je dio kulturne baštine manjine. Prema Krakoveru (2017), kada dominantna skupina preuzme manjinsku baštinu, ona se ili ušutkuje, tolerira, dopušta uz baštinu dominantne skupine, ili se uključuje u narativ kao simbol pluralizma i različitih identiteta. Taj je proces omogućio da židovski prostor u urbanim područjima bude uočljiv i dio lokalnog turizma.

Židovska baština u Europi dio nacionalnih i lokalnih povijesti postaje početkom 1990-ih, nakon pada komunističkih režima (Corsale, 2017). Od kraja Drugoga svjetskog rata do 1990-ih, židovska je baština bila zapuštena, uništena, ali i zaboravljena (Corsale, 2017). Židovska baština u Europi predstavlja manjinsku baštinu koja je u nekim područjima nestala još prije nekoliko stoljeća, dok je drugdje danas čuva mala zajednica, uglavnom starije životne dobi i visoko asimilirana (Corsale, 2017). Sastoji se od židovske četvrti, židovskog muzeja, sinagoge, lokalne židovske osobe, groblja, spomenika holokausta i ostalih spomenika (Gruber, 2002; Krakover, 2013; Sandri, 2013). Uz navedeno, židovska kultura obuhvaća izložbe židovske umjetnosti, koncerte tradicionalne glazbe, festivale i restorane (Sandri, 2013). Razlozi za porast interesa za materijalnu nepokretnu židovsku baštinu posljedica su dugotrajne krivnje ili nelagode prema prošlosti (mračni turizam) i stereotipne nostalgije (Dulska, 2020).

Turizam židovske baštine može biti masovni oblik turizma, poput turizma koncentracijskih logora (ili turizma holokausta), alternativnog turizma, poput pješačkih tura židovskim četvrtima, do specifičnog nišnog oblika turizma kao što su Hillulot hodočašća u Maroku. Ovisno o državi, turizam židovske baštine može se razvijati unutar različitih okvira: nacionalnog, manjinskog, vjerskog, genealoškog, turizma dijaspori, bolne baštine ili nacionalne krivnje (Soussi, 2020). Dulska (2020) iznosi glavne poteškoće židov-

with identity (Graham et al., 2000). Heritage tourism refers to visits by people who are 'seeing or experiencing built heritage, living culture or contemporary arts' (Timothy, 2021, p. 4), and they are motivated to learn something new, to spend some time with family, and to satisfy their curiosity (Timothy, 2021). Jewish heritage is a part of cultural heritage, which includes both tangible and intangible elements. It is part of the cultural heritage of the minority, which is Jewish heritage everywhere outside of Israel. According to Krakover (2017), there are three cases of what happens to the minority heritage when the dominant group takes it over: it is silenced, it is tolerated or allowed alongside the heritage of the dominant, and it is incorporated into the narrative as a place of pluralism or different identities. Jewish heritage was silenced, but from the 1990s it has been incorporated into national histories. That process allowed that visible Jewish space in urban areas became noticeable and part of local tourism.

After the fall of communist regimes, Jewish heritage in Europe became part of national and local history in the early 1990s (Corsale, 2017). From the end of World War II until the 1990s, Jewish heritage was neglected, destroyed, and forgotten (Corsale, 2017). Jewish heritage in Europe represents a minority heritage that either disappeared, sometimes several centuries ago, or is now made up of a small community with members who are mostly elderly and have a high degree of assimilation (Corsale, 2017). It consists of a Jewish quarter, a Jewish Museum, a synagogue, a local Jewish person, cemeteries, Holocaust memorials, and other monuments (Gruber, 2002; Krakover, 2013; Sandri, 2013). In addition, Jewish culture includes exhibitions of Jewish art, concerts of traditional music, festivals, and restaurants (Sandri, 2013). The reasons for the increase in interest in tangible immovable Jewish heritage are the result of long-standing guilt or discomfort with the past (dark tourism) and stereotypical nostalgia (Dulska, 2020).

Jewish heritage tourism can be a mass form of tourism, such as concentration camp tourism (or Holocaust tourism), alternative tourism, such as walking tours of Jewish neighbourhoods, to a specific niche form of tourism such as Hillulot pilgrimages in Morocco. Depending on the individual country, Jewish heritage tourism can develop within different frameworks: national, minority, religious, genealogical,

ske baštine. Navodi da je židovska baština danas osjetljivo socijalno i političko pitanje, da su pojedini gradovi izgubili sinagoge i židovske četvrti kao najvažniju materijalnu nepokretnu židovsku baštinu, ali i groblja. Dok se nakon holokausta javlja problem pitanja vlasništva (koji u Europi do danas nije potpuno riješen), u Španjolskoj i Portugalu toga problema nema jer su židovski vlasnici napustili svoje domove još u 15. stoljeću, njihove su kuće ostale stoljećima zapuštene ili su dobili nove vlasnike koji su ondje već stoljećima (Dulska, 2020).

Posjetitelji židovske baštine mogu se podijeliti na turiste židovskog i nežidovskog podrijetla, a razlikuju se prema motivaciji (Duda-Seifert & Kajdanek, 2021). Židovski turisti žele posjetiti mjesta i muzeje povezane sa židovstvom te se nerijetko govori i o genealoškom turizmu. Sličnu motivaciju imaju nežidovski turisti, ali sa slabijom emocionalnom povezanosti s mjestima koje posjećuju. Više ih motivira uživanje u specifičnom ambijentu židovskih četvrti.

U posljednjih tridesetak godina turizam židovske baštine postao je rastući segment kulturnog turizma u mnogobrojnim europskim državama: Češkoj (Gaižutytė-Filipavičienė, 2020; Mitsche & Strielkowski, 2016), Litvi (Sandri, 2013), Mađarskoj (Drotár & Kozma, 2021; Gaižutytė-Filipavičienė, 2020; Smith & Zatori, 2015), Sjevernoj Makedoniji (Petrevska i sur., 2018), Poljskoj (Cohen, 2015; Duda-Seifert, 2016; Duda-Seifert & Kajdanek, 2021; Gaižutytė-Filipavičienė, 2020; Sandri, 2013), Rumunjskoj (Corsale, 2017), Ukrajini (Corsale, 2020; Corsale & Vuytsyk, 2018; Haba i sur., 2020). Turizam sefardske baštine, kao podoblik turizma židovske baštine, može se pronaći u državama koje su u nekom povijesnom trenutku imale sefardsku zajednicu, bilo da su izvorni stanovnici (Španjolska i Portugal) ili su izbjegli u te zemlje (Italija, Maroko, Grčka, Turska, BiH, Hrvatska, Srbija, Sjeverna Makedonija, Bugarska, Izrael, Nizozemska, SAD itd.).

Znanstvena literatura i istraživanja o turizmu židovske baštine s vremenom se povećavaju. Iako je demografski najveća populacija Židova u Europi prije holokausta bila u Srednjoj i Istočnoj Europi, podjednak je znanstveni interes za istraživanje baštine i Sefarda i Aškenaza. U Tablici 1. prikazani

diaspora tourism, as a painful heritage and national guilt (Soussi, 2020). Dulska (2020) presents the main difficulties of Jewish heritage, i.e., that today it is a sensitive social and political issue, that some cities have lost synagogues and Jewish neighbourhoods as the most important material immovable Jewish heritage, as well as cemeteries. While the problem of ownership arose after the Holocaust (which has not been fully resolved in Europe to this day), it is absent in Spain and Portugal because Jewish owners left their homes in the 15th century, their houses remained neglected for centuries or got new owners who have been there for centuries (Dulska, 2020).

Visitors to Jewish heritage sites can be divided into tourists of Jewish and non-Jewish origin, who differ in their motivation (Duda-Seifert & Kajdanek, 2021). Jewish tourists want to visit places and museums associated with Judaism, and genealogical tourism is often discussed. Non-Jewish tourists have a similar motivation, but they have a weaker emotional connection to the places they visit. They are more motivated by enjoying the specific atmosphere of Jewish quarters.

In the last thirty years, Jewish heritage tourism has become a growing segment of cultural tourism in many European countries: the Czech Republic (Gaižutytė-Filipavičienė, 2020; Mitsche & Strielkowski, 2016), Lithuania (Sandri, 2013), Hungary (Drotár & Kozma, 2021; Gaižutytė-Filipavičienė, 2020; Smith & Zatori, 2015), North Macedonia (Petrevska et al., 2018), Poland (Cohen, 2015; Duda-Seifert, 2016; Duda-Seifert & Kajdanek, 2021; Gaižutytė-Filipavičienė, 2020; Sandri, 2013), Romania (Corsale, 2017), Ukraine (Corsale, 2020; Corsale & Vuytsyk, 2018; Haba et al., 2020). When we talk about Sephardic heritage tourism, as a sub-type of Jewish heritage tourism, it can be found in countries that had a Sephardic community at some point in history, whether it originated there (Spain and Portugal) or Sephardim fled to these countries (Italy, Morocco, Greece, Turkey, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Serbia, North Macedonia, Bulgaria, Israel, the Netherlands, the USA, etc.).

Scientific literature and research on Jewish heritage tourism is increasing over time. Although demographically the largest population of Jews in Europe before the Holocaust was in Central and Eastern Europe, there is equal scientific interest in research-

TABLICA 1. Pregled radova koji se bave sefardskom baštinom

TABLE 1 Overview of studies dealing with Sephardic heritage

| Autor(i) / Author(s)        | Država (grad) / State (City)             | Objekt istraživanja / Research object                                           |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Choluj & Gawrecki, 2019     | Spain (Lorca)                            | Sinagoga i četvrt / Synagogue and quarter                                       |
| Corsale & Krakover, 2019    | Italy (Syracuse)                         | Židovska baština / Jewish heritage                                              |
| Dinis & Krakover, 2016      | Portugal (Belmonte)                      | Židovska baština / Jewish heritage                                              |
| Dulska, 2020                | Spain (Navarre)                          | Židovska baština / Jewish heritage                                              |
| Isnart, 2023                | Portugal (Tomar)                         | Sinagoga / Synagogue                                                            |
| Jimber del Rio et al., 2020 | Spain (Cordoba)                          | Sinagoga / Synagogue                                                            |
| Krakover, 2012              | Portugal (Serra da Estrela)              | Turizam židovske baštine / Jewish heritage tourism                              |
| Krakover, 2013              | Spain                                    | Židovska baština / Jewish heritage                                              |
| Krakover, 2019              | Greece (Thessaloniki)                    | Židovska baština / Jewish heritage                                              |
| Krakover & Corsale, 2021    | Italy (Sicily) and Greece (Thessaloniki) | Internet platforma za židovsku baštinu / Online platform for Jewish heritage    |
| Russo & Romagosa, 2010      | Spain                                    | Organizacija Red de Juderías de España / Red de Juderías de España Organisation |
| Santos et al., 2022         | Portugal (Coimbra)                       | Kulturna ruta / Cultural route                                                  |
| Soussi, 2020                | Morocco                                  | Židovska baština / Jewish heritage                                              |
| Zammit, 2020                | Malta                                    | Židovska baština / Jewish heritage                                              |

su autori radova u kojima je objekt istraživanja sefardska baština. Navedene su i analizirane države odnosno gradovi. Većinom je objekt istraživanja općenito židovska baština Sefarda (sinagoga, četvrt, groblje, ulice, trgovi i slično), a tek se pojedini radovi konkretno fokusiraju na pojedinu sinagogu ili primjerice organizaciju. Unatoč sve većem broju znanstvenih radova i istraživanja židovske baštine, „nedostaju složena istraživanja posvećena analizi turista koji posjećuju mjesta židovske baštine kao neku vrstu turističke niše” (Soussi, 2020, p. 262). Svrha ovoga istraživanja je popuniti taj nedostatak.

U sinagogi u Córdoba provedeno je anketno istraživanje među posjetiteljima židovske vjeroispovijesti s ciljem ispitivanja razine zadovoljstva i očekivanih vrijednosti lokaliteta (Jimber del Río i sur., 2020). Istraživanjem je obuhvaćeno 350 ispitanika. Rezultati su pokazali da većinu čine osobe srednje životne dobi (između 40 i 59 godina), uglavnom muškarci (54,1 %) s višim stupnjem obrazovanja (53,3 %). Među posjetiteljima su prevladavali domaći turisti (57,8 %). U istraživanju je ispitano njihovo zadovoljstvo posjetom odabranom lokalitetu, koje je u prosjeku ocijenjeno s 7,3 od mogućih 10 bodova. Međutim, njihova su očekivanja bila viša od stvarnog doživ-

ing both Sephardic and Ashkenazi heritage. Table 1 shows the authors of studies in which the research object is Sephardic heritage. The countries or cities that were analysed are also listed. Most of the research is generally on Sephardic Jewish heritage (synagogue, quarter, cemetery, streets, squares, etc.), and only a few studies specifically focus on a single synagogue or, for example, an organisation. Despite the growing number of scholarly studies and research on Jewish heritage, ‘there is a lack of comprehensive research dedicated to the analysis of tourists visiting Jewish heritage sites as a kind of tourist niche’ (Soussi, 2020, p. 262). The purpose of this research is to fill this gap.

A survey was conducted among visitors to the synagogue in Cordoba (Jimber del Rio et al., 2020) with the aim of investigating the level of satisfaction and expected value of the site. The criterion was that the visitors were Jewish, and the total number of respondents was 350 visitors. The results showed that the majority of visitors were middle-aged (between 40 and 59 years old), male (54.1%), with a higher level of education (53.3%). Domestic tourists prevailed (57.8%). The study examined the satisfaction of visiting the selected site, which they rated with 7.3 (out of 10), but their expectations of the visit were high, which were not met, therefore the rating is 6.57 (out of 10). This research contributes to the under-

ljaja, što pokazuje niža prosječna ocjena očekivanja od 6,57 (od 10). Ovo istraživanje pridonosi razumijevanju turizma židovske baštine te odnosu između lokaliteta i posjetitelja. Dinis i Krakover (2016) izradili su strukturu posjetitelja u skladu s podacima židovskog muzeja u Belmontu. Najviše posjetitelja dolazi iz Izraela, zatim SAD-a, Španjolske i Francuske, ali naglašava se nedostatak nežidovskih posjetitelja.

Židovska baština u Španjolskoj i Portugalu razlikuje se od židovske baštine u ostatku Europe. O njoj se govori samo do 1492. godine za Španjolsku, odnosno 1497. za Portugal (Gerber, 1992). Židovi su na Iberskom poluotoku živjeli u posebnim četvrtima, koje su se u srednjovjekovnoj Španjolskoj nazivale *juderias* (Dulska, 2020), a toponimi *castro de los judis* i *Montjuïc* svjedoče o lokacijama njihovih groblja (Jacobs, 2008). Sefardski nadgrobni spomenici prate trend muslimana s horizontalno položenom pločom (Jacobs, 2008). S druge strane, Aškenazi su preuzeli kršćansku tradiciju te imaju okomite nadgrobne spomenike (Segal, 2005). Židovsku baštinu na Iberskom poluotoku čine javna imovina (židovske četvrti, *juderias* /ulice i slično/, sinagoge, mikve i groblja) te privatne relikvije (privatne kuće važnih Židova, hebrejski natpisi ili simboli, poput minore i Magen Davida) ugravirani u kamen, mezuze ili rupe od mezusa i sl. (Krakover, 2013). Krakover (2013) navodi glavne materijalne elemente u gradovima kao dio njihove ponude židovske baštine. Ovi su elementi poredani prema učestalosti, gdje su židovske četvrti ključne za identifikaciju i prostorno lociranje potencijalne židovske baštine i sinagoga, dok manju važnost imaju trgovi nazvani po židovskim osobama te obnova židovskih groblja. Krakover (2013) iznosi tri problema s *juderias*: ne razlikuje se od ostalih kuća; nedostaje im priča o židovskoj četvrti ako ne sadrže određeni židovski simbol ili ne imenuju ulicu po židovskoj osobi / o židovskom životu; manje se razlikuju od ostalih atrakcija. Za razliku od židovskih četvrti, židovska su groblja u Španjolskoj očuvana jer su skrivena stoljećima. Dulska (2020) navodi da se sefardska baština nalazi u urbanim i u ruralnim prostorima te ima potencijala kao dio kulturnog turizma.

*Red de Juderias de España* (engl. *Network of*

standing of Jewish heritage tourism and the relationship between the site and visitors. Dinis and Krakover (2016) developed a visitor structure based on data from the Jewish Museum in Belmont. The largest number of visitors come from Israel, followed by the USA, Spain and France, but the lack of non-Jewish visitors is highlighted.

The Jewish heritage in Spain and Portugal is different from that in the rest of Europe. We are talking about time before 1492 and 1497 for Spain and Portugal, respectively (Gerber, 1992). Jews in the Iberian Peninsula lived in separate quarters, which in medieval Spain were called *juderias* (Dulska, 2020), and the toponyms *castro de los judis* and *Montjuïc* can be evidence of the locations of the cemeteries (Jacobs, 2008). Sephardic tombstones follow the Muslim trend of horizontally placed slabs (Jacobs, 2008). Conversely, Ashkenazi adopted the Christian tradition of using vertical tombstones (Segal, 2005). Jewish heritage in the Iberian Peninsula consists of public property (Jewish quarters (*juderias*), synagogues, mikvehs and cemeteries) and private relics (private houses of important Jews, Hebrew inscriptions or symbols (such as the menorah and Magen David) engraved in stone, mezuzahs or mezuzah holes, etc.) (Krakover, 2013). In his research, Krakover (2013) lists the main material elements in cities as part of their Jewish heritage tourism supply. These elements are ordered by frequency, which suggests that Jewish quarters are a necessary condition for demarcating or locating where potential Jewish heritage, synagogues, could be located, and squares named after Jewish people and the restoration of Jewish cemeteries are of lesser importance. Krakover (2013) lists three problems with *juderias*: the houses there are not different from other houses; they can lack the story about Jewish quarter if they do not have a specific Jewish symbol or a street named after a Jewish person/about Jewish life, and the diversity is small compared to other attractions. Unlike Jewish quarters, Jewish cemeteries in Spain have been preserved because they are hidden. Dulska (2020) states that Sephardic heritage can be found in both urban and rural areas and has potential as a part of cultural tourism.

*Red de Juderias de España* (short RED, or eng. Network of Spanish Jewries) is a non-profit organization of 24 member cities in Spain with a goal of preserving the urban, archaeological, historical, artis-

*Spanish Jewries* RED) je neprofitna organizacija 24 španjolska grada čiji je cilj očuvanje urbane, arheološke, povijesne, umjetničke i kulturne baštine Sefarda u Španjolskoj. Svojim članovima nudi organizacijske i savjetodavne usluge, web marketing, tiskane publikacije i povezivanje s Europom. Organizacija je polazna točka za sve zainteresirane za sefardsku baštinu u Španjolskoj. Članovi RED organizacije sastavljaju različite povezane rute i itinerare te rade na internacionalizaciji mreže. Time Španjolska postaje dobar primjer razvoja proizvoda židovske baštine. Iz ove organizacije proizašle su dvije inicijative: *European Day of Jewish Culture* i *European Jewish Heritage Route* (Red de Juderías de España, 2024). Slična organizacija postoji u Portugalu pod nazivom *Rede de Judiarias de Portugal* (engl. *Portuguese Network of Jewish Quarters*) (Rede de Judiarias de Portugal, 2024).

### *Profil posjetitelja kulturnog turizma*

Turizam židovske baštine dio je kulturnog turizma (Duda-Seifert, 2016). Za bolju analizu profila turista sefardske baštine potrebno je uzeti u obzir profil kulturnog turista radi utvrđivanja razlika i sličnosti. Richards (1996) određuje kulturne turiste kao osobe s visokom razinom obrazovanja i socioekonomskog statusa, slobodnog vremena i često povezane s kulturnim industrijama. Izbor turističke destinacije određen je prirodnim kulturnim interesom te postoji razlika između općih kulturnih turista i specifičnih kulturnih turista (Jelinčić, 2008). Opći kulturni turisti su, prema Richardsu (1996), stariji, dobro obrazovani i čine najveći udio posjetitelja kulturnih atrakcija. S druge strane, specifični kulturni turisti su mlađi, kulturno su motivirani, često putuju, a na njihov izbor destinacije utječu kulturne atrakcije. Jelinčić (2008) daje tipologiju kulturnih turista koji se razlikuju prema stupnju motivacije: primarna, slučajna i usputna. Turist s primarnom motivacijom odabire destinaciju isključivo na temelju kulture, na primjer određene izložbe, kazališne predstave, koncerti. Turist usputne motivacije posjećuje destinaciju radi odmora, zabave ili posla, ali će tijekom boravka posjetiti kulturne ustanove ili događaje. Kod slu-

tic and cultural heritage of the Sephardic people in Spain. It offers its members organizational and advisory services, web marketing, printed publications and connections with Europe. The organization is actually the starting point for anyone interested in Sephardic heritage in Spain. The members of RED organisation create different routes and itineraries that are interconnected and work on the internationalization of the network, making Spain a good example of the development of Jewish heritage products. Two initiatives emerged from this organization: the European Day of Jewish Culture and the European Jewish Heritage Route (Red de Juderías de España, 2024). In addition to Spain, a similar organization exists in Portugal called Rede de Judiarias de Portugal (eng. Portuguese Network of Jewish Quarters) (Rede de Judiarias de Portugal, 2024).

### *Profile of cultural tourism visitors*

Jewish heritage tourism is part of cultural tourism (Duda-Seifert, 2016). For a better analysis of the profile of Sephardic heritage tourists, it is necessary to take into account the profile of the cultural tourist in order to determine differences and similarities. Richard (1996) defines cultural tourists as persons who have a high level of education and socio-economic status, leisure time, and are often related to the cultural industries. The choice of a tourist destination is determined by the nature of cultural interest, and there is a distinction between general cultural tourists and specific cultural tourists (Jelinčić, 2008). General cultural tourists are, according to Richards (1996), older, well-educated, and they make up the largest share of the visitors to cultural attractions. Conversely, specific cultural tourists are younger, culturally motivated, they travel frequently, and their choice of destination is influenced by cultural attractions. Jelinčić (2008) also provides a typology of cultural tourists who differ according to the level of motivation: primary, incidental and accidental. A tourist with primary motivation chooses a destination entirely on the basis of culture, for example, certain exhibitions, theatre performances, concerts. A tourist with an incidental motivation visits a destination for leisure, entertainment or work, but will visit cultural institutions or events during their stay. With an accidental motivation, the tourist

čajne motivacije turist ne posjećuje destinaciju s kulturnim motivom, već stupanjem u kontakt s lokalnim stanovništvom upoznaje njihovu kulturu.

S obzirom na navedene tipologije, vidljivo je da se kulturni turisti razlikuju od ostalih turista i posjetitelja. Institut za turizam je 2008. godine proveo TOMAS istraživanje kojim su se ispitali stavovi i potrošnja posjetitelja kulturnih atrakcija i događanja u Hrvatskoj (Institut za turizam, 2009). Rezultati su pokazali da je prosječni kulturni turist u Hrvatskoj srednje (30-49) i mlađe životne dobi (do 29 godina), muškarac (53 %), fakultetski je obrazovan (38 %) ili ima završenu višu školu (24 %) te ima mjesečna primanja između 1.000 i 3.000 eura (55 %). Uglavnom su to inozemni posjetitelji (62 %), a prevladavaju posjetitelji iz Italije (15 %), Njemačke (14 %), Francuske (9%) i Ujedinjenog Kraljevstva (9 %), a domaći posjetitelji su iz svojeg grada ili okolnih županija. Borave u destinaciji (43 %) ili su izletnici (26 %). Posjećuju kulturne i povijesne znamenitosti i atrakcije, crkve i samostane, muzeje i galerije, festivale, tematske rute i puteve, glazbeno-scenske događaje i predstave. Motivacija kulturnih turista je: učenje, znatiželja, želja za upoznavanjem kulture i osobe koje predstavljaju lokalno. Unaprijed se informiraju o kulturnim atrakcijama destinacije, koje dobiju od prijatelja, na internetu, iz reklama, brošura, turističkih sajмова i izložbi. Jelinčić (2008) daje sličan profil kulturnog turista: ima specifičan interes, viši stupanj obrazovanja, starije je životne dobi, kupuje i troši više, ostaje dulje. Tvrdi da je 5 do 15 % turista motivirano kulturom te 5 % lokalnog stanovništva.

## POVIJEST ŽIDOVSKIH ZAJEDNICA U SPLITU I DUBROVNIKU

Dva su geografska i kulturološka pravca naseljavanja Židova u Hrvatskoj. Aškenazi se od sredine 18. stoljeća doseljavaju u kontinentalnu Hrvatsku (koja je pod habsburškom vlašću), a Sefardi još od srednjeg vijeka u Split i Dubrovnik (tada pod mletačkom vlašću i Dubrovačkom Republikom).

does not visit the destination with a cultural motive, but rather gets to know the local population through contact with their culture.

Considering the typologies previously mentioned, it is noticeable that cultural tourists differ from other tourists and visitors. In 2008, Croatian Institute of Tourism conducted the TOMAS survey to examine the attitudes and spending of visitors to cultural attractions and events in Croatia (Institute of Tourism, 2009). The results showed that the average cultural tourist in Croatia is middle-aged (30-49) and younger (up to 29), male (53%), has a university degree (38%) or a professional higher education qualification (24%), and has a monthly income between 1,000 and 3,000 euros (55%). Most of them are foreign visitors (62%), coming from Italy (15%), Germany (14%), France (9%) and UK (9%), while domestic visitors are from their home town or surrounding counties. They stay at the destination (43%) or are excursionists (26%). They visit cultural and historical landmarks and attractions, churches and monasteries, museums and galleries, festivals, thematic routes and paths, music and stage events and performances. The motivation of cultural tourists is: learning, curiosity, desire to get to know the culture and people who represent the locality. They inform themselves in advance about the cultural attractions of the destination, which they get from friends, on the internet, from advertisements, brochures, tourist fairs and exhibitions. Jelinčić (2008) provides a similar profile of a cultural tourist: he has a specific interest, a higher level of education, is older, buys and spends more, stays longer. She claims that 5 to 15% of tourists are motivated by culture, whereas it is 5% for the local population.

## HISTORY OF JEWISH COMMUNITIES IN SPLIT AND DUBROVNIK

When it comes to the settlement of Jews in Croatia, there are two geographical and cultural routes. Ashkenazi Jews were moving to continental Croatia (under Habsburg rule) since the mid-18th century, while Sephardim were settling in Split and Dubrovnik (then under Venetian rule and the Dubrovnik Republic) since the Middle Ages.

*Povijest židovske zajednice u Splitu*

Povijest Židova u Splitu prati se od 2. i 3. stoljeća na prostoru antičke Salone, pa se može govoriti o postojanju kontinuiteta naseljavanja Židova u Splitu od gotovo dvije tisuće godina. Splitska židovska zajednica pojavljuje se u dokumentima Splitske nadbiskupije sredinom 14. stoljeća, spominjući veliku sinagogu unutar Dioklecijanove palače. Današnja sinagoga sagrađena oko 1500. godine integrirana je u stambene zgrade u sjeverozapadnom kutu zidina palače u kojoj su živjeli Židovi (Goldstein, 1988).

Doseljavanjem izbjeglica s Pirenejskog poluotoka (zvanih Ponentini) tijekom 16. stoljeća zajednica se povećava. Ranije naseljeni Židovi u Splitu nazivali su se Levantini. Njihove slobode i propise određivala je mletačka vlast. Bavili su se trgovinom i obrtom (štavljenje kože, izrada prediva i tkanina, krojenje nošnji). U 16. stoljeću najvažniji Židov u gradu bio je poduzetnik Daniel Rodríguez, koji je mletačkom Senatu podnio projekt izgradnje splitske luke (prihvaćen 1577.). U taj je projekt uložio vlastiti novac, izgradio je luku s carinarnicom i ambulantom, tzv. splitsku *Scalu*. Izgradnjom ovoga projekta Split je postao konkurencija Dubrovniku, a Židovi posrednici u turskoj robi. Otvaranjem splitske luke nastala je potreba za otvaranjem banke, što je Danielu Rodríguezu dopušteno 1592. godine. Godine 1657. Osmanlije su opsjeli Split, a Židovi su sudjelovali u izgradnji gradskih zidina i tvrđave Gripe te su se istaknuli u obrani sjeverozapadne kule Dioklecijanove palače – Arnirove kule, koja se od tada naziva Židovska kula. Splitski geto osnovan je 1778. godine.

Dolaskom Splita pod austrijsku vlast, slobode Židova su smanjene, ali i grad zaostaje u razvoju. Tek u drugoj polovici 19. stoljeća splitski Židovi oživljavaju gradsku trgovinu i obrt, a 1867. stječu sva građanska prava i punu ravnopravnost. Među njima se u to vrijeme ističe Vid Mörpurgo (1838.–1911.), jedan od utemeljitelja narodnog pokreta u Dalmaciji i zastupnik Narodne stranke u Dalmatinskom saboru. Bio je i poduzetnik: osnivač prve dalmatinske Narodne banke, vlasnik destilerije, pokretač novih industrijskih djelatnosti, vodeći splitski i dalmatinski knjižar

*History of Jewish community in Split*

The history of Jews in Split can be traced back to the 2nd and 3rd centuries in the area of ancient Salona, so it can be said that there was a continuous settlement of Jews in Split for almost two thousand years. The Split Jewish community appears in documents of the Split Archdiocese in the mid-14th century, mentioning a large synagogue inside Diocletian's Palace, while the present synagogue was built around 1500, integrated into residential buildings in the northwest corner of the palace walls where Jews lived (Goldstein, 1988).

During the 16th century, refugees from the Iberian Peninsula (called Ponentini) settled, increasing the size of the community. The previously settled Jews in Split were called Levantini. Their freedoms and regulations were determined by the Venetian authorities. They were engaged in trade and crafts (tanning leather, making yarn and fabrics, tailoring). In the 16th century, the most important Jew in the city was the entrepreneur Daniel Rodríguez, who submitted a project to the Venetian Senate to build the Split port (accepted in 1577). He invested his own money in this project, building a port with a customs house and an infirmary, the so-called Split Scala. With the construction of this project, Split became a competitor to Dubrovnik, and the Jews became intermediaries in Turkish goods. The opening of the Split port led to the need to open a bank, and a Jew was allowed to do it in 1592. In 1657, the Ottomans besieged Split, and the Jews participated in the construction of the city walls and the Gripe fortress, and distinguished themselves in the defence of the north-western tower of Diocletian's Palace - Arnir's Tower, which has since been called the Jewish Tower. The Split ghetto was founded in 1778.

When Split came under Austrian rule, the freedoms of the Jews were reduced, but the city also fell behind in development. It was not until the second half of the 19th century that the Jews of Split revived the city's trade and crafts, and in 1867 they acquired all civil rights and full equality. At that time, Vid Mörpurgo (1838-1911) stood out among them as one of the founders of the national movement in Dalmatia and a representative of the People's Party in the Dalmatian Parliament. He was also an entrepreneur: the founder of the first Dalmatian National

i izdavač svojega vremena. U 19. stoljeću mnoge se stare židovske obitelji sele u Trst. Istovremeno i početkom 20. stoljeća, u Split se doseljavaju obitelji iz sefardskih zajednica u Bosni i iz aškenaskih zajednica iz kontinentalne Hrvatske. Godine 1940. Židovska općina Split imala je 284 člana, ali je Drugi svjetski rat preživjelo samo njih 150. Njemačke su vlasti 1943. godine devastirale i opljačkale sinagogu, a spašeno je samo nekoliko starih i matičnih knjiga (Goldstein, 1988). Danas Židovska općina u Splitu ima stotinjak članova.

Židovsko groblje u Splitu najstarije je židovsko groblje u Hrvatskoj. Groblje se nalazi na južnoj strani brda Marjan. Prvi ukop bio je 16. siječnja 1573., a u funkciji je do 1945. Pred ulazom u groblje nalazi se zgrada nekadašnje židovske mrtvačnice (izgrađena 1892. godine). Groblje predstavlja multikulturalnu židovsku dimenziju jer su tu pokopani i Sefardi i Aškenazi s oko 700 nadgrobnih spomenika (Kečkemet & Efron, 1973).

### *Povijest židovske zajednice u Dubrovniku*

Dokumentacijski spisi Dubrovnika prvi put spominju jednog Židova liječnika 1326. godine, a stalne stanovnike grada navode 1421. godine (Goldstein, 1988). Dolaskom izbjeglica s Iberskog poluotoka krajem 15. i početkom 16. stoljeća njihov se broj povećao te su već 1538. osnovali zajednicu (Goldstein, 1988). Dopušteno im je da se nastane unutar gradskih zidina (Goldstein, 1988). Geto je osnovan 1546. godine i sastojao se od jedne ulice (Žudioska ulica), a krajevi na Stradunu i Prijekom bili su zatvoreni vratima. Unutar geta imali su slobodu organiziranja općinskog i vjerskog života. S vremenom je geto postao premalen, pa pojedini Židovi žive izvan njega. Sinagoga kao prostor za vjersku službu nastala je istovremeno kada i geto (Miović, 2012).

U 16. stoljeću postaju važan dio gospodarstva i sudjeluju u prekomorskoj trgovini. Tek u 18. stoljeću počinje ih se tretirati kao građane (ne samo kao državljane) Republike, ali iako su bili zaštićeni, bili su drugorazredni sloj: imali su razne zabrane i plaćali posebne poreze (Goldstein, 1988). Najčešće su bili trgovci, doktori, po-

Bank, the owner of a distillery, the initiator of new industrial activities, the leading Split and Dalmatian bookseller and publisher of his time. In the 19th century, many old Jewish families moved to Trieste. At the same time, and at the beginning of the 20th century, families from the Sephardic communities in Bosnia and from the Ashkenazi communities from continental Croatia immigrated to Split. In 1940, the Jewish community of Split had 284 members, but only 150 survived World War II. In 1943, the German authorities devastated and looted the synagogue, and only a few old civil registers were saved (Goldstein, 1988). Today, the Jewish community in Split has about a hundred members.

The Jewish cemetery in Split is the oldest cemetery. The cemetery is located on the southern side of Marjan hill. The first burial was on 16 January, 1573, and it was used until 1945. In front of the entrance to the cemetery is the building of the former Jewish morgue (built in 1892). The cemetery represents a multicultural Jewish dimension as both Sephardim and Ashkenazim are buried here, and it consists of around 700 tombstones (Kečkemet & Efron, 1973).

### *History of Jewish community in Dubrovnik*

The history of the Jews in Dubrovnik dates back to the records that first mention a Jewish doctor in 1326, and as permanent residents of the city in 1421 (Goldstein, 1988). Their number increased with the arrival of refugees from the Iberian Peninsula in the late 15th and early 16th centuries, and they established a community in 1538 (Goldstein, 1988). Jews were allowed to settle within the city walls (Goldstein, 1988), so a ghetto was established in 1546 and consisted of one street (Žudioska ulica), while the areas on Stradun and Prijeko streets were closed off by gates. They had the freedom to organize their municipal and religious life within the ghetto. Over time, the ghetto became too small, and some Jews lived outside. The synagogue as a place for religious services was created at the same time as the ghetto (Miović, 2012).

In the 16th century, Jews became an important part of the economy and participated in overseas trade. It was not until the 18th century that they began to be treated as citizens of the Republic, but although they were protected, they were second-class

morci (Miović, 2012). Pretpostavlja se da je od početka osnutka općine postojala *Hevra kadiša* (društvo koje se brinulo o bolesnicima, posebno o ukopima umrlih prema vjerskim običajima). Iznad sjevernih zidina nalazilo se staro židovsko groblje, koje je početkom 20. stoljeća premješteno na Boninovo (Miović, 2012).

Na mjestu starog židovskog groblja danas su izgrađene privatne kuće i vatrogasna zajednica, unutar koje se može naći pokoji spomenik. Židovsko groblje na Boninovu i dalje je u funkciji.

Demografska slika općine nije se previše mijenjala kroz stoljeća. Prema popisu iz 1799. godine bio je 171 član općine, 1808. godine 227, 1831. godine 260, a 1940. godine 87 članova. U Holokaustu je poginulo 27 članova općine (Goldstein, 1988). Danas Židovska općina Dubrovnik ima 50 članova, a u sklopu zgrade sinagoge 2003. godine otvorili su muzej.

## SVRHA, CILJ I METODOLOGIJA ISTRAŽIVANJA

Svrha ovoga istraživanja je otkrivanje profila posjetitelja sefardske baštine u Splitu i Dubrovniku, ali i njihove razlike, kako bi se u skladu s tim sastavila ponuda tržišta. Dobiveni podaci o sličnostima i razlikama među posjetiteljima u Dubrovniku i Splitu mogu se koristiti za turistički razvoj lokaliteta sefardske baštine, kao i za usmjeravanje za potencijalno tržište. S obzirom na prostorni razmještaj sefardske baštine u Hrvatskoj, u kojemu se isti prostor Dalmacije, kao reprezentativna studija slučaja poslužili su Split i Dubrovnik, kao jedini gradovi u Hrvatskoj sa sefardskom baštinom. Sve do 19. stoljeća, židovske zajednice u Splitu i Dubrovniku bile su potpuno sefardske, a njihova je baština sačuvana do danas. U Splitu se važnošću i atraktivnošću za turistički posjet izdvaja ponajprije židovsko groblje na Marjanu, osnovano još 1573. godine (Kečkemet & Efron, 1973), a u Dubrovniku sinagoga, koja je nakon one u Pragu najstarija sinagoga s neprekidnim djelovanjem (Miović, 2012).

Dubrovnik je administrativno središte Dubrovačko-neretvanske županije smješten na samom jugu Hrvatske, u južnoj Dalmaciji. Atrakcijsku

citizens: they had various prohibitions and paid special taxes (Goldstein, 1988). As for their professions, they were most commonly merchants, doctors, and sailors (Miović, 2012). It is assumed that from the beginning of the community's foundation, there was a *Hevra Kaddisha* (a society that took care of the sick, especially the burial of the deceased according to religious customs). Above the northern walls there was an old Jewish cemetery, which was moved to Boninovo at the beginning of the 20th century (Miović, 2012). Private houses and a fire brigade were built on the site of the old Jewish cemetery, within which a few monuments can be found. The Jewish cemetery in Boninovo still has an active function.

The demographic picture of the community did not change too much over the centuries, so according to the census from 1799 there were 171 members, 227 in 1808, 260 in 1831, and 87 members in 1940. In the Holocaust, 27 members of the community died (Goldstein, 1988). Today the Jewish community of Dubrovnik has 50 members, and in 2003 a museum was opened in the synagogue building.

## PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this research is to identify the profiles of visitors to Sephardic heritage sites in Split and Dubrovnik, as well as the differences between them, in order to create a market offer. These identified similarities and differences can support the development of Sephardic heritage tourism and help in targeting potential markets. With regard to the spatial distribution of Sephardic heritage in Croatia, in which Dalmatia stands out, Split and Dubrovnik served as representative case studies, as the only cities in Croatia with a Sephardic heritage. Until the 19th century, the Jewish communities in Split and Dubrovnik were entirely Sephardic, and their heritage has been preserved to this day. The Jewish cemetery on the peninsula Marjan in Split, which was founded in 1573 (Kečkemet & Efron, 1973), and the synagogue in Dubrovnik, which is the oldest continuously operating synagogue after the synagogue in Prague, stand out in terms of their importance and attractiveness for a tourist visit (Miović, 2012).

osnovu Dubrovnika čini srednjovjekovna gradska jezgra okružena zidinama koja je od 1979. pod UNESCO-ovom zaštitom (Dubrovačka razvojna agencija, 2019). Ukupan turistički promet za 2022. godinu iznosio je 1 356 123 dolazaka i 4 270 176 noćenja, pri čemu je udio domaćih turista u ukupnom prometu veoma nizak: 5,5 % u dolascima i 4,3 % u noćenjima (Turistička zajednica grada Dubrovnika, 2025). Split je drugi po veličini grad u Hrvatskoj, makroregionalno središte Dalmacije, koji se nalazi na povoljnom geoprometnom položaju, među ostalim na čvorištu trajektnih i željezničkih linija. Glavna turistička atrakcija Splita je Dioklecijanova palača koja je od 1979. na UNESCO-ovoj listi (Blažević, 2003). U 2024. godini ukupan turistički promet Splita bio je 1 050 847 dolazaka i 3 190 921 noćenje. Udio domaćih turista viši je nego u Dubrovniku: u dolascima čine 10,2 %, a u noćenjima 7,5 % (Turistička zajednica Split, 2025).

Iako su oba grada prema broju dolazaka i noćenja popularne hrvatske destinacije, među njima postoje sličnosti i razlike. Oba se grada nalaze na Jadranskom moru, bogata su kulturno-povijesnom baštinom te im je glavna atrakcija, gradska jezgra, pod zaštitom UNESCO-a. Imaju razvijenu turističku infrastrukturu te u ponudi osim kulturnih atrakcija nude i razne događaje i festivale. Međutim, Split je demografski i prostorno mnogo veći grad od Dubrovnika, pa su tijekom ljetne turističke sezone česte gužve. Dubrovnik se često referira kao turistički grad podređen turizmu, od gastronomske ponude do smještajnih objekata. Splitska kulturna baština temelji se na rimskoj arhitekturi, dok je Dubrovnik srednjovjekovni grad. Zračne luke u Dubrovniku i Splitu, sa Zagrebom, bile su najprometnije zračne luke u Hrvatskoj u 2024. godini (Turistička zajednica Split, 2025). Split je povezaniji te služi kao baza za daljnja istraživanja središnje Dalmacije. Dubrovnik karakterizira i masovni turizam, najviše zbog kruzera. U strukturi dolazaka i noćenja prevladavaju strani posjetitelji, ali zbog lakše dostupnosti, Split ima veći udio domaćih posjetitelja od Dubrovnika. Tome pridonosi i cijena usluga i smještaja koja je znatno veća u Dubrovniku te je Split mnogo pristupačniji za posjetitelje – domaće i strane.

Dubrovnik is the administrative centre of Dubrovnik-Neretva County, located at the very south of Croatia, in the region of Dalmatia. The city's main attraction is its medieval Old Town, surrounded by historic city walls. This area has been a UNESCO World Heritage site since 1979 (Dubrovnik Development Agency, 2019). Total tourist traffic for 2022 was 1,356,123 arrivals and 4,270,176 overnight stays. However, the number of domestic tourists remains relatively low: 5.5% of arrivals and 4.3% of overnight stays (Dubrovnik City Tourist Board, 2025). Split, Croatia's second-largest city, is the macro-regional centre of Dalmatia, located in a favourable geo-traffic position, i.e., at the junction of ferry and railway lines. The main tourist attraction in Split is Diocletian's Palace, which has been on the UNESCO World Heritage list since 1979 (Blažević, 2003). In 2024, Split's total tourist traffic amounted to 1,050,847 arrivals and 3,190,921 overnight stays. Domestic tourists make up a higher percentage of Split's total traffic compared to Dubrovnik, representing 10.2% of arrivals and 7.5% of overnight stays (Split Tourist Board, 2025).

While both cities are major tourist destinations in Croatia, there are still similarities and differences between them. Both are located along the Adriatic Sea, and are rich in cultural and historical heritage, with UNESCO-protected city centres. They both offer a well-developed tourist infrastructure, as well as numerous events and festivals. However, Split is much larger, both demographically and geographically, compared to the smaller Dubrovnik. As a result, Dubrovnik tends to get crowded during the summer months. Dubrovnik is often referred to as a tourist city, because it is largely tailored to the visitors' needs. Split is known for its Roman architecture, while Dubrovnik has a medieval town base. In 2024, both Dubrovnik and Split, along with Zagreb, ranked among the busiest airports in Croatia (Split Tourist Board, 2025). However, Split has better overall connectivity, making it a base for central Dalmatia. Dubrovnik, often characterized by mass tourism driven by cruise ships, primarily attracts foreign visitors. Nevertheless, due to its easier accessibility and more affordable services, Split sees a larger proportion of domestic tourists compared to Dubrovnik, where prices for accommodations and services tend to be much higher.

Cilj ovoga istraživanja je utvrđivanje profila posjetitelja sefardske baštine u Hrvatskoj na temelju analize obilježja turističkog putovanja u okviru kojega su posjetili lokalitete sefardske baštine u Hrvatskoj, njihove motivacije i prethodne informiranosti o posjetu navedenim lokalitetima u Hrvatskoj, potom navika i preferencija posjećivanja pojedinih tipova turističkih atrakcija povezanih sa židovskom baštinom te naposljetku na temelju ocjene turističke atraktivnosti i važnosti posjećenih kulturnih dobara u turističkim ponudama destinacija.

S obzirom na početnu pretpostavku da se posjetitelji sefardske baštine u Splitu i Dubrovniku međusobno razlikuju prema sociodemografskim obilježjima, kao i navedenim profilnim karakteristikama, kao cilj istraživanja ističe se i identifikacija statistički značajnih razlika između posjetitelja sefardske baštine u Splitu i Dubrovniku.

Postavljeni ciljevi istraživanja ostvareni su anketiranjem posjetitelja sefardske baštine na židovskom groblju u Splitu i u sinagogi u Dubrovniku. Anketni upitnik podijeljen je na tri skupine pitanja: sociodemografski profil posjetitelja, motivacija posjeta grada i židovskih lokaliteta te zadovoljstvo ponudom posjeta lokalitetima židovske baštine. Sociodemografska obilježja posjetitelja ispitana su putem prvih šest pitanja koja su se odnosila na dob, spol, zemlja podrijetla za inozemne posjetitelje, mjesto stalnog boravka za domaće i inozemne posjetitelje, završena razina obrazovanja i radni status. Drugi dio pitanja odnosio se na obilježja njihova putovanja (organizacija, trajanje i motivacija putovanja) i posjete lokalitetu židovske baštine (motivacija za posjet lokalitetu, izvor informacija). Treća skupina pitanja obuhvatila je zadovoljstvo posjetitelja informacijom, interpretacijom i turističkom opremljenošću lokaliteta, planiranje posjeta ostalim lokalitetima židovske baštine u Hrvatskoj, ponovni posjet lokalitetu te preporuke. Anketni upitnik obuhvatio je pet pitanja otvorenog tipa i 16 zatvorenog tipa. Anketiranje se provodilo tehnikom „licem u lice“ od 21. do 29. srpnja 2022. u Splitu te od 17. do 21. svibnja 2023. u Dubrovniku. Podaci su prikupljeni metodom prigodnog uzorkovanja, a u uzorak su ušli punoljetni posjetitelji navedenih lokaliteta koji su ih ciljano posjetili. Anketar je

The aim of this research is to determine the profile of visitors to Sephardic heritage sites in Croatia based on the characteristics of the tourist trip during which they visited the Sephardic heritage sites in Croatia, their motivation and information prior to visiting sites in Croatia, then on the habits and preferences of visiting certain types of tourist attractions related to the Jewish heritage, and finally on the basis of the evaluation of the tourism attractiveness and the importance of the visited cultural assets in the tourism supply of the destinations.

Based on the initial assumption that visitors to the Sephardic heritage in Split and Dubrovnik differ according to socio-demographic characteristics and the above-mentioned profile characteristics, the objective of the research is also to identify statistically significant differences between visitors to the Sephardic heritage in Split and Dubrovnik.

The goal of the research was achieved through direct surveying of visitors of Sephardic heritage at the Jewish cemetery in Split and in the synagogue in Dubrovnik. The survey questionnaire was divided into three groups: socio-demographic profile of visitors, motivation for visiting the city and Jewish attractions, and satisfaction with the offer of visiting Jewish heritage sites. The socio-demographic characteristics of visitors were examined through the first six questions, which related to age, gender, country of origin for foreign visitors, place of permanent residence for domestic and foreign visitors, completed level of education, and employment status. The second part of the questions related to the characteristics of their trip (organization, duration, and motivation for the trip) and visit to the Jewish heritage site (motivation for visiting the site, source of information). The third group of questions included visitor satisfaction with information, interpretation, and tourist amenities of the site, planning visits to other Jewish heritage sites in Croatia, revisiting the site, and recommendations. The questionnaire included five open-ended questions and 16 closed-ended questions. The questionnaire was originally written in Croatian, and then translated to English. Both versions were available during the survey. The survey was conducted using the face-to-face method from 21st to 29th July 2022 in Split and from 17th to 21st May 2023 in Dubrovnik. The data were collected by the method of convenience sampling, and the

pristupio ispitanicima nakon što su posjetili groblje, odnosno razgledali sinagogu i muzej. Onima koji nisu zadovoljili te kriterije, nije se pristupilo. U ukupan uzorak ušlo je 264 ispitanika, od čega 127 u Splitu i 137 u Dubrovniku.

U strukturi ispitanika s obzirom na spol nešto je više žena (njih 151 ili 57,2 %), dok je muškaraca 113 (42,8 %). Prosječna dob svih ispitanika je 48,5 godina (SD = 19,785). Raspon dobi u uzorku kreće se od 18 godina, koliko je napunio najmlađi ispitanik, do 90 godina koliko je napunio najstariji. Ako se svi ispitanici podijele u četiri dobne kategorije na: mlađe (18 – 30 godina), mlađe zrele (31 – 45 godina), starije zrele (46 – 60 godina) i starije (više od 60 godina), vidljivo je da u uzorku znatno prevladavaju stariji ispitanici, zastupljeni s više od jedne trećine ukupnog uzorka (96 ispitanika ili 36,4 %), slijede mlađi ispitanici (75 ispitanika ili 28,4 %), ispred kontingenta starijih zrelih ispitanika (51 ispitanik ili 19,3 %) te mlađih zrelih ispitanika (42 ispitanika ili 15,9 %). Razmjerno velika zastupljenost starije populacije među ispitanicima podudara se s obilježjima potražnje u turizmu baštine općenito, jer ovaj oblik turizma uvelike privlači upravo starije skupine turista (Jelinčić, 2008).

Što se tiče zemlje prebivališta, samo su dva ispitanika (u Dubrovniku) bila iz Hrvatske, čiji je udio manji od 1 % u ukupnom uzorku, a ostali su bili stranci. Analiza domaćih posjetitelja nije se mogla provesti zbog premalog uzorka. Prema državama stanovanja, nešto je više ispitanika koji žive u Europi (147 ispitanika ili 55,7 %) od ispitanika iz izvan europskih država (117 ispitanika ili 44,3 %). Od europskih država najviše ispitanika dolazi iz: UK-a (čak 48 ispitanika ili 18,2 % ukupnog uzorka), Njemačke (21), Francuske (18) i Finske (13), dok se brojem ispitanika među izvan europskim državama ističu: SAD (čak 86 ispitanika ili 32,6 % svih anketiranih), Australija (9), Kanada (8) i Izrael (7), što je manje od očekivanja.

Zaposlenih je bilo više od pola ispitanika (njih 154 ili 58,3 %), dok su ostali ispitanici bili umirovljenici (69 ispitanika ili 26,1 %), studenti (35 ispitanika ili 13,3 %) i nezaposleni (6 ispitanika ili 2,3 %). Velik udio umirovljenika u uzorku može se objasniti iznadprosječnom zastupljeno-

sample included adult visitors to the aforementioned locations. The interviewer approached the individuals after they had visited the cemetery, or the synagogue and the museum. Those who did not meet these criteria were not approached. The total sample comprised 264 respondents, 127 in Split and 137 in Dubrovnik.

In terms of sex, there are slightly more women (151 or 57.2%), while there are 113 (42.8%) men. The average age of all respondents is 48.5 years (SD=19.785). The age range in the sample extends from 18 years, the age of the youngest respondent, to 90 years, the age of the oldest respondent. When all respondents are divided into four age categories: younger (18-30 years), younger mature (31-45 years), older mature (46-60 years) and older (over 60 years), it can be seen that there is a clear predominance of older respondents in the sample, accounting for more than a third of the total sample (96 respondents or 36.4%), followed by younger respondents (75 respondents or 28.4%), ahead of the contingent of older mature respondents (51 respondents or 19.3%) and younger mature respondents (42 respondents or 15.9%). The relatively high proportion of the older population among the respondents is consistent with the characteristics of demand in heritage tourism in general, as this form of tourism primarily attracts older groups of tourists (Jelinčić, 2008).

Regarding the country of residence, only two respondents (in Dubrovnik) are from Croatia, whose share is less than 1% in the sample, and the others are foreigners. The analysis of domestic respondents could not be conducted due to the small sample size. There are slightly more respondents living in Europe (147 respondents or 55.7%) than respondents from non-European countries (117 respondents or 44.3%). Of the European countries, most respondents are from the UK (48 respondents or 18.2% of the total sample), Germany (21), France (18) and Finland (13), while the number of respondents from non-European countries stands out: the USA (86 respondents or 32.6% of all respondents), Australia (9), Canada (8) and Israel (7), which is less than expected.

More than half of the respondents were employed (154 of them or 58.3%), while the rest of the respondents were pensioners (69 respondents or

šću umirovljeničke populacije u turističkim kretanjima motiviranim baštinom (Jelinčić, 2008).

U strukturi ispitanika s obzirom na postignut stupanj obrazovanja uvjerljivo dominiraju visokoobrazovani ispitanici, koji čine više od četiri petine svih anketiranih (čak 218 ispitanika ili 82,6 %). Naime, ispitanici sa završenim magisterijem ili doktoratom znanosti iznimno su zastupljeni u uzorku (čak 105 ispitanika ili 39,8 %), a brojni su i ispitanici sa završenim sveučilišnim studijem (113 ispitanika ili 42,8 %). Ispitanika sa završenom višom školom bilo je 38 (14,4 %), a sa završenom srednjom školom tek 8 (3 %). Može se zaključiti da je uzorak anketiranih prema postignutom stupnju obrazovanja vrlo pristran jer prevladavaju visokoobrazovani ispitanici, što je općenito karakteristično za sve oblike turizma baštine (Timothy, 2021).

Osim deskriptivne statistike (utvrđivanje srednjih vrijednosti i učestalosti odgovora ispitanika), u istraživanju je provedena statistička analiza u programu SPSS radi utvrđivanja razlika između posjetitelja sefardske baštine u Splitu i Dubrovniku. Pritom je kao temeljna statistička metoda primijenjena multivarijatna analiza varijance (MANOVA). S obzirom na to da se u ovoj metodi kao zavisne varijable mogu koristiti kontinuirane varijable (a ne dihotomne ili kategorijalne varijable), uz multivarijatnu analizu varijance provedene su i dodatne analize s hi-kvadrat testom za dihotomne varijable.

## REZULTATI

### *Profil posjetitelja*

Na temelju rezultata anketiranja može se utvrditi profil posjetitelja sefardske baštine u Splitu i Dubrovniku s obzirom na obilježja turističkog putovanja, motivaciju i prethodnu informiranost za posjet lokalitetima sefardske baštine u Hrvatskoj, navike i preferencije posjećivanja tipova atrakcija povezanih sa židovskom baštinom te ocjene turističke atraktivnosti i važnosti posjećenih kulturnih dobara u turističkim ponudama Splita i Dubrovnika.

Više od četiri petine anketiranih posjetitelja sefardske baštine (njih 214 ili 81,1 %) Splita,

26.1%), students (35 respondents or 13.3%) and unemployed (6 respondents or 2.3%). The high proportion of pensioners in the sample can be explained by the above-average representation of pensioners in heritage tourism (Jelinčić, 2008).

The structure of the respondents with regard to the level of education is convincingly dominated by the highly educated respondents, who account for more than four fifths of all respondents (218 respondents or 82.6%). In particular, respondents with a doctorate are exceptionally well represented in the sample (105 respondents or 39.8%), and there are also many respondents with a university degree (113 respondents or 42.8%). There were 38 respondents (14.4%) with a completed professional higher education qualification, and only 8 respondents (3%) with a completed secondary school education. It should be noted that the sample of respondents is very biased according to the level of education, as highly educated respondents predominate, which is generally characteristic of all forms of heritage tourism (Timothy, 2021).

In addition to descriptive statistics (determining the mean values and responses frequencies), a statistical analysis was carried out using the SPSS programme in order to determine the differences between visitors to the Sephardic heritage in Split and Dubrovnik. The main statistical method used was multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA). Since this method allows continuous variables (and not dichotomous or categorical variables) to be used as dependent variables, some additional analyses were carried out using the chi-square test for dichotomous variables in addition to MANOVA.

## RESULTS

### *Visitors profile*

Based on the results of the survey, it is possible to determine the profile of visitors to the Sephardic heritage sites in Split and Dubrovnik in terms of the characteristics of the tourist trip, the motivation and prior information for visiting Sephardic heritage sites in Croatia, the habits and preferences for visiting attractions related to Jewish heritage, as well as the evaluation of the tourism attractiveness and the importance of the visited cultural assets in the tourism supply of Split and Dubrovnik.

odnosno Dubrovnika posjetili su u individualnoj organizaciji, i u jednoj od navedenih destinacija u prosjeku su proveli 3,73 dana (SD = 3,035). Pritom je najkraći zabilježen boravak u destinaciji bio tek 1 dan, a najdulji čak 30 dana.

Na pitanje o glavnim motivima za posjet Splitu ili Dubrovniku ispitanici su mogli izabrati više ponuđenih odgovora. Ne iznenađuje da je najviše ispitanika (njih 198) između ponuđenih glavnih motiva posjeta odabralo „kulturnu baštinu“. Od ostalih ponuđenih odgovora najučestaliji motivi su: „odmor i opuštanje“ (147), „nova iskustva i doživljaji“ (118) i „prirodne ljepote“ (111). Takva struktura motivacijskih faktora ponešto se razlikuje od glavnih razloga posjeta Jadranskoj Hrvatskoj, u kojima dominiraju „more“ (motivacijski faktor za 83,2 % turista u Hrvatskoj) i priroda (63,1 %), dok je „kultura i umjetnost“ kao motivacijski faktor rangiran tek na sedmo mjesto (motivacijski faktor za tek 8,8 % turista u Hrvatskoj) (Institut za turizam, 2023), iz čega jasno proizlazi da su posjetitelji sefardske baštine u Splitu i Dubrovniku motiviraniji posjetom lokalitetima kulturne baštine od prosječnog turista u Hrvatskoj.

Da se radi o turistima jače motiviranim za posjet židovskoj baštini, potvrđuje činjenica da je čak 236 ispitanika (89,4 %) imalo ranije iskustvo posjeta nekom od lokaliteta židovske baštine, pri čemu je više od dvije trećine ispitanika ranije posjetilo sinagoge, a više od polovice ispitanika muzeje židovske baštine, židovske četvrti i židovska groblja (Tab. 2.).

Što se tiče važnosti posjećivanja lokaliteta židovske baštine na turističkim putovanjima, odgovori ispitanika u prosjeku ukazuju na to da židovsku baštinu posjećuju usputno, kao i druge

More than four-fifths of the surveyed visitors to the Sephardic heritage sites (214 of them or 81.1%) visited Split and/or Dubrovnik as part of an individual arrangement and spent an average of 3.73 days (SD= 3.035) in one of these destinations. The shortest recorded stay in destination was only 1 day and the longest was 30 days.

When asked about the main reasons for visiting Split and/or Dubrovnik, respondents could choose several answers. Not surprisingly, most respondents (198) chose ‘cultural heritage’ as their main reason for visiting. Considering other possible answers, the most frequent reasons are: ‘rest and relaxation’ (147), ‘new experiences’ (118) and ‘natural beauty’ (111). This structure of motivating factors differs somewhat from the main reasons for visiting the Adriatic Croatia, where ‘sea’ (motivating factor for 83.2% of tourists in Croatia) and nature (63.1%) dominate, while ‘culture and art’ ranks only seventh as a motivating factor (motivating factor for only 8.8% of tourists in Croatia) (Institut za turizam, 2023), which clearly shows that visitors to the Sephardic heritage sites in Split and Dubrovnik are more motivated to visit cultural heritage sites than the average tourist in Croatia.

It is confirmed by the fact that 236 respondents (89.4%) had previous experience of visiting one of the Jewish heritage sites, whereby more than two thirds of respondents have visited synagogues and more than half of respondents have visited Jewish heritage museums, Jewish neighbourhoods and Jewish cemeteries (Table 2).

Regarding the importance of visiting Jewish heritage sites during a tourist trip, the respondents’ answers indicate that they visit Jewish heritage sites as well as other attractions in the destination on average ‘by accident’ and that Jewish heritage is not a more

**TABLICA 2.** *Odgovori ispitanika na pitanje o posjetu pojedinim tipovima lokaliteta židovske baštine prije dolaska u Split i Dubrovnik*

**TABLE 2** *Respondents’ answers to the question about visiting different types of Jewish heritage sites before arriving in Split and Dubrovnik*

Izvor / Source: *Anketno istraživanje (2022, 2023) / Source: Survey research (2022, 2023)*

| Tip lokaliteta / Locality type                  | Da / Yes |      | Ne / No |      |
|-------------------------------------------------|----------|------|---------|------|
|                                                 | n        | %    | n       | %    |
| Sinagoga / Synagogue                            | 190      | 72,0 | 74      | 28,0 |
| Muzej židovske baštine / Jewish heritage museum | 174      | 65,9 | 90      | 34,1 |
| Židovska četvrt / Jewish neighbourhood          | 143      | 54,2 | 121     | 45,8 |
| Židovsko groblje / Jewish cemetery              | 136      | 51,5 | 128     | 48,5 |
| Koncentracijski logor / Concentration camp      | 113      | 42,8 | 151     | 57,2 |

TABLICA 3. Koliko vam je važan posjet lokalitetu židovske baštine na turističkom putovanju?

TABLE 3 How important is visiting a Jewish heritage site to you when traveling as a tourist?

Izvor / Source: Anketno istraživanje (2022, 2023) / Source: Survey research (2022, 2023)

| Tvrdnja / Statement                                                                                                                                                                                                                      | n          | %            |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|--------------|
| Ne vodim računa hoću li na putovanju posjetiti židovsku baštinu. / I do not consider whether I will visit a Jewish heritage on my trip.                                                                                                  | 63         | 23,9         |
| Židovsku baštinu posjećujem usputno, kao i druge atrakcije u destinaciji. / I visit the Jewish heritage in passing, as well as other attractions of the destination.                                                                     | 105        | 39,8         |
| Posjećujem židovsku baštinu ako je riječ o jednoj od najvažnijih atrakcija u destinaciji. / I visit the Jewish heritage sites when it is one of the main attractions of the destination.                                                 | 37         | 14,0         |
| Svaki put kada sam u nekoj destinaciji informiram se ima li u ponudi židovske baštine i nastojim je posjetiti. / Every time I go to a destination, I enquire whether there is any Jewish heritage in tourism supply and try to visit it. | 57         | 21,6         |
| Destinaciju biram zbog postojanja židovske baštine u ponudi. / I chose the destination because it has a Jewish heritage in tourism supply.                                                                                               | 2          | 0,8          |
| <b>Ukupno/ Total</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | <b>264</b> | <b>100,0</b> |

atrakcije u destinaciji te im u motivaciji židovska baština na turističkom putovanju ne predstavlja motiv važniji od drugih ( $M = 2,36$ ,  $SD = 1,09$ ).<sup>1</sup> Distribucija ispitanika po pojedinim ponuđenim odgovorima prikazana je u Tablici 3.

Da je riječ o turistima koji židovsku baštinu u Splitu i Dubrovniku posjećuju usputno, upućuju i odgovori na pitanje o izvoru informiranja o židovskom groblju u Splitu i sinagogi u Dubrovniku. Iako su ispitanici mogli izabrati više komunikacijskih kanala za informiranje o navedenim lokalitetima, njihovi odgovori upućuju na to da većina anketiranih posjetitelja nije bila informirana o kulturnim dobrima sefardske baštine prije negoli su ih posjetili, a među izvorima informiranja najučestalije je usputno informiranje, a potom promotivni materijali (Tab. 4.).

Ispitanici su ocijenili sljedeće elemente turističke valorizacije židovske baštine u Splitu i Dubrovniku s pomoću Likertove skale, pri čemu je gradacija odgovora kodirana ocjenama od 1 = najmanje do 5 = najviše: turističku atraktivnost židovskoga groblja u Splitu i sinagoge u Dubrovniku, zadovoljstvo ispitanika dobivenim informacijama o navedenim kulturnim dobrima na licu mjesta, zastupljenost židovske baštine u turističkoj ponudi Splita/Dubrovnika, turistički potencijal židovske baštine Splita/Dubrovnika i stupnja poznavanja

important motive than other for for a tourist trip ( $M=2.36$ ,  $SD=1.09$ )<sup>1</sup>. The distribution of respondents to the individual answers is shown in Table 3.

When we talk about tourists who visit Jewish heritage sites in Split and Dubrovnik in passing, they also gave the responses to the question about the source of information on the Jewish cemetery in Split and the synagogue in Dubrovnik. Although the respondents could have chosen several communication channels for information about the mentioned places, their answers indicate that the majority of the surveyed visitors were not informed about the cultural assets of Sephardic heritage before visiting them, and among the sources of information, the most frequent is casual information, followed by promotional materials (Table 4).

Respondents evaluated following aspects of the tourism valorisation of the Jewish heritage in Split and Dubrovnik using Likert scales, with the grading of the responses coded with grades from 1=least to 5=most: the tourism attractiveness of the Jewish cemetery in Split and the synagogue in Dubrovnik, the satisfaction of the respondents with the information they received on site about the cultural assets on the spot, the presentation of the Jewish heritage in the tourism supply of Split/Dubrovnik, the tourism potential of the Jewish heritage of Split/Dubrovnik and the degree of

<sup>1</sup> Odgovori ispitanika kodirani su prema važnosti posjeta lokalitetu židovske baštine na putovanjima od 1 = "ne vodim računa hoću li na putovanju posjetiti židovsku baštinu" do 5 = "destinaciju biram zbog postojanja židovske baštine u ponudi".

<sup>1</sup> Respondents' answers were coded according to the importance of visiting a Jewish heritage site when travelling, from 1= 'I do not consider whether I will visit a Jewish heritage site on my trip' to 5= 'I choose the destination because of the Jewish heritage in the supply.

TABLICA 4. Izvor informiranja o židovskom groblju u Splitu i sinagogi u Dubrovniku

TABLE 4 Source of information about the Jewish cemetery in Split and the synagogue in Dubrovnik

Izvor / Source: Anketno istraživanje (2022, 2023) / Source: Survey research (2022, 2023)

| Izvor informiranja / Source of information                                    | Da / Yes |      | Ne / No |      |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|------|---------|------|
|                                                                               | n        | %    | n       | %    |
| Usputno informiranje / Casual information                                     | 99       | 37,5 | 165     | 62,5 |
| Promotivni materijali / Promotional materials                                 | 70       | 26,5 | 194     | 73,5 |
| Društvene mreže / Social networks                                             | 28       | 10,6 | 236     | 89,4 |
| Preporuka obitelji i/ili prijatelja / Recommendation of family and/or friends | 22       | 8,3  | 242     | 91,7 |
| Obrazovanje / Education                                                       | 14       | 5,3  | 250     | 94,7 |
| Turističke agencije / Travel agencies                                         | 11       | 4,2  | 253     | 95,8 |

židovske baštine u Hrvatskoj (Tab. 5.).

Odgovori ispitanika o elementima turističke valorizacije židovske baštine u Splitu i Dubrovniku jasno pokazuju da je tamošnja sefardska baština nedovoljno turistički valorizirana u odnosu na ocjenu njezine turističke atraktivnosti. Tome govore u prilog više ocjene njezine turističke atraktivnosti od zadovoljstva informacijama koje su ispitanici dobili o sefardskoj baštini tijekom posjeta, a uvelike više od ocjene zastupljenosti židovske baštine u turističkoj ponudi Splita/Dubrovnika. Posjetitelji su relativno nisko ocijenili turistički potencijal židovske baštine u Splitu, odnosno Dubrovniku, što, zajedno s izrazito niskom ocjenom zastupljenosti židovske baštine u turističkoj ponudi grada, podupire tezu da u obje destinacije sefardska baština ne spada u red vodećih atrakcija u ukupnoj atrakcijskoj osnovi, ali ni u kulturnoj baštini kao najvažnijem njezinu segmentu. Da je židovska baština u Hrvatskoj turistički iznimno slabo vrednovana

knowledge of the Jewish heritage in Croatia (Table 5).

The respondents' answers to the elements of the tourism valorisation of the Jewish heritage in Split and Dubrovnik clearly show that the Sephardic heritage is not sufficiently valorised in comparison to the assessment of its tourism attractiveness. This is confirmed by the fact that tourism attractiveness is rated higher than satisfaction with the information respondents received about Sephardic heritage during their visit and much higher than the rating of the presentation of Jewish heritage in Split/Dubrovnik's tourism supply. Visitors rated the tourism potential of Jewish heritage in Split and Dubrovnik relatively low, which, together with the extremely low rating of the presentation of Jewish heritage in the city's tourism supply, supports the thesis that Sephardic heritage in both destinations is neither among the leading attractions in the overall attraction base nor in cultural heritage as its most important segment. The fact that the

TABLICA 5. Ocjena turističke valorizacije židovske baštine u Splitu i Dubrovniku

TABLE 5 Evaluation of the tourist valorization of Jewish heritage in Split and Dubrovnik

Izvor / Source: Anketno istraživanje (2022, 2023) / Source: Survey research (2022, 2023)

| Element turističke valorizacije židovske baštine / An element of touristic valorization of Jewish heritage                                                                                                                                                    | M    | SD    |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|-------|
| Ocjena turističke atraktivnosti posjećenog lokaliteta / Evaluation of the tourism attractiveness of the place                                                                                                                                                 | 3,80 | 0,998 |
| Zadovoljstvo informacijama (info-ploče, izlaganje turističkog vodiča) o posjećenom lokalitetu židovske baštine na licu mjesta / Satisfaction with the information on site (information boards, presentation of the tourist guide) on the Jewish heritage site | 3,11 | 1,620 |
| Ocjena zastupljenosti židovske baštine u turističkoj ponudi grada / Evaluation of the presentation of Jewish heritage in the city's tourism supply                                                                                                            | 1,81 | 1,021 |
| Ocjena turističkog potencijala židovske baštine u gradu / Evaluation of the tourism potential of the Jewish heritage in the city                                                                                                                              | 3,16 | 1,019 |
| Upoznatost sa židovskom baštinom u Hrvatskoj / Familiarity with the Jewish heritage in Croatia                                                                                                                                                                | 1,56 | 0,843 |

**TABLICA 6.** *Odgovori ispitanika na pitanja o planovima za ponovni posjet židovskoj baštini u Splitu i Dubrovniku i posjet židovskoj baštini u Hrvatskoj te o preporuci posjeta židovskoj baštini u Splitu i Dubrovniku prijateljima i rođacima*

**TABLE 6** *Respondents' answers to questions about plans to revisit Jewish heritage sites in Split and Dubrovnik, to visit Jewish heritage sites in Croatia in general, and to recommend visiting Jewish heritage in Split and Dubrovnik to friends and relatives*

Izvor / Source: *Anketno istraživanje (2022, 2023) / Source: Survey research (2022, 2023)*

| Pitanje / Question                                                                                                                                                                       | Da / Yes |      | Ne / No |      |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|------|---------|------|
|                                                                                                                                                                                          | n        | %    | n       | %    |
| Hoćete li se vratiti u destinaciju i na lokalitet? / Will you return to the destination and the Jewish heritage site?                                                                    | 122      | 46,2 | 142     | 53,8 |
| Planirate li za vrijeme ovog putovanja posjetiti i druge lokalitete židovske baštine u Hrvatskoj? / Do you plan to visit other Jewish heritage sites in Croatia during this trip?        | 75       | 28,4 | 189     | 71,6 |
| Planirate li u okviru budućih putovanja posjetiti i druge lokalitete židovske baštine u Hrvatskoj? / Do you plan to visit other Jewish heritage sites in Croatia on your future travels? | 83       | 31,4 | 181     | 68,6 |
| Hoćete li preporučiti židovsku baštinu grada svojim prijateljima i/ili rodbini? / Will you recommend the city's Jewish heritage sites to your friends and/or relatives?                  | 227      | 86,0 | 37      | 14,0 |

pokazuje i odgovor na pitanje o upoznatosti ispitanika s njome (Tab. 4.).

Na pitanja o planovima za ponovni posjet židovskoj baštini u Splitu i Dubrovniku, kao i o planovima za posjete drugim lokalitetima židovske baštine u Hrvatskoj tijekom ovoga ili budućih putovanja, ispitanici su odgovorili pretežno negativno (Tab. 5.). Pozitivnije odgovore dali su na pitanje o preporuci posjeta židovskoj baštini u Splitu i Dubrovniku prijateljima i rođacima (Tab. 6.).

Na otvoreno pitanje koje bi još lokalitete židovske baštine u Hrvatskoj ispitanici voljeli posjetiti u okviru ovoga ili budućega putovanja, većina ispitanika nije navela konkretnu lokaciju, što upućuje na nepoznavanje lokaliteta židovske baštine u Hrvatskoj, a od češćih odgovora ističu se Split (kod ispitanika u Dubrovniku), Dubrovnik (kod ispitanika u Splitu) i Zagreb.

Navedeno govori u prilog zaključku da je židovska baština u Splitu i Dubrovniku, ali i u Hrvatskoj u cjelini, turistima uglavnom nepoznata i slabo turistički valorizirana s obzirom na atrakcijski potencijal koji posjeduje. Ipak, ocjene ispitanika u Splitu i Dubrovniku upućuju na zaključak da potencijalna turistička atraktivnost židovske baštine u Hrvatskoj većini turista nije glavni turistički motiv posjeta, čak ni među atrakcijama temeljenim na kulturnoj baštini.

Jewish heritage in Croatia is held in extremely low grades by tourists is also shown by the answer to the question about the respondents' familiarity with it (Table 4).

Respondents answered mostly negatively to questions about plans to revisit the Jewish heritage in Split and Dubrovnik, as well as plans to visit other Jewish heritage sites in Croatia during this or future trips (Table 5). When asked whether they would recommend visiting the Jewish heritage in Split and Dubrovnik to friends and relatives, they gave more positive answers (Table 6).

When asked which other Jewish heritage sites in Croatia they would like to visit during this or a future trip, the majority of respondents did not specify a particular place, indicating that they are not familiar with Jewish heritage sites in Croatia. The most common responses are Split (for respondents in Dubrovnik), Dubrovnik (for respondents in Split) and Zagreb.

All facts mentioned above supports the conclusion that the Jewish heritage in Split and Dubrovnik, as in Croatia as a whole, is largely unknown to tourists and is rated poorly in terms of its attraction potential. Nevertheless, the ratings of respondents in Split and Dubrovnik suggest that the potential tourism attraction of Jewish heritage in Croatia is not the main motive for most tourists during their visit, even among cultural heritage-based attractions.

### *Razlike između posjetitelja sefardske baštine u Splitu i Dubrovniku*

Za utvrđivanje razlika među posjetiteljima koji su posjetili sinagogu u Dubrovniku i one koji su posjetili židovsko groblje u Splitu kao temeljna analiza primijenjena je multivarijatna analiza varijance (MANOVA). S obzirom na to da se u ovoj metodi kao zavisne varijable mogu koristiti kontinuirane varijable (a ne dihotomne ili kategorijalne varijable), uz multivarijatnu analizu varijance provedene su i dodatne analize s hi-kvadrat testom za dihotomne varijable.

Na oba lokaliteta distribucija ispitanika po spolu je poprilično izjednačena. Tako je u Splitu od 127 posjetitelja bilo 57 muškaraca (44,9 %) i 70 žena (55,1 %), dok je u Dubrovniku od 137 posjetitelja bilo 56 muškaraca (40,9 %) i 81 žena (59,1 %). Posjetitelji se statistički značajno razlikuju prema državi iz koje dolaze. Posjetitelji u Splitu dominantno dolaze iz europske zemlje (njih 111 od 127 ili 87,4 %), dok posjetitelji u Dubrovniku u većoj mjeri dolaze iz izvan europskih država (101 od 137 ili 73,7 %) ( $X^2 = 99,782$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  $p = 0,000$ ).

Ispitanici na obje lokacije statistički se značajno razlikuju i prema radnom statusu. U splitskom uzorku bilo je tek 6,3 % umirovljenika (8 od 127 ispitanika), a dominirala je populacija zaposlenih (85 ili 66,9 %) te studenata (30 ili 23,6 %). Od 137 anketiranih posjetitelja u Dubrovniku, njih 44,5 % bili su umirovljenici ( $n = 61$ ), a zaposlenih je bilo 69 ili 50,4 % ( $X^2 = 60,604$ ,  $df = 3$ ,  $p = 0,000$ ).

Što se tiče obrazovanja, ispitanici na obje lokacije u prosjeku su visokoobrazovani. Ipak, u dubrovačkom uzorku ima puno više posjetitelja sa završenim magisterijem ili doktoratom znanosti (njih 69 od 137 ili čak 50,4 %), dok ih je u splitskom uzorku oko 28 %, što je gotovo dvostruko manje nego u dubrovačkom uzorku ( $X^2 = 25,196$ ,  $df = 3$ ,  $p = 0,000$ ). S druge strane, u splitskom uzorku značajan broj ispitanika je s višom školom (31 ili 24,4 %), dok ih je u dubrovačkom uzorku samo 5,1 %.

Posjetitelji se očekivano statistički značajno razlikuju s obzirom na organizaciju putovanja. U Splitu je čak 123 anketirana posjetitelja došlo individualno (96,9 %), a samo 4 organizirano (3,1 %) U Dubrovniku je 91 ispitanik došao individualno (66,4

### *Differences between visitors to the Sephardic heritage in Split and Dubrovnik*

To determine the differences between the visitors who visited the synagogue in Dubrovnik and those who visited the Jewish cemetery in Split, a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used as the main tool. Since this method allows continuous variables to be used as dependent variables (and not dichotomous or categorical variables), some additional analyses were carried out using the chi-square test for dichotomous variables in addition to MANOVA.

In both places, the distribution of respondents by sex is fairly even. In Split, 57 of 127 visitors were men (44.9%) and 70 were women (55.1%), while in Dubrovnik, 56 of 137 visitors were men (40.9%) and 81 were women (59.1%). There is a statistically significant difference between visitors according to the country they come from. The visitors in Split are predominantly from European countries (111 out of 127 or 87.4%), while the visitors in Dubrovnik are predominantly from non-European countries (101 out of 137 or 73.7%) ( $X^2=99.782$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $p=0.000$ ).

The respondents at both locations differ statistically significantly in terms of work status. In the sample in Split, there were only 6.3% pensioners (8 out of 127 respondents), and the population was dominated by employees (85 or 66.9%) and students (30 or 23.6%). Of the 137 visitors surveyed in Dubrovnik, 44.5% were retired ( $n=61$ ) and 69 or 50.4% were employed ( $X^2=60.604$ ,  $df=3$ ,  $p=0.000$ ).

Regarding education, the respondents in both places are very well educated on average. However, in the Dubrovnik sample there are many more visitors with a master's or doctoral degree (69 out of 137 or even 50.4%), while in the Split sample it is about 28%, which is almost twice as much as in the Dubrovnik sample ( $X^2=25.196$ ,  $df=3$ ,  $p=0.000$ ). On the other hand, there is a significant number of respondents with higher education in the Split sample (31 or 24.4%), compared to only 5.1 in the Dubrovnik sample.

As expected, there are statistically significant differences between the visitors in terms of the organisation of the trip. In Split, 123 of the surveyed visitors travelled individually (96.9%), and only 4 of them were organised (3.1%). In Dubrovnik, 91 respondents travelled individually (66.4%) and 46 were or-

%), a 46 organizirano (33,6 %) ( $X^2 = 39,743$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  $p = 0,000$ ). Navedene razlike mogu se objasniti činjenicom da je Dubrovnik turistička destinacija s većim udjelom organiziranih putovanja (primjerice turisti na kruzerima), dok u Splitu prevladavaju putovanja organizirana u vlastitoj režiji.

Multivarijatna analiza varijance provedena je radi detekcije u kojem skupu varijabli se razlikuju ispitanici u Splitu u odnosu na one u Dubrovniku. Razmotrene su njihove razlike prema dobi, broju dana boravka u destinaciji, različitosti motiva putovanja, prethodnog iskustva posjeta lokalitetima židovske baštine, uobičajenoj namjeri posjećivanja lokaliteta židovske baštine, ocjenama turističke atraktivnosti posjećenog lokaliteta, zadovoljstvu informacijama o posjećenom lokalitetu židovske baštine dobivenih na licu mjesta, upoznatosti sa židovskom baštinom u Hrvatskoj, procjeni zastupljenosti židovske baštine u turističkoj ponudi Splita/Dubrovnika, procjeni turističkog potencijala koju ima židovska baština u Splitu/Dubrovniku te namjeri da se preporuči lokalitet ili ponovno posjeti isti ili drugi lokalitet židovske baštine u Splitu/Dubrovniku. S obzirom na to da se varijance u oba subuzorka statistički značajno razlikuju (Boxov  $M = 264,468$ ,  $p = 0,000$ ), primijenjen je Pillai Trace-test koji je statistički značajan i ukazuje na opravdanost provedbe multivarijatne analize varijance ( $F$  (Pillai Trace) = 46,640,  $df$  pogreške = 252,  $p = 0,000$ , parcijalni eta-kvadrat = 0,671). Rezultati multivarijatne analize varijance pokazuju da se dvije skupine ispitanika, u Splitu i Dubrovniku, statistički razlikuju u svim aspektima (Tab. 7.).

Svi parametri osim dobi ispitanika i broja dana u destinaciji ispitani su s pomoću Likertove skale, pri čemu je gradacija odgovora kodirana ocjenama od 1 = najmanje do 5 = najviše. Uočljivo je da su posjetitelji židovskog groblja u Splitu u prosjeku bili znatno mlađi (36,33 godine) od posjetitelja sinagoge u Dubrovniku (59,78 godina). Iako posjetitelji sinagoge u Dubrovniku borave u destinaciji u prosjeku kraće (3,35 dana) u odnosu na posjetitelje židovskoga groblja u Splitu (4,14 dana), ispitanici u Dubrovniku dali su osjetno povoljnije ocjene po svim parametrima (Tab. 6.).

Posjetitelji sefardske baštine u Dubrovniku iskazali su veću različitost motiva koji su ih privukli u destinaciju od onih u Splitu, a odlikuju se i boljim

organizirano (33.6%) ( $X^2 = 39.743$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  $p = 0.000$ ). The differences mentioned above can be explained by the fact that Dubrovnik is a destination with a larger proportion of organised trips (e.g., tourists on cruisers), while in Split self-guided trips predominate.

The MANOVA was carried out with the aim of finding out in which variables the respondents in Split differ from those in Dubrovnik. The following variables were tested: age, number of days spent at the destination, variety of motives for travelling, previous experience of visiting Jewish heritage sites, usual intention to visit Jewish heritage sites, evaluation of the tourism attractiveness of the visited site, satisfaction with the information received on site about the visited Jewish heritage site, familiarity with Jewish heritage in Croatia, evaluation of the presentation of Jewish heritage in the tourism supply of Split/Dubrovnik, evaluation of the tourism potential of Jewish heritage in Split/Dubrovnik and the intention to recommend the site to others or to visit the same or another Jewish heritage site in Split/Dubrovnik again. As the variances in both subsamples are statistically significantly different (Box's  $M = 264.468$ ,  $p = 0.000$ ), the Pillai Trace-test was used, which is statistically significant and indicates the performance of a multivariate analysis of variance ( $F$  (Pillai Trace) = 46.640,  $df$  error = 252,  $p = 0.000$ , partial  $\eta^2 = 0.671$ ). The results of the multivariate analysis of variance show that the two groups of respondents in Split and Dubrovnik differ statistically in all aspects (Table 7).

All parameters, with the exception of the age of the respondents and the number of days in the destination, were assessed using Likert scales, with the gradation of responses coded with grades from 1=least to 5=most. It is noticeable that the visitors to the Jewish cemetery in Split were on average significantly younger (36.33 years) than the visitors to the synagogue in Dubrovnik (59.78 years). Although visitors to the synagogue in Dubrovnik stay in their destination for a shorter period of time on average (3.35 days) than visitors to the Jewish cemetery in Split (4.14 days), the respondents in Dubrovnik gave significantly more positive ratings for all parameters (Table 6).

Visitors to the Sephardic heritage in Dubrovnik indicated a greater diversity of motives that attracted them to the destination than visitors to Split, and they are also characterised by a better knowledge of

**TABLICA 7.** Razlike među ispitanicima u Splitu i Dubrovniku koji su posjetili tamošnje lokalitete sefardske baštine  
**TABLE 7** Differences among respondents in Split and Dubrovnik who visited the local Sephardic heritage sites

Izvor / Source: Anketno istraživanje (2022,2023) / Research survey (2022, 2023)

| Varijabla / Variable                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | Split |        | Dubrovnik |        | F<br>(df=1) | P     | Parcijalni<br>eta-kvadrat<br>/ Partial<br>eta-squared |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|--------|-----------|--------|-------------|-------|-------------------------------------------------------|
|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        | M     | SD     | M         | SD     |             |       |                                                       |
| Dob (godine) / Age (years)                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             | 36,33 | 15,084 | 59,78     | 16,723 | 142,354     | 0,000 | 0,352                                                 |
| Broj dana boravka u destinaciji / Number of days of stay in the destination                                                                                                                                                                                                            | 4,14  | 3,879  | 3,35      | 1,889  | 4,542       | 0,034 | 0,017                                                 |
| Različitoost motiva dolaska u destinaciju (1-5) / Variety of motives for visiting the destination (1-5)                                                                                                                                                                                | 2,03  | 1,038  | 2,37      | 1,175  | 5,933       | 0,016 | 0,022                                                 |
| Prethodno iskustvo posjete lokalitetima židovske baštine (1-5) / Earlier experiences of visiting Jewish heritage sites (1-5)                                                                                                                                                           | 3,10  | 1,943  | 4,37      | 1,548  | 34,347      | 0,000 | 0,116                                                 |
| Uobičajena namjera posjećivanja lokaliteta židovske baštine (1-5) / Usual intention for visiting Jewish heritage sites (1-5)                                                                                                                                                           | 1,80  | 0,891  | 2,87      | 1,006  | 82,460      | 0,000 | 0,239                                                 |
| Ocjena turističke atraktivnosti posjećenog lokaliteta (1-5) / Evaluation of the tourism attractiveness of the place (1-5)                                                                                                                                                              | 3,38  | 1,023  | 4,20      | 0,794  | 53,259      | 0,000 | 0,169                                                 |
| Zadovoljstvo informacijama (info-ploče, izlaganje turističkog vodiča) o posjećenom lokalitetu židovske baštine dobivenih na licu mjesta (1-5) / Satisfaction with the information on site (information boards, presentation of the tourist guide) about the Jewish heritage site (1-5) | 1,85  | 1,254  | 4,28      | 0,866  | 341,005     | 0,000 | 0,566                                                 |
| Upoznatost sa židovskom baštinom u Hrvatskoj (1-5) / Familiarity with the Jewish heritage in Croatia (1-5)                                                                                                                                                                             | 1,28  | 0,677  | 1,82      | 0,899  | 30,195      | 0,000 | 0,103                                                 |
| Ocjena zastupljenosti židovske baštine u turističkoj ponudi grada (1-5) / Evaluation of the presentation of Jewish heritage in the city's tourism supply (1-5)                                                                                                                         | 1,42  | 0,706  | 2,18      | 1,126  | 42,960      | 0,000 | 0,141                                                 |
| Procjena turističkog potencijala koju ima židovska baština u gradu (1-5) / Evaluation of the tourism potential of the Jewish heritage in the city (1-5)                                                                                                                                | 2,97  | 1,083  | 3,34      | 0,926  | 8,808       | 0,003 | 0,033                                                 |
| Namjera da se preporuči lokalitet ili ponovno posjeti isti ili drugi lokalitet židovske baštine u Hrvatskoj (1-5) / Intention to recommend the site or to revisit the same or another Jewish heritage site in Croatia (1-5)                                                            | 1,69  | 1,130  | 2,13      | 1,083  | 10,353      | 0,001 | 0,038                                                 |

poznavanjem židovske baštine općenito, ali i u Hrvatskoj, što se primjećuje ako se usporede srednje vrijednosti prethodnog iskustva posjeti lokalitetima židovske baštine, uobičajenom namjerom po-

Jewish heritage in general, but also in Croatia, which is evident when comparing the mean scores of previous experience of visiting Jewish heritage sites, usual intention to visit Jewish heritage sites and familiar-

sjećivanja lokaliteta židovske baštine te upoznatošću sa židovskom baštinom u Hrvatskoj (usprkos niskim ocjenama u obje destinacije).

Ispitanici su višim ocjenama ocijenili atraktivnost dubrovačke sinagoge od splitskog židovskog groblja, a bili su i uvelike zadovoljniji informacijama (info-ploče, izlaganje turističkog vodiča, itd.) o posjećenom lokalitetu sefardske baštine dobivenih na licu mjesta, što upućuje na zaključak da je sefardska baština u Dubrovniku atraktivnija, ali i turistički osjetno bolje valorizirana u odnosu na sefardsku baštinu u Splitu.

Iako su ispitanici u oba grada relativno niskim ocjenama ocijenili zastupljenost židovske baštine u turističkoj ponudi grada, kao i turistički potencijal koji ima židovska baština u gradu, oba parametra dobila su više ocjene posjetitelja u Dubrovniku nego u Splitu. To se primjećuje i u pogledu ponovnog posjeta istom ili posjeta drugom lokalitetu židovske baštine u Hrvatskoj, odnosno u namjeri preporuke za posjet posjećenog lokaliteta prijateljima i/ili rođacima.

## RASPRAVA

Anketnim istraživanjem utvrđen je profil posjetitelja sefardske baštine na židovskom groblju u Splitu i sinagogi u Dubrovniku. Posjetitelji sefardske baštine dolaze u destinaciju u individualnoj organizaciji u kojoj borave 3,73 dana, najviše ih dolazi iz europskih država (55,7 %), a ostalo čine izvan europske države (44,3 %). Naglašene su razlike prema posjetiteljima među gradovima, pri čemu Split uglavnom posjećuju iz europskih, a Dubrovnik iz izvan europskih država. Najviše ispitanika je iz SAD-a (32,6 %), Ujedinjenog Kraljevstva, Njemačke, Francuske i Finske. Sociodemografske karakteristike pokazale su da su posjetitelji uglavnom žene, visokoobrazovane osobe, umirovljenici i osobe starije životne dobi u Dubrovniku, a zaposleni i mlađi u Splitu. Glavni motiv dolaska u destinacije je „kulturna baština“, dok su ostali motivi „odmor i opuštanje“, „nova iskustva i doživljaji“ i „prirodne ljepote“. Što se tiče njihove navike posjećivanja lokaliteta židovske baštine, posjećuju je usputno i nije glavni motiv za odabir destinacije. Prema tome je i njihovo informiranje o sefardskoj baštini

ity with Jewish heritage in Croatia (despite the low scores in both destinations).

The respondents rated the attractiveness of the synagogue in Dubrovnik higher than the Jewish cemetery in Split and were much more satisfied with the information on the Sephardic heritage received on site (information boards, presentation of the tourist guide, etc.), which suggests that the Sephardic heritage in Dubrovnik is not only more attractive, but is also rated significantly better in terms of tourism than the Sephardic heritage in Split.

Although respondents in both cities rated the presentation of Jewish heritage in the city tourism supply relatively low, as well as the tourism potential of Jewish heritage in the city, both parameters received higher ratings from visitors in Dubrovnik than in Split. The same is observed with regard to visit the same or another Jewish heritage site in Croatia again, i.e., with the intention to recommend the visited site to friends and/or relatives.

## DISCUSSION

The survey determined the profile of visitors to Sephardic heritage at the Jewish cemetery in Split and the synagogue in Dubrovnik. Visitors to the Sephardic heritage come to the destination in an individual organization where they stay for 3.73 days, and the majority come from European countries (55.7%), and the rest are non-European (44.3%). Differences in visitors between the cities are emphasized, whereby Split is mostly visited from European countries, and Dubrovnik from non-European countries. Most respondents are from the USA (32.6%), United Kingdom, Germany, France and Finland. Sociodemographic characteristics showed that visitors are mainly women, highly educated people, retirees and older people in Dubrovnik, and employed and younger people in Split. The main motive for coming to the destinations is 'cultural heritage,' while other motives are 'leisure and relaxation,' 'new experiences and adventures' and 'beautiful nature'. As for their habit of visiting Jewish heritage sites, they visit them incidentally and it is not the main motive for choosing a destination. Accordingly, their information about Sephardic heritage is incidental, and only slightly less from promotional materials. Visitors to Sephardic

usputno, a tek nešto manje iz promotivnih materijala. Posjetitelji sefardske baštine u Hrvatskoj većinom su redovni posjetitelji židovske baštine (89 %), koji u najvećoj mjeri posjećuju sinagoge, a potom židovske muzeje.

Prema Tomas istraživanju, 2022./2023. u Hrvatskoj prosječna je dob turista 42 godine i srednje su životne dobe (60 % od 30 do 49 godina) te su fakultetski obrazovani (42 %). Kao glavni motivi dolaska u Jadransku Hrvatsku navode se more (83 %) i priroda (63 %), dok su kultura i umjetnost kao glavni motiv prevladali tek kod 9 % posjetitelja. To znači da posjetitelji sefardske baštine nisu tipični turisti koji posjećuju Jadransku Hrvatsku (Institut za turizam, 2023), nego spadaju u 9 % kulturnih turista te među njima treba tražiti buduće posjetitelje takvog tipa baštine. Razlog tome je što su ti posjetitelji jače motivirani za židovsku baštinu, ali je posjećuju usputno te posjet židovskoj baštini nije glavni motiv dolaska u destinaciju.

U usporedbi s navedenim istraživanjima uočene su sličnosti i razlike u profilu posjetitelja sefardske baštine. Primjeri sličnih istraživanja fokusirani su na sinagoge i muzeje, dok se ovo istraživanje bavilo i sinagogom/muzejom i grobljem. Zbog toga se uočavaju razlike među posjetiteljima lokaliteta. U istraživanju Dinisa i Krakovera (2016), u strukturi posjetitelja židovskog muzeja u Belmontu Izraelci čine većinu, a zatim posjetitelji iz SAD-a. Slijede posjetitelji iz Španjolske i Francuske, susjedne portugalske države. Posjetitelji iz SAD-a čine 32,6 % anketiranih u Splitu i Dubrovniku. Ostatak strukture nije sličan jer ostali posjetitelji ne dolaze iz susjednih, već iz udaljenijih država. Usporedbom dobivenih rezultata s istraživanjem provedenim u sinagogi u Cordobi (Jimber del Rio i sur., 2020), primijećene su razlike i sličnosti u profilu posjetitelja. Struktura posjetitelja prema spolu pokazala je da je u Hrvatskoj više žena nego muškaraca i da su gotovi svi posjetitelji strani, za razliku od Cordobe gdje prevladavaju domaći posjetitelji i muškarci. Obje skupine imaju viši stupanj obrazovanja i srednje su životne dobi. Što se tiče zadovoljstva posjetom, u oba istraživanja ispitanici su podjednako ocijenili zadovoljstvo.

Posjetitelji su ocijenili turističku valorizaciju židovske baštine u gradovima. Prosječna ocjena turističke atraktivnosti lokaliteta je 3,8, a zadovolj-

heritage in Croatia are mostly regular visitors to Jewish heritage (89%), who mostly visit synagogues, followed by Jewish museums.

According to the 2022/2023 TOMAS survey, the average age of tourists in Croatia is 42 and they are middle-aged (60% from 30 to 49 years old) and have a university education (42%). The main motives for coming to Adriatic Croatia are the sea (83%) and nature (63%), while culture and art prevailed as the main motive for only 9% of visitors. This means that visitors to Sephardic heritage are not typical tourists visiting Adriatic Croatia (Institut za turizam, 2023), but belong to the 9% of cultural tourists, and future visitors to this type of heritage should be sought among them. The reason for this is that these visitors are more motivated by Jewish heritage, but they visit it incidentally, and in fact visiting Jewish heritage is not the main motive for coming to the destination.

Compared to the aforementioned research, similarities and differences were observed in the profile of visitors to Sephardic heritage. Examples of similar research are focused on synagogues and museums, while this research dealt with both a synagogue/museum and a cemetery. This is precisely why differences are observed among visitors to the site. In the study by Dinis and Krakover (2016), Israelis make up the majority in the structure of visitors to the Jewish Museum in Belmont, followed by visitors from the USA, and then from Spain and France, which are neighbouring Portuguese countries. Visitors from the USA make up 32.6% of those surveyed in Split and Dubrovnik. However, the rest of the structure is not similar because the rest of the visitors do not come from neighbouring countries but from more distant countries. Comparing the results obtained with a study conducted in the synagogue in Cordoba (Jimber del Rio et al., 2020), some differences and similarities in the visitor profile were observed. The structure of visitors by gender showed that in Croatia there are more women than men and almost all visitors are foreign, unlike in Cordoba where domestic visitors and men predominate. Both groups have a higher level of education and are middle-aged. Regarding satisfaction with the visit, in both studies the respondents rated satisfaction equally.

Visitors participated in the touristic valorisation of Jewish heritage in cities. The average tourist attrac-

stvo informacijama ocijenjeno je s 3,11, pri čemu se zaključuje da ima mjesta za napredak u ovom segmentu. Međutim, posjetitelji su negativno ocijenili (1,81) zastupljenost u turističkoj ponudi gradova, ali isto tako nisu niti upoznati sa židovskom baštinom u Hrvatskoj (1,56). Unatoč negativnim ocjenama, smatraju da lokaliteti ima turistički potencijal. Ocjena zadovoljstva turističkom infrastrukturom židovske baštine podijeljena je među ispitanicima u Splitu i Dubrovniku. Rezultati istraživanja upućuju na razliku među posjetiteljima u Splitu i Dubrovniku, odnosno na sam lokalitet. Razlog tome je svakako lokacija odabranih lokaliteta s obzirom na glavne turističke atrakcije. Sinagoga/muzej u Dubrovniku bolje je ocijenjena i ima veću atraktivnost zbog blizine ostalih gradskih atrakcija jer se nalazi unutar gradske jezgre, institucionalizirana je te su posjetitelji bili zadovoljniji dobivenim informacijama. S druge strane, židovsko groblje u Splitu posjećuje se usputno, manje je atraktivno i dobije se manje informacija o lokalitetu zbog nedostatka turističke infrastrukture.

Prethodna istraživanja turizma židovske baštine pokazala su nedostatak istraživanja profila turista, a ovim istraživanjem nastojalo se popuniti taj nedostatak. Analiza profila posjetitelja daje sljedeće karakteristike: to su inozemni visokoobrazovani posjetitelji srednje i starije životne dobi koji posjećuju destinaciju zbog njezine kulturne baštine, posjećuju židovsku baštinu u destinaciji ako ona postoji, usputno se o njoj informiraju, ne planiraju ponovni posjet, ali će preporučiti lokalitete.

Na temelju provedenog istraživanja na lokalitetima sefardske baštine, zaključuje se da profil posjetitelja sefardske baštine u Hrvatskoj odgovara profilu kulturnih turista u Hrvatskoj. U odnosu na profil prosječnog kulturnog turista u Hrvatskoj, prema TOMAS istraživanju 2022./2023. (Institut za turizam, 2023), profil posjetitelja sefardske baštine razlikuje se po dobi, spolu i državi iz koje dolaze. To pokazuje kako je turizam židovske baštine dio kulturnog turizma. S obzirom na to, može se raditi na unaprjeđenju i promociji lokalne sefardske baštine u Hrvatskoj u kontekstu kulturnog turizma, jer na strani turističke potražnje postoji zainteresirana specifična skupina turista za posjet upravo tim lokalitetima.

tiveness rating of the site was 3.8, and the satisfaction with information was rated 3.11, which leads to the conclusion that there is room for improvement in this segment. However, visitors negatively evaluated (1.81) the presentation in the tourism supply of cities, and they were also not even familiar with the Jewish heritage in Croatia (1.56). Despite the negative ratings, they believe that the site has tourist potential. The satisfaction rating with the tourist infrastructure of Jewish heritage was divided among respondents in Split and Dubrovnik. The results of the survey indicate a difference between visitors in Split and Dubrovnik, or rather the site itself. The reason for this is certainly the location of the selected sites with respect to the main tourist attractions. The synagogue/museum in Dubrovnik was rated better and has greater attractiveness due to its proximity to other city attractions because it is located within the city centre, it is institutionalised, and visitors were more satisfied with the information received. On the other hand, the Jewish cemetery in Split is visited incidentally, is less attractive and provides less information about the site due to the lack of tourist infrastructure.

Previous research on Jewish heritage tourism has shown a lack of research on tourist profiles, and this research sought to fill this gap. The following characteristics are concluded from the analysis of visitor profiles: these are foreign, highly educated middle-aged or older visitors who visit the destination for its cultural heritage, who visit Jewish heritage sites at the destination if it exists, get information about it incidentally, who do not plan a return visit, but will recommend the sites.

Based on the research conducted on Sephardic heritage sites, it is concluded that the profile of Sephardic heritage visitors in Croatia corresponds to the profile of cultural tourists in Croatia. Compared to the profile of the average cultural tourist in Croatia, according to the TOMAS 2022/2023 survey (Institut za turizam, 2023), the profile of visitors to Sephardic heritage differs in age, gender, and country of origin. It shows that Jewish heritage tourism is part of cultural tourism. Given this, work can be done to improve and promote local Sephardic heritage in Croatia in the context of cultural tourism, because on the tourist demand side, a specific group of tourists is interested in visiting these sites.

## ZAKLJUČAK

Sefardsku materijalnu nepokretnu baštinu čine groblja, sinagoge, muzeji i četvrti, koji se najčešće nalaze u mediteranskim državama. Sefardi se na prostor Hrvatske naseljavaju nakon izгона iz Španjolske i Portugala, odnosno nakon 1492. i 1496. godine. Dvije sefardske zajednice formirane su u Splitu i Dubrovniku. Sličnih su povijesnih karakteristika, a sinagoge su im smještene unutar gradskih zidina. Do danas su sačuvani i sinagoga i groblje u oba grada. Split i Dubrovnik važne su hrvatske turističke destinacije u kojima se nudi raznovrstan sadržaj za posjetitelje: od turističkog proizvoda sunca i mora, prirodnih i kulturnih atrakcija do događanja.

Turizam židovske baštine temelji se na turističkoj valorizaciji židovskih četvrti, muzeja, sinagoga, lokalnih židovskih osoba, groblja i sl. Iako je od 1990-ih turizam židovske baštine postao dio kulturnog turizma u brojnim europskim državama, ovo je istraživanje pokazalo da u Hrvatskoj židovska baština još nije važan dio ponude kulturnog turizma.

Rezultati anketnog istraživanja pokazali su da je profil posjetitelja sefardske baštine u Hrvatskoj sličan profilu kulturnih turista. To znači da se radi o visokoobrazovanim osobama, srednje životne dobi, sklonim posjećivati lokalitete židovske baštine, iako ona većini nije glavni motiv kod odabira destinacije. Što se tiče zadovoljstva, negativna je percepcija prema kvaliteti usluge u pogledu dobivenih informacija na lokalitetima, kao i slaba zastupljenost u turističkoj ponudi. S druge strane, ispitanici smatraju kako sefardska baština ima turistički potencijal u kulturnom turizmu Splita i Dubrovnika. Uspoređujući profil kulturnih posjetitelja prema Richardsu (1996) i posjetitelja sinagoga u Cordobi (Jimber del Rio i sur., 2020), posjetitelji sefardske baštine dijele neke karakteristike kao i kulturni turisti: visok stupanj obrazovanja i dob.

Iako se rad bavi utvrđivanjem profila posjetitelja sefardske baštine u Splitu i Dubrovniku, uočene su razlike u strukturi posjetitelja u ta dva grada. U Dubrovniku je nešto više muškaraca među posjetiteljima prema spolu. Velika je razlika u strukturi prema državama iz kojih dolaze, odnosno kod podjele na europske i izvan europske. U Splitu pre-

## CONCLUSION

Sephardic tangible immovable heritage consists of cemeteries, synagogues, museums and quarters, which are most often found in Mediterranean countries. Sephardim settled in Croatia after their expulsion from Spain and Portugal, i.e., after 1492 and 1496. Two Sephardic communities were formed in Split and Dubrovnik. They have similar historical characteristics, and their synagogues are located within the city walls. Both synagogues and cemeteries have been preserved to this day in both cities. Split and Dubrovnik are important Croatian tourist destinations that offer a variety of content for visitors: from the tourism product of Sun and Sea, natural and cultural attractions to events.

Jewish heritage tourism is based on the tourism valorisation of Jewish quarters, museums, synagogues, local Jewish people, cemeteries, etc. Although Jewish heritage tourism has become a part of cultural tourism in many European countries since the 1990s, this research has shown that in Croatia Jewish heritage has not yet become an important part of the cultural tourism offer.

The results of the survey showed that the profile of visitors to Sephardic heritage in Croatia is similar to the profile of cultural tourists. This means that they are highly educated, middle-aged people who tend to visit Jewish heritage sites, although for most it is not the main motive when choosing a destination. As for satisfaction, there is a negative perception of the quality of service in terms of information received at the sites, as well as poor representation in the tourism supply. Nevertheless, the respondents believe that Sephardic heritage has tourist potential in the cultural tourism of Split and Dubrovnik. Comparing the profile of cultural visitors according to Richards (1996) and visitors to synagogues in Cordoba (Jimber del Rio et al., 2020), visitors to Sephardic heritage sites share some characteristics with cultural tourists: high level of education and age.

Although the paper deals with determining the profile of visitors to Sephardic heritage in Split and Dubrovnik, differences were observed in the structure of visitors in these two cities. In Dubrovnik, there are slightly more men than women among visitors by sex. There is a big difference in the structure

vladavaju posjetitelji iz europskih država, a u Dubrovniku iz izvan europskih. Razlike su i u radnom statusu pri čemu u Dubrovniku zaposleni posjetitelji čine više od polovice u odnosu na umirovljenike. S druge strane, u Splitu dominiraju zaposleni dok je udio umirovljenika gotovo neznan. Četvrtina ispitanika u Splitu su studenti. Iako u strukturi posjetitelja dominiraju visokoobrazovane osobe, Dubrovnik više posjećuju osobe s magisterijem i doktoratom, a u Splitu s višom školom. U organizaciji putovanja utvrđene su značajne razlike. Gotovo svi splitski posjetitelji dolaze u individualnom aranžmanu, u Dubrovniku dvije trećine posjetitelja dolazi u individualnom, a jedna trećina u organiziranom aranžmanu. Posjetitelji Dubrovnika su gosti kruzera ili američkih grupa. Prema provedenoj analizi, posjetitelji židovske baštine Splita i Dubrovnika značajno se razlikuju, što vjerojatno proizlazi iz ispitanih lokaliteta židovske baštine kao i njihove lokacije unutar gradova.

Na temelju analize rezultata može se zaključiti kako je sefardska baština u Splitu slabije turistički vrednovana, ali je stav posjetitelja da ima potencijala. S druge strane, dubrovačka sinagoga ocijenjena je atraktivnijom te su posjetitelji zadovoljniji dobivenim informacijama. Takva raspodjela ocjena upućuje na to da se turistička valorizacija treba fokusirati na splitsko groblje, dok se u Dubrovniku treba održavati dosadašnja kvaliteta.

Unatoč turističkoj atraktivnosti, prema ispitanicima, sefardska baština je nedovoljno turistički valorizirana te postoji prostor za njezin daljnji razvoj i uključivanje u turističku destinaciju. Primarni fokus trebao bi biti na postavljanju turističke infrastrukture na židovskom groblju u Splitu. Prvo, groblju su potrebni znakovi oko njega, posebno u blizini Prve vidilice, gdje je većina posjetitelja. Znak na ulazu trebao bi biti bolje označen. Unutar groblja trebala bi se nalaziti informativna ploča s osnovnim informacijama o lokalitetu, koje grobove posjetiti, kratkim pričama nekih istaknutih obitelji i židovskoj zajednici u Splitu. Informativne ploče mogle bi sadržavati i QR kodove s više informacija i slika. Drugo, Turistička zajednica grada Splita, u suradnji sa splitskom židovskom općinom, trebala bi izraditi promotivne materijale u obliku brošure. Brošura bi se trebala sastojati od karte židovske baštine u Splitu, s kartom svih mje-

according to the countries they come from, that is, when dividing them into European and non-European. In Split, visitors from European countries predominate, while in Dubrovnik there are more visitors from non-European countries. There are also differences in employment status. On the one hand, in Dubrovnik the employed visitors make up more than a half, as compared to retirees. On the other hand, Split is dominated by employed people, while the share of retirees is almost negligible. A quarter of the respondents in Split are students. Although the structure of visitors is dominated by highly educated people, Dubrovnik is visited more by people with master's degrees and doctorates, while in Split by people with college degrees. As far as the organization of travel is concerned, significant differences were found. Almost all Split visitors come in individual arrangements, while in Dubrovnik two-thirds are in individual arrangements and one-third in organized groups. From surveys with visitors in Dubrovnik, it was found that these are guests of cruise ships or American groups. According to the analysis, visitors to the Jewish heritage sites of Split and Dubrovnik are significantly different from each other, which probably results from the Jewish heritage sites examined, as well as their location within the cities themselves.

Based on the analysis of the results, it can be concluded that Sephardic heritage in Split is less valued as a tourist destination, but the visitors' attitude is that it has potential. Conversely, the Dubrovnik synagogue was rated as more attractive and visitors were more satisfied with the information received. Such a distribution of ratings suggests that tourist valorisation should focus on the Split cemetery, while the current quality in Dubrovnik should be maintained.

Despite its tourism attractiveness, according to the respondents, Sephardic heritage is insufficiently valorised in terms of tourism, and there is room for its further development and inclusion as a tourist destination. The primary focus should be on setting up tourist infrastructure at the Jewish cemetery in Split. Firstly, the cemetery needs signs around it, especially near Prva vidilica (First peak), where most visitors come. The sign at the entrance should be more visible. Inside the cemetery there should be an information board containing basic

sta židovske baštine, s kratkim opisom. Trebala bi biti dostupna u fizičkom obliku u informativnim centrima i sinagogama, kao i online na web stranici Turističke zajednice grada Splita. Promocija židovske baštine trebala bi se provoditi putem društvenih mreža Turističke zajednice, barem tri puta godišnje: prije turističke sezone, tijekom turističke sezone, s naglaskom na židovsko groblje, i nakon turističke sezone. Promocija može sadržavati razne informacije ili, na primjer, o pripremi groblja za nadolazeću sezonu. Takva turistička infrastruktura nije potrebna u Dubrovniku u vezi s muzejom, posjetiteljima treba pružiti više informacija unutar muzeja i sinagoge. Uključivanje sefardske baštine u turističku ponudu gradova pokazuje otvorenost prema multikulturalizmu i očuvanju baštine. Iako u Dubrovniku nije potrebna takva turistička infrastruktura s obzirom na muzej, trebalo bi u muzeju i sinagogi pružiti posjetiteljima više informacija. Uključivanje sefardske baštine u turističku ponudu gradova pokazuje otvorenost prema multikulturalnosti i očuvanju baštine.

Kao jedan od glavnih nedostataka ovoga istraživanja je neuključenost posjetitelja splitske sinagoge. Međutim, iz razgovora s posjetiteljima u Splitu i Dubrovniku saznalo se da je sinagoga, unatoč natpisu o radnom vremenu od 10 do 14 sati, bila zatvorena, te se postavlja pitanje bi li se takvo istraživanje uopće moglo izvesti. Radi dodatnog produbljivanja spoznaja o turističkoj valorizaciji sefardske baštine u Splitu i Dubrovniku, rezultate provedenog istraživanja u budućnosti bi trebalo nadopuniti istraživanjima o važnosti posjetitelja s kruzera za njezinu valorizaciju, kao i o usporedbi profila posjetitelja sinagoga u Splitu i Dubrovniku. U znanstvenoj literaturi nedostaju istraživanja profila posjetitelja židovske, odnosno sefardske baštine. Profil posjetitelja dobiven istraživanjem može poslužiti za kreiranje novih turističkih proizvoda.

Nedostatak anketnog istraživanja je i to što nije provedeno istovremeno, ali zbog toga što je jedna osoba provodila terensko istraživanje, tehnički nije bilo moguće provesti. Turistička sezona u Dubrovniku počinje već u svibnju, a tijekom ljetnih mjeseci velike su gužve. Prije provođenja anketa, autori su se informirali u židovskoj općini te je rečeno kako je od lipnja do kolovoza iznimno velika gužva u sinagogi i muzeji, te se postavilo pitanje

information about the site, which graves to visit, short stories of some prominent families, and the Jewish community in Split. Information boards could also contain QR codes with more information and pictures. Secondly, the Tourist Board of Split, in cooperation with the Split Jewish community, should make promotional materials in the form of a brochure. The brochure should consist of a map of Jewish heritage in Split, with a map of all the places of Jewish heritage, with a short description. It should be available in physical form in information centres and synagogues, as well as online on the website of the Tourist Board of Split. Promotion of Jewish heritage should be done through the social media of the Tourist Board, at least three times a year: before the tourist season, during the tourist season, but with a focus on the Jewish cemetery, and after the tourist season. Promotion can contain various information, for example, on how the cemetery was prepared for the upcoming season. Although such tourist infrastructure is not needed in Dubrovnik concerning the museum, more information should be provided to visitors within the museum and the synagogue. The inclusion of Sephardic heritage in the tourism supply of cities shows openness towards multiculturalism and heritage preservation. Although such tourist infrastructure is not needed in Dubrovnik with regard to the museum, more information should be provided to visitors within the museum and synagogue. The inclusion of Sephardic heritage in the tourism supply of cities shows openness towards multiculturalism and heritage preservation.

One of the main shortcomings of this research is the lack of inclusion of visitors to the Split synagogue. However, from conversations with visitors in Split and Dubrovnik, it was found that the synagogue, despite the sign stating that its opening hours are from 10 am to 2 pm, was closed, and the question arises whether such research would even be possible to conduct. In order to further deepen our understanding of the tourism valorisation of Sephardic heritage in Split and Dubrovnik, it would be desirable to expand the results of the research in the future with research on the significance of cruisers visitors for its valorisation, as well as a comparison of the profiles of synagogue visitors in Split and Dubrovnik. Namely, there

moгуćnost provedbe anketa. Već je krajem svibnja 2023., kada se provodilo terensko istraživanje, bila gužva, a zbog nedostatka prostora u muzeju, nije bilo moguće pitati sve posjetitelje jesu li zainteresirani za anketiranje. S druge strane, anketno je istraživanje bilo moguće provesti u Splitu tijekom ljetnih mjeseci, jer se radilo o groblju koje je veliko te je otvoren prostor.

**Autorski doprinosi:** Autorski doprinos Anite Fiket bazira se na provođenju anketnog istraživanja i pregleda literature te pisanju poglavlja *Uvod*, *Teorijski okvir*, *Povijest židovskih zajednica u Splitu i Dubrovniku*, *Svrha, cilj i metodologija istraživanja*, *Rasprava i Zaključak*. Autorski doprinos Vuka Tvrtka Opačića leži u definiranju metodologije i strukture istraživanja, statističkoj analizi i interpretaciji podataka dobivenih provedenim anketnim istraživanjem, te u pisanju poglavlja *Rezultati*, kao i u konačnom oblikovanju teksta.

**Zahvale:** Anketno istraživanje je provedeno u okviru doktorskog istraživanja na temu *Turističko-geografska valorizacija židovske baštine u Hrvatskoj*. Zahvaljujemo Židovskim općinama Split i Dubrovnik na susretljivosti i dopuštenju provođenja anketnog istraživanja.

**Izjava o dostupnosti podataka:** Podaci su dostupni na zahtjev autorima.

**Sukob interesa:** Autori izjavljuju da nema sukoba interesa.

is a lack of research on the profile of visitors to Jewish and Sephardic heritage in the scientific literature. The profile of visitors obtained from the research can be used to create new tourism products.

Another lack of the survey research is that it was not conducted simultaneously, because one person was conducting the field research, so it was technically impossible. The tourist season in Dubrovnik starts in May, and during the summer months, there are huge crowds. Before conducting the survey, the authors contacted the Jewish community and were told that from June to August, there is an extremely large crowd in the synagogue and museums, and the question of the possibility of conducting the survey was raised. Already at the end of May 2023, when the field research was conducted, it was crowded, and due to the lack of space in the museum, not all visitors could be asked if they were interested in taking the survey. On the other hand, the survey research could have been conducted in Split during the summer months, because it's a large cemetery and open-air space.

**Author Contributions:** Anita Fiket authorial contribution is based on conducting a survey and literature review, and writing the chapters *Introduction*, *Theoretical Framework*, *History of Jewish Communities in Split and Dubrovnik*, *Purpose, objectives and research methodology*, *Discussion*, and *Conclusion*. Vuk Tvrtko Opačić authorial contribution lies in defining the methodology and structure of the research, statistical analysis and interpretation of data obtained from the survey, and writing the *Results* chapter, as well as in the final formatting of the text.

**Acknowledgements:** The survey was conducted as part of a doctoral research project on the topic *Tourism and geographic valorisation of Jewish heritage in Croatia*. We would like to thank the Jewish communities of Split and Dubrovnik for their kindness and permission to conduct the survey.

**Data availability statement:** Data are available upon request to the author.

**Conflict of interest:** The author declare no conflict of interest.

## LITERATURA I IZVORI / BIBLIOGRAPHY AND SOURCES

- Blažević, I. (2003). *Turistička geografija Hrvatske*. Školska knjiga.
- Choluj, A., & Gawrecki, K. (2019). Jewish quarter in medieval Lorca (south-eastern Spain). *Turystyka Kulturowa*, 1, 107–122.
- Cohen, S. K. (2015). The guide with the tourist gaze: Jewish heritage travel to Poland. *Journal of Jewish Education*, 81(4), 377–397. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15244113.2015.1096125>
- Corsale, A. (2017). Jewish heritage tourism in Bucharest: Reality and visions. *The Geographical Journal*, 183(3), 261–271. <https://doi.org/10.1111/geoj.12211>
- Corsale, A. (2020). Issues and changes related to dissonant heritage: A case from Jewish and Polish heritage in the small towns of Western Ukraine. *Tourism Planning & Development*, 18(4), 479–487. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21568316.2020.1825521>
- Corsale, A., & Krakover, S. (2019). Cultural tourism between local and transnational identities: Jewish heritage in Syracuse, Italy. *Tourism Geographies*, 21(3), 460–481. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616688.2018.1497083>
- Corsale, A., & Vuytsyk, O. (2018). Jewish heritage tourism between memories and strategies: Different approaches from Lviv, Ukraine. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 21(5), 583–598. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2015.1103210>
- Dinis, A., & Krakover, S. (2016). Niche tourism in a small peripheral town: The case of Jewish heritage in Belmonte, Portugal. *Tourism Planning & Development*, 13(3), 310–332. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21568316.2015.1114014>
- Drotár, N., & Kozma, G. (2021). A new element of tourism in the north-eastern part of Hungary: Steps to attract Jewish pilgrims to the Tokaj-Hegyalja region. *Folia Geographica*, 63(1), 19–39.
- Dubrovačka razvojna agencija DURA. (2019). *Plan prilagodbe klimatskim promjenama grada Dubrovnika*. IRES Ekologija. [https://dura.hr/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/Climate-Adaptation-Plan\\_HRV\\_DURA\\_finalno.pdf](https://dura.hr/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/Climate-Adaptation-Plan_HRV_DURA_finalno.pdf)
- Duda-Seifert, M. (2016). The characteristics of cultural tourists who visit urban Jewish heritage centres: The case study of visitors to the White Stork Synagogue in Wrocław. *Tourism*, 26(2), 57–64. <https://doi.org/10.1515/tour-2016-0014>
- Duda-Seifert, M., & Kajdanek, K. (2021). The experience and satisfaction of visiting a Jewish heritage site in the context of cultural and Jewish heritage tourism. Evidence from Krakow, Poland. *Journal of Tourism and Cultural Change*, 20(3), 419–435. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14766825.2021.1956508>
- Dulska, A. K. (2021). Urban Jewish heritage and its (in)visibility: Perspectives from Navarre, Spain. *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, 16(5), 580–596. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1743873X.2020.1810693>
- Gaižutytė-Filipavičienė, Ž. (2020). Jewish heritage in the creative cities of Central and Eastern Europe: Tourism, technologies, and prosthetic memory. *Creativity Studies*, 13(1), 41–52. <https://doi.org/10.3846/cs.2020.6079>
- Gerber, J. S. (1992). *Jews of Spain: A history of the Sephardic experience*. The Free Press.
- Goldstein, S. (Ed.). (1988). *Židovi na tlu Jugoslavije: katalog izložbe*. Naša djeca.
- Graham, B., Ashworth, G. J., & Tunbridge, J. E. (2000). *A geography of heritage: Power, culture and economy*. Arnold.
- Gruber, R. E. (2002). *Virtually Jewish: Reinventing Jewish culture in Europe*. University of California Press.
- Haba, M., Dnistrianska, N., Ilnytska-Hykavchuk, H., Makar, O., & Senkiv, M. (2020). Jewish cultural heritage of the Lviv Oblast as a tourism resource. *Journal of Geology, Geography and Geoecology*, 29(3), 502–511. <https://doi.org/10.15421/112045>
- Institut za turizam. (2009). *TOMAS 2008: Kulturni turizam. Stavovi i potrošnja posjetitelja kulturnih atrakcija i događanja u Hrvatskoj*. <https://iztg.hr/hr/projekti/tomas-istrazivanja/>
- Institut za turizam. (2023). *TOMAS Hrvatska 2022./2023. Stavovi i potrošnja turista u Hrvatskoj*. <https://iztg.hr/hr/projekti/tomas-istrazivanja/>

iztg.hr/hr/projekti/tomas-istrazivanja/

- Isnart, C. (2023). Written remains: Materiality and the religious heritage complex of the Jewish Portuguese past. *Religions*, 14(1504). <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel14121504>
- Jacobs, J. (2008). *Houses of life: Jewish cemeteries of Europe*. Frances Lincoln.
- Jelinčić, D. A. (2008). *Abeceda kulturnog turizma*. Meandarmedia.
- Jimber del Río, J. A., Hernández-Rojas, R. D., Navajas-Romero, V., & Hidalgo-Fernández, A. (2020). The loyalty of tourism in synagogues: The special case of the synagogue of Córdoba. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(12), 4212. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17124212>
- Kečkemet, D., & Efron, Z. (1973). *Židovsko groblje u Splitu*. Židovska općina u Splitu.
- Koš, J. (1999). Alef bet židovstva: pogled u krugu židovske povijesti, religije i običaja. Self-published.
- Krakov, S. (2012). Coordinated marketing and dissemination of knowledge: Jewish heritage tourism in Serra da Estrela, Portugal. *Revista Turismo & Desenvolvimento*, 17/18, 11–16.
- Krakov, S. (2013). Generation of a tourism product: Jewish heritage tourism in Spain. *Enlightening Tourism: A Pathmaking Journal*, 3(2), 142–168.
- Krakov, S. (2017). A heritage site development model: Jewish heritage product formation in south-central Europe. *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, 12(1), 81–101. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1743873X.2016.1151430>
- Krakov, S. (2019, October). *Thessaloniki's Jewish heritage tourism product exposure on the internet* [Conference presentation]. 3rd International Scientific Conference: Tourism, Travel and Hospitality at Crossroads – The Way Ahead, Thessaloniki, Greece.
- Krakov, S., & Corsale, A. (2021). Sieving tourism destinations: Decision-making processes and destination choice implications. *Journal of Tourism, Heritage & Services Marketing*, 7(1), 33–43. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4518923>
- Miović, V. (2012). *Židovi Dubrovnika: šetnja kroz prostor i vrijeme od ranih dana do danas*. Tiskara Alfa-2.
- Mitsche, N., & Strielkowski, W. (2016). Tourism e-services and Jewish heritage: A case study of Prague. *European Journal of Tourism, Hospitality and Recreation*, 7(3), 203–211. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ejthr-2016-0019>
- Petrevska, B., Krakov, S., & Collins-Kreiner, N. (2018). Preserving cultural assets of others: Jewish heritage sites in Macedonian cities. *Tourism Geographies*, 20(3), 549–572. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616688.2017.1387811>
- Red de Juderías de España. (2024, January 10). *Caminos de Sefarad*. Red de Juderías de España. <https://redjuderias.org/>
- Rede de Judiarias de Portugal. (2024, January 11). *Rede de Judiarias de Portugal* [Portuguese Network of Jewish Quarters]. <https://www.redejudiariasportugal.com/index.php/en/>
- Richards, G. (1996). *Cultural tourism in Europe*. CAB International.
- Russo, A. P., & Romagosa, F. (2010). The network of Spanish Jewries: In praise of connecting and sharing heritage. *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, 5(2), 141–156. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17438730903576104>
- Sandri, O. (2013). City heritage tourism without heirs: A comparative study of Jewish-themed tourism in Krakow and Vilnius. *CyberGeo: European Journal of Geography*, (646). <https://cybergeog.revues.org/25934>
- Santos, N., Oliveira Moreira, C., & Silveira, L. (2024). Genealogy tourism and city tourism in Coimbra: Proposal for a Jewish culture route. *International Journal of Tourism Cities*, 10(1), 66–77. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJTC-05-2022-0121>
- Segal, J. L. (2005). *A field guide to visiting a Jewish cemetery: A spiritual journey to the past, present and future*. Jewish Cemetery Publishing.
- Skolnik, F. (Ed.). (2007). *Encyclopaedia Judaica*. Thomson Gale/Keter.
- Smith, M., & Zatori, A. (2015). Jewish culture and tourism in Budapest. In A. Diekmann & M. K. Smith (Eds.), *Ethnic and minority cultures as tourist attractions* (pp. 188–201). Channel View Publications.
- Soussi, H. (2020). Jewish heritage tourism in Morocco: Memories and visions. In D. Vanneste & W. Gruijthuijsen (Eds.), *Value of heritage for tourism: Proceedings of the 6th UNESCO UNITWIN Conference 2019*

- (pp. 261–270). University of Leuven.
- Timothy, D. J. (2021). *Cultural heritage and tourism: An introduction* (2nd ed.). Channel View Publications.
- Turistička zajednica grada Dubrovnika. (2025). *Izvješće o izvršenju programa rada s financijskim planom za 2024.* [https://tzdubrovnik.hr/user\\_files/novak/Izvješ%C4%87e%20o%20izvr%C5%A1enju%20programa%20rada%20s%20financijskim%20planom%20za%202024.%20godinu.pdf](https://tzdubrovnik.hr/user_files/novak/Izvješ%C4%87e%20o%20izvr%C5%A1enju%20programa%20rada%20s%20financijskim%20planom%20za%202024.%20godinu.pdf)
- Turistička zajednica Split. (2025). *Statistička analiza turističkog prometa na području grada Splita u 2024. godini.* <https://visitsplit.com/clients/1/multimedia/6697rmdmcdnmvr0.pdf>
- Zammit, V. (2020). Jewish tourism to Malta: A nostalgic pilgrimage? *International Journal of Religious Tourism and Pilgrimage*, 8(6). <https://doi.org/10.21427/dsse-zg52>