

Croatian Islands: the Role of Demographic Features in Tourism Development

Ivo Nejašmić*

The paper deals with the role of modern demographic features in the island tourism development. The population age structure is the main limiting factor of development on the majority of islands. That cannot be said for the educational structure, at least not in a significant measure, but in a part of the islands it undoubtedly represents the brake to a more powerful development of modern tourism. The conclusion is that on the majority of islands the human resource is one of the weaker points in the possible application of the "new tourism" conception.

Key words: Croatian islands, demographic features, educational structure of population, tourism development

Hrvatsko otočje: uloga demografskih značajki u razvitku turizma

U radu se razmatra uloga suvremenih demografskih značajki u razvitku otočnog turizma. Kod većine otoka sastav stanovništva po dobi glavni je ograničavajući čimbenik razvitka. Obrazovni sastav to nije u značajnijoj mjeri, ali je nedvojbeno da u dijelu otočja predstavlja kočnicu snažnijem razvitku suvremenog turizma. Zaključuje se da je na većini otoka ljudski resurs jedna od slabijih točaka u mogućoj primjeni koncepta "novog turizma".

Ključne riječi: hrvatsko otočje, demografske značajke, obrazovni sastav stanovništva, razvitak turizma

INTRODUCTORY CONSIDERATIONS

The Croatian islands include almost all islands of the eastern Adriatic coast. According to largeness they represent the second Mediterranean islands. In the Croatian part of the Adriatic there are all together 1,185 islands, islets, cliffs and reefs (718 islands and islets, 389 cliffs and 78 reefs) (Nacionalni program..., 1997). It makes 96.1 percent of the total number of islands, cliffs and reefs on the Adriatic Sea, and out of the total length of the island coasts, the Croatian islands account for 97.2 percent. It is important to emphasize that from the demographic point of view the Adriatic Sea is also represented by the Croatian islands; the only other populated islands are Tremiti in the Italian part of the Adriatic. The area of the islands figures out about 3,300 sq km, which makes 5.8 percent of the continental part of the Croatian state territory. How-

* Dr. sc., izv. prof., Učiteljska akademija, Savska cesta 77., 10.000 Zagreb, Hrvatska / Croatia

ever, we must bear in mind that the coastal sea is determined by the islands (respectively, the territorial sea as its part); without them it would be for about two thirds smaller (the coastal sea covers 31,421 sq km).

The island population accounts for 2.6 percent of the total population of Croatia (the census of 1991). The population density (38.3 inhabitants on 1 sq km in 1991) is smaller than in other Mediterranean groups of islands. On 67 islands there is at least one settlement, and we could consider them populated in wider sense. However, many island settlements have become deserted, so there are 50 permanently inhabited islands. A group of settlements consists of 303 permanent settlements (the census of 1991), with 417 inhabitants on an average. There are no larger urban settlements on the islands. Mali Lošinj is the only settlement with more than 5,000 inhabitants (6,566). At the same time the islands belong to ethnically the most homogenous regions of the Republic of Croatia; in 1991 92.4 percent of population declared themselves Croats.

The islands represent a valuable and very delicate natural-geographic, economic and social environment. When we speak about the Croatian islands, we must point out that there we have a special combination of development features, ambiance and mentality, i. e. specific harmony of natural and cultural scenery. Consequently, analyzing development strategy, it is necessary to respect singularities of particular island groups and islands.

Here, we shall also point at certain doubt dealing with general development of our islands and demographic features. Namely, it is doubtful whether population ought to follow development, or quite opposite: development ought to be conformed to population. The opinion according to which the pressure of development beyond the needs of the local population is unacceptable, is more present. In other words, every development on the islands greater than necessary is questionable, because of pressure on usually very delicate natural resources, and because of the "import" of population (labour) on the islands. It is believed that "...every pressure of the island development beyond the needs of the local population can diminish future advantages" (I. Šimunović, 1994:464). That means that the island economy, tourism in this particular case, should not be treated (nor forced) as a salutary solution for national economy. It must remain in the limits of sustainable development, which means "...optimazing benefits if it does not expose to danger possible potentials in change for simillar benefits in future" (R. K. Turner, 1989:96). Accordingly when we speak about the islands, it is necessary to find a balance which will respect the material riches of the population without destroying the basis on which that riches is lying.

As tourism (besides agriculture) represents the base of the island development, the aim of this paper is to examine the role of contemporary demographic features in development of the island tourism. In Croatian scientific literature this question has not been contemplated in more detail, although it was emphasized that a difficult demographic condition of the majority of islands (especially of the smaller ones), besides infrastructure and traffic problems, seriously confines development of the islands (M. Montana, 1987). The purpose of the paper is to deepen cognition about human resource as a factor to which every strategy of the Croatian islands development must pay attention.

THE FEATURES OF THE ISLAND TOURISM

The Adriatic Sea is deeply drawn into the European continent. That fact is of special traffic importance and an essential factor in tourism valorization of the Croatian islands. Proportional nearness of the Central and North-west European countries, as the most important tourist generating region in the world, is especially significant (N. Stražičić, 1987).

With tourism development economizing philosophy is being changed fundamentally, as well as the way of life on the islands, i. e. the whole island region becomes the main development resource. We can say that the regions where every ambience becomes resource as it does on the islands, are very rare (I. Šimunović, 1994). Undoubtedly, tourism development opens to the island population new perspectives of life and work, before all, employment beyond households. A great economic value of tourism is in its ability of valuing material and cultural goods which do not have characteristics of merchandise, such as: sea, coast, climate, geographic position, tradition, cultural-historical monuments etc.; that means, just those values which the islands have in plenty (M. Montana, 1987).

Tourism development significantly contributed to revitalization of the coastal island zone, but we must point at danger of a more emphasized monocultural economic development. That is to say, every greater disarrangement on the tourist market (recession, wars and sim.) provokes a hard economic crisis, which reflects itself more intensively on the smaller island communities than on the neighbouring coastal area (V. Mikačić, 1994). Because of the well known reasons, one-sided orientation to tourism provoked a hard economic crisis in the "tourist islands and settlements" during the 1990s. This stimulated returning to agriculture (olive-trees, sheep and sim.) in many island regions (J. Defilippis, 1997).

Undoubtedly, a successful model of existence on the islands ought to be based on the conception of "a mixed economy". That means that tourism should be only a part of the total island economy and living, although we speak about an important economic branch with the development of which the whole economy makes progress, and which stimulates the sociocultural and demographic development of the islands. Consequently, not calling in question the fundamental role of tourism in the whole development "... there is an eternal economic rule for the islands - a wide fan of activities ought to be developed there with agriculture always in the background" (I. Šimunović, 1994).

The beginnings of the island tourism date from the remote half of the last century, but a greater development started towards the end of the 1970s by establishment of numerous car ferry lines, road network and other advantages on the islands. By construction of fundamental infrastructure (electricity, waterworks, roads, telecommunications, etc.) the islands became very attractive for summer holidays. Nowadays, 120 settlements or 40 percent of their total number, register tourist arrivals (V. Mikačić, Z. Pepeonik, 1997). There are three national parks on the islands (the Brioni Islands, the Kornati Islands, Mljet), a natural park Telaščica, Modra špilja (Blue cave) on Biševo and a series of other attractive localities.

The conception of tourism development has for a long time been connected only with natural attractiveness and pitiless exploitation of natural resources, primarily of

small bays, on the one hand, and with construction of huge hotels with a large number of the employed, on the other.¹ Nowadays, it is quite clear that the approach to tourism development must be changed because of: a) general tourism trends in the world,² b) a small number of the active island population (on the majority of islands), and c) the fact that an area is a given category which could not be "spent at pleasure". The aforementioned approach must lie on a responsible individual (family) "... and on the help which he could be offered in order to become richer or rich, just him, not an abstract hotel-manager" (V. Skračić, 1994).

Generally, the island economy depends on tourism more than the economy on the coast. The share of the private and public sector of catering and tourism in the social product of 1991 in the island municipalities amounted to 26 percent, and on the coast 12 percent; in 1991, in the island municipalities the public sector of catering and tourism accounted for 27 percent of the total number of the employed, and on the coast it accounted for only 9 percent (the share of the employed in this branch was even greater because the private sector was not expressed) (V. Mikačić, 1994). The tourism development of the Croatian islands is even better illustrated by the corresponding analytic indicators. They confirm a great dependence of the islands upon the tourist-catering activity (tab. 1)³.

Tab. 1 Indicators of the tourism development of the Croatian islands in 1989

Region	Population	Tourists	Overnight stays	Beds	Length of stay	Coef. of functional.	Days of full capacity	Intensity of tourist flow
Islands	123,295	1,617,852	14,506,593	224,480	8.9	185.3	64.6	1,335.4
Coast	1,137,795	5,871,158	43,032,856	657,719	7.3	58.8	65.4	525.3
Littoral	1,261,090	7,489,010	57,539,449	882,199	7.7	71.2	65.2	604.5
Croatia	4,784,265	9,669,804	61,848,887	922,845	6.4	19.4	67.0	203.7

Note: The indicators have been calculated on the basis of the estimated number of inhabitants for 1989.

- 1) Coefficient of functionality = number of beds (accommodation units) / number of inhabitants x 100
- 2) Utilization of capacities (days of full capacity) = number of overnight stays / number of beds
- 3) Intensity of tourist flow = number of tourists / number of inhabitants x 100

Source: Promet turista u primorskim mjestima (The Tourist Flow in Littoral Settlements), RZS SRH, Zagreb, 1989 (according to V. Mikačić, 1994).

The second dwellings make a special form of accommodation capacities. In 1991 39.352 of them were listed, which made 43.1 percent of the total housing found of the islands; the main part of these capacities is well supplied for possible offering of the tourism services (I. Kunst, 1997).

We must point out the fact that in the last decade the island region of Croatia has experienced an exceptionally rapid development of the nautical offer. According to the data from 1992 there is 40 percent of the Croatian nautical tourism offer (according to the number of berths) on the islands, and about 50 percent of the whole traffic of the floating vessels using such berths (V. Mikačić, 1994).

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE CROATIAN ISLANDS

The data of demographic statistics and research results show that some retrograde processes take place on the islands.

The point in question is a strong depopulation, the process begun at the beginning of the 20th century and got into full swing after the World War II (I. Lajić, 1992). Even a superficial observer can easily notice that a so called depopulation landscape prevails in the island region. It is characterized by: the remains of the formerly cultivated ground (pine and macchia have covered the main part of the cultivable ground), the houses scarcely resisting time, untidy private plots, demolished fences - all signs of "the extinguishing fire-place" (I. Nejašmić, 1991a). The Croatian islands (together with the hilly-mountainous regions), for decades exposed to losing of population, are, nowadays, most weakly populated area of Croatia. In 1880 5.58 percent of the total population of Croatia lived in that region, while in 1991 the corresponding share was for a half smaller (2.64 percent) (tab. 2). We must point out that during the 1981-1991 period the population number growth of 10.2 percent was registered; if we compare only "population in the country", we can see that the growth was third the size (3.1 percent).⁴ The main part of the total population growth in the last period between the censuses relates to the group of large Kvarner islands; other islands, especially the smaller ones and those more apart from the continent further register the loss of population (I. Nejašmić, 1991b).

Tab. 2 Trends of the population number of the Croatian islands 1948-1991

Year (census)	Number of inhabitants	Index 1880=100.0	Chain index	Index 1948=100.0	Average annual intercensus rate of change (in percent)	Share (percent) in population of Croatia
1880	139 884	100.0	-	-	-	5.58
1910	174 652	124.9	124.9	-	0.74	5.05
1921	174 713	124.9	100.0	-	0.00	5.07
1931	166 479	119.0	95.3	-	-0.48	4.40
1948	153 173	109.5	92.0	100.0	-0.49	4.05
1953	151 331	108.2	98.9	98.9	-0.24	3.84
1961	140 704	100.6	92.9	91.9	-0.91	3.38
1971	128 357	91.8	91.2	83.8	-0.92	2.90
1981 (A)*	114 782	82.1	89.4	74.9	-1.12	2.49
1981 (B)	110 727	79.2
1991 (A)	126 447	90.4	110.2	81.1	0.97	2.64
1991 (B)	114 178	81.6	103.1	74.3	0.47	...

* The data comprise the total enrolled population (A), respectively only "population in the country" (B), then without "foreigners" (see the note 4)

Source: Calculated according to the data for settlements; for the 1880-1971 period according to Korenčić, M., 1979: *Naselja i stanovništvo SR Hrvatske 1957.-1971.*, JAZU, Zagreb (Djela JAZU, knj. 54); for 1981 and 1991 according to the documentations of censuses

Recapitulating the trends of the island population we can conclude that all natural population growth and a part of the "basic" population were lost in a century period. Besides the numerical decrease of the population, disarrangements in its structure are particularly destructive (age, sex and sim.), which will strongly influence the future trends of the island population.

The process of demographic emptying spread so quickly that already in the 1960s it could be said that the islands, especially the smaller ones, died out demographically (M. Friganović, 1962). Emigration, as a specific derivative of the socioeconomic lagging of the island region, is the main factor of the unfavourable demographic processes and circumstances (I. Lajić, 1989). Departure took over the features of total exodus, particularly in the environments which had not joined the tourism economy in time.

According to the results of the relevant analyses, some 70 settlements or a fourth of the island group of settlements (284 settlements in 1981) will die out in the foreseeable future, of course, if the basic demographic factors remain unchangeable (Nejašmić, 1991a). These settlements will "die" as agglomerations of permanent inhabitants and become mere geographic notions.

The fact that emigration is the main factor of depopulation points itself at the lopped state of the population age structure and at a certain imbalance according to sex. It comprehends narrowing of the fertile groups, decline of the vital potential and decrease of the bioreproductive power. General population trends of the majority of islands are more and more determined by demographic aging, and a high (and increasing) death-rate can be hardly compensated by birth-rate, even if it increases a bit (A. Wertheimer-Baletić, 1979).

As to the sex structure of the island population, there is a certain imbalance in the fertile contingent. According to the census of 1991, there is a slight excess of women (the relation of women and men is 102.3 : 100) in the younger fertile group (20-29 years of age), and a perceptible lack of women (the relation of women and men is 87.2 : 100) in the older fertile group (40-49 years of age) (I. Nejašmić, 1992). The demonstrated sex imbalance in the most vital age groups (the cohort 40-49 was the same some 20 years ago) necessarily contributes to further depopulation. Namely, it provokes a compulsory celibacy and stimulates definitive departure in pursuit of "matrimonial happiness", and it leads, by chain reaction (reduced number of marriages), to disarrangement in bioreproduction.

The island population, which in 1953, according to all relevant indicators, had already been caught by the aging process, grew appreciably old by 1991, respectively, the age structure changed unfavourably. In 1991 the share of the young age groups (0-19 years of age) in the island population figured out 26.5 percent, the share of mature age groups (20-59 years of age) 55.9 percent, and that of the elderly ones (60 and more years) 17.6 percent; (I. Nejašmić, 1992).

In 1991 the relation of the young (0-19 years of age) and the elderly (60 and more years of age) inhabitants was 100:93.1. As the critical relation is 100:40, because then the aging process of population begins, the presented fact clearly shows the advanced demographic aging of the island population. The medial age (Mx) amounts to 38.2 years (in 1953 it was 29.8) (I. Nejašmić, 1992). The circumstances are somewhat more favourable on the Kvarner Islands, Middle Dalmatian and South Dalmatian Islands, where the situation is similar to the average, while the North Dalmatian Islands have

the worst age structure of population. The islands with the worst age structure of population can be found in the North Dalmatian Islands in the group of small islands, sooner in the outer archipelago than in the inner one.

The shares of the three characteristic age groups in 1991 - "children" (0-14 years of age) accounted for 18.8 percent, "parents" (15-49 years) for 45.6 percent, and "patriarchs" (50 and more years) accounted for 35.6 percent - show that the island population belongs to the regressive (old, constrictive) type of the age pyramid. We must point out that the share of "patriarchs" is almost twice larger than the share of "children"! The lopped structure is reflected in the lopsided pyramid, which is that geometrical solid no more.

Since there is an extended aging process on the islands, evaluation must be conformed to that fact, and the aging degree of the island population standardized. Instead of the standardization based on combination of shares of the "young" and "elderly", every parameter was separately ranked, and the ranking indicator of demographic age of the island population gained by summing up those values.⁵ The standardization based on the ranking value has seven types of the age structure, i. e. seven age rates with a corresponding descriptive feature added to each of them. The total island population was ranked with 72.5 points, which means that in 1991 it belonged to the 4th type - green old age. To tell the truth, it was the early phase of the 4th type (in other words, the island population had only "made a step" towards the green old age). On 43 islands (there are totally 50, but for some of them the aging index has not been calculated because of the small number of inhabitants) there is no population in the type 1 (on the threshold of aging), the population of one island is in the type 2 (aging), of ten islands in the type 3 (old age), of six in the type 4 (green old age), of seven in the type 5 (very green old age), of nine in the type 6 (markedly green old age) and even the population of ten islands is in the type 7 (extremely green old age). The most favourable condition (better to say a less bad one) of the population age structure is on larger islands and on those closer to the towns on the coast (Lošinj, Krapanj, Čiovo, Rab, Brač...) In conformity with that, the worst situation (the least value of the ranking indicator) is on the small islands (on Drvenik Mali 0.0; it is followed by Kaprije, Zverinac, Rivanj, Molat...) (I. Nejašmić, 1992).

Accordingly, when we speak about the island demographic problems, we must pay attention not only to mere decrease of the population number, but, before all, to the age-sex structure of the present-day population. It has turned out that the aging degree is such that it threatens with even worse circumstances and complete population emptying of particular islands.

The presented retrograde processes say that in the observed region we must expect unfavourable fertility, respectively (bio) reproduction. The papers confirm that and point at certain differences among the island groups.

The general (female) fertility rate of the island population in two late intercensuses (1971-1991) registers the up-down trends. After a short growth of the rate at the beginning of the 1980s (57.6 pro mille), caused by the "echo effect" (a strong generation of women born in the postwar compensation period), it decreased significantly in the decade 1981-1991. In 1991 it amounted to 47.3 pro mille and practically became equal with that of 1971 (it amounted to 47.4 pro mille) (I. Nejašmić, 1997). Comparison with the total Croatian population (in 1971 - 53.7 pro mille; in 1981 - 58.9 pro mille; in 1991 -

48.8 pro mille) shows identity of the fertility rate trends, that means a significant decrease in the last decade. We notice that in 1991 the fertility rate of the island population was only slightly lower than that of the total population, which is a bit unexpectedly. That means that in Croatia there are regions where fertility is even less favourable than on the islands (cf. I. Nejašmić, 1996). On the islands the lowest fertility rate was registered in the North Dalmatian island group (41.7 pro mille in 1991), and the highest one in the South Dalmatian (51.6) and Kvarner island groups (50.0).

The net reproduction rate as the indicator of the female population renewal has been for decade under the marginal level of simple reproduction (which figures out 1.0). In 1991 the net rate amounted to only 0.79 and was almost identical to that for Croatia (0.80) (I. Nejašmić, 1997). That means that the female population (the reproduction bearer) has not been renewed for a longer time, i. e. there is a reproduction depopulation. The net reproduction rate can also be considered (with a certain reserve) the indicator of the future changes of the total population number (expressed in percent which shows how much the rate is lower or higher than 1.0). In a concrete case the net rate of 0.79 means that the island population number will decrease for 21 percent in one generation period (about 30 years, then, till 2020) under the condition that the fertility rates remain unchanged and without migration component ("closed population"). In other words, only as the consequence of reproduction depopulation. In 1991 all island groups (see the note 6) had the net reproduction rate considerably under the level which insures simple reproduction; the lowest level is in the North Dalmatian islands (0.70).

The total fertility rate (TFR'), as one of the best indicators of reproduction registers a significant decrease in the period 1981-1991. Evidently, there was an acceleration of the long lasting unfavourable trends in the 1990s. In 1991 TFR' for all islands amounted to 1.67 (I. Nejašmić, 1997). And in 1990, the total fertility rate in Croatia amounted to 1.69 and in 1994 it decreased to 1.50 (I. Nejašmić, 1996). The total fertility rate (we can say, the average number of children in a family) moves from 1.46 in the North Dalmatian island group to 1.81 in the South Dalmatian one. All island groups register the rates under the critical value (2.15) which insures (theoretically) a simple reproduction, consequently, the generation renewal is doubtful. As to the largeness of the islands and bioreproductional features, a certain differentiation is present. Indeed, on the basis of the rough division into three groups of islands (large, medium and small) we cannot speak about the functional connection between the island largeness and the trends of the population reproduction rate. The worst situation is in the small island groups (TFR' only 1.42 or 85% of the all islands value). However, neither the population of the large islands insures a simple renewal: we can only say that the situation is less bad (TFR' = 1.77). In distinction from largeness which, evidently, influences demographic processes (how much should be examined in more detail), the islands position expressed on the level of rough division (inner and outer) does not show more perceptible differences of the reproduction indicators (TFR' inner /1.67/, outer /1.69/).

We can conclude that the population reproduction on the Croatian islands is considerably under the level which insures a simple renewal, and that the unfavourable trends were accelerated during the last intercensus period. Long unfavourable demographic processes (emigration, depopulation, demographic aging) and general decrease of fertility have lead to decline of (bio) reproductive power and vital potential. Repro-

ductive and generation depopulation are happening. The population of the North Dalmatian islands and smaller islands (without regard to which island group they belong) have the worst (bio) reproductive features.

EDUCATIONAL STRUCTURE OF THE ISLAND POPULATION

Educational structure is one of the most important features of population, especially from the point of view of potential economic development. Among the island population at the age of 15 or more there is more than a half persons with unfinished or only elementary school (together 52.6%). The share of the persons with secondary education is significant (35.6%), while the share of those with higher and university qualification (7.1%) is close to the corresponding share on the national level (tab. 3).

Tab. 3 The population of the Croatian islands at the age of 15 and more according to education and literacy in 1991

Islands	Total	Without school qualifi. or 1-3 classes of El. s.	4-7 classes of Elem. sch.	Elementary education	Secondary education	Higher education	University education	Unknown	Illiterates
KVARNER	100.0	3.1	17.6	25.2	43.0	4.6	4.0	1.2	1.3
NORTH DALMATIAN	100.0	8.5	27.7	21.3	28.3	2.9	2.3	6.1	2.9
MIDDLE DALMATIAN	100.0	4.8	26.5	23.4	34.7	3.5	3.5	1.7	1.9
SOUTH DALMATIAN	100.0	4.9	22.8	24.5	36.8	4.5	3.5	1.1	1.9
LARGE	100.0	4.3	23.7	24.8	36.5	3.9	3.7	1.6	1.5
MEDIUM	100.0	5.8	22.1	22.2	36.8	3.8	3.1	4.3	1.9
SMALL	100.0	8.7	26.5	21.2	30.0	3.3	2.5	3.8	4.0
INNER (coastal)	100.0	5.8	24.2	22.5	35.6	3.5	3.1	3.0	2.3
OUTER	100.0	4.7	23.0	24.9	35.7	4.2	3.6	2.3	1.6
ISLANDS WITH ONE SETTLEMENT	100.0	9.5	26.1	22.9	27.0	2.5	2.1	5.0	4.9
ISLANDS TOTALLY	100.0	5.4	23.7	23.5	35.6	3.8	3.3	2.7	2.2
CROATIA	100.0	12.0	24.6	24.2	29.8	3.7	4.2	1.5	4.8

Source: Calculated according to *Dokumentacija 884*, DZS, Zagreb.

Comparison with the year 1981 (there were 63.2% persons with unfinished and finished elementary school, and only 3.9% with higher and university qualification) clearly shows the growth of the population educational level. Although this is not an island particularity but a general manifestation, the redoubling of the share of the population with higher and university professional qualification points at possible

particularities. In the intercensus period there was, undoubtedly, a real growth of the number of the persons with higher and university professional qualification, but it is also sure that a part of that growth is a merit of a larger volume of the "foreign contingent" with a relatively high share of the persons with higher and university qualification.⁷

The presented data show that, according to the characteristic "school qualification", the island population does not differ essentially from the total population of Croatia. However, in some categories the situation is markedly better than in the total population (e. g. secondary education), and there are also half less illiterates. As to higher and university education, difference is in appearance insignificant (the islands 7.1% : Croatia 7.9%), but, with regard to the exposed facts about the "foreign contingent" difference is most likely somewhat larger (we suppose, the islands 6.9% : Croatia 7.9%).

We notice that there are perceptible differences of educational structure of population among particular island groups. The lowest educational level of population is on the North Dalmatian islands, and the highest one is on the Kvarner group of islands (it shows connection between the age and educational structure). As to the largeness of the islands, the weakest educational structure is, as we could expect, in the groups of small islands. There is no perceptible difference between the outer and inner islands, while in the group of islands with one settlement (and they are, chiefly, the smallest islands) the educational structure of population is significantly weaker than on all islands.

On the basis of the presented data and comparisons with general population, we can say that the educational structure of the island population is relatively good. Here the speech is about the formal structure, and the second question is how many islanders have a professional qualification relevant for tourism.⁸ According to the partial data and shallow cognitions, there is insufficiency of the "tourist professional staff" on the islands.

INFLUENCE OF THE PRESENTED STRUCTURE FEATURES OF THE POPULATION ON TOURISM DEVELOPMENT

Modern comprehension of tourism and the trends of the world demand say that the strategy and model of the tourism offer should be organized to point out: a) the offer of contrasts and diversity, b) the offer of tourism identity and c) the offer of a humanized sojourn (M. Montana, 1994). Simultaneously, some elements should be taken into consideration: the choice of tourism establishments and their maximal burden, respectively, the level of the carrying capacity of each island and, especially, its protection. In order to exist at all on the tourist market, the Croatian islands must constantly be "in tendency" of new trends and intrude on the market with stronger marketing. We must emphasize that the Croatian islands have a significantly lower level of the tourism saturation than the majority of destinations in the competitive Mediterranean countries. Therefore, this is one of the most promising regions for application of new models of tourism development, certainly, if the following cognition is respected: "...the proper dose of tourism is a medicine, and the overdose is poison for the island region and island population" (I. Kunst, 1997).

There are already certain market conditions for application of the described development model, and some standards of economic politics can also be conformed to it. Similarly, general conditions of infrastructure and traffic accessibility can be improved. However, a decisive assumption, which is the most difficult to be influenced on, is a sufficient number of capable and educated people. Bearing in mind the presented facts, we can conclude that the model of "new tourism" will not be able to be well applied on all islands, especially on those with very weak demographic potential.

We have established that the main demographic processes on the Croatian islands are depopulation and population aging. It is known that in the population, in which the elderly generations prevail, there is decrease of economic activities, and social and cultural life is dying.⁹ The elderly generation is inert by nature and mainly not interested in modern changes of the way of life and management (doing business); on the other hand, engaging in tourism claims much sense for modern trends. Besides, we must bear in mind the fact that, in most of cases, the elderly generation is a formal and real owner-possessor of immovables on the island (if the ownerspossessors are not, formally, their dead, emigrated ancestors).

We can conclude that, on the majority of islands, the population structure according to age is the main limiting factor of tourism development. The educational structure of the island population is not so limiting, but on some islands it also represents an obstruction to a stronger development, chiefly on those where old and not numerous population prevails.

CONCLUSION

We have come to the conclusion that dynamic, and especially structural demographic features of the island population represent a limiting factor of modern tourism development. On the majority of islands the human resource is one of the weaker items in the possible application of the conception of "new tourism". Among other things, the obtained findings show, that, while forming the strategy of the Croatian islands development, we must take into account the real demographic situation and leave the planning based on wishes and unreal "projections".

NOTES

- 1 So the establishment of the "tourist settlements" on Dugi otok (20,000 beds in Soline and 3,000 ones in Cušćica) was previously suggested.
- 2 The new market researches warn to the criteria which the potential tourists take into account while choosing destination, the most prominent are: natural attractiveness, cleanliness, number of sunny days, pleasant atmosphere, healthy climate, peace and quietness (little traffic), typical ambiance (attractions), possibility of bathing, high ecological consciousness in the settlement, the price of accommodation, good offer of entertaining and sport contents, etc.; in conformity with that we come upon the notion "new tourism" with increasing frequency today (I. Kunst, 1997).
- 3 The fact that the data of 1989 - the last year of normal tourist business in Croatia, have been used, does not diminish essentially the relevance of the conclusions.
- 4 According to the same methodology, the censuses of 1981 and 1991 included the contingent of "the persons on the temporary work abroad and the members of the families who live with them" ("foreigners"). However, the census of 1991 registered a markedly larger number of "foreigners" (this contingent of

population on the islands is made by 12,269 persons) than the census of 1981 (totally 4,055). On the level of particular settlements and islands differences are even larger (e. g. in 1981 the island Olib had 3 "foreigners", and in 1991 even 546). Since there was no enormous migration abroad (on the contrary, emigration was weaker than during the previous decades), it is obvious that here we have a larger volume of "foreigners" (the number of the inhabitants is partly increased because of "transformation" of the week-enders to the permanent inhabitants). As in the case of the islands and littoral we speak mainly about "overseas foreigners" (cf. Mikačić, V., 1978), a certain growth of the population number partly fogs the real situation and represents a revitalization "on the paper".

- 5 The share of the young in the population is evaluated by 0.0-30.0 points, that means a larger share of the young is evaluated by a larger number of points. The share of the old is evaluated by 0.0-70.0 points, but in the way that a larger share of the old gets a smaller number of points (then conversely of evaluating the share of the young). Since a larger share of the young and a smaller share of the old brings a larger final number of points, that means that the population with a larger number of points has a better age structure (cf. I. Nejašmić, 1992).
- 6 The populated Croatian islands have been classified into four island groups:
 - a) The Kvarner Islands: Krk, Cres, Lošinj, Rab and a group of smaller islands;
 - b) The North Dalmatian Islands: the island Pag has also been classified into this group (together with the settlement Lun which previously belonged to the municipality Rab), although, according to the classic regionalization, it is a part of the Kvarner Islands (cf. Rubčić, I., 1952); consequently, this island group includes the islands from Silba to Krapanj.
 - c) The Middle Dalmatian Islands: from Drvenik Mali to Hvar and Vis.
 - d) The South Dalmatian Islands: from Sušac to Koločep.

The islands have also been classified into some groups which were supposed to express different values of the observed demographic features. They are:

- a) Large islands (larger than 100 sq km): Krk, Cres, Brač, Hvar, Pag, Korčula and Dugi otok. Medium islands (50-100 sq km): Mljet, Vis, Rab, Lošinj, Pašman, Šolta and Ugljan; Small islands (smaller than 50 sq km): all other populated islands and islets.
- b) Inner (coastal) islands: Krk, Rab, Pag, Vir, Ugljan, Pašman, Vrgada, Murter, Prvić (near Šibenik), Zlarin, Krapanj, Drvenik Mali, Drvenik Veli, Čiovo, Šolta, Brač, Šipan, Koločep and Lopud; Outer islands: all other populated islands.
- 7 The example of the island Olib illustrates it best. In 1991 there were 546 "persons on the temporary work abroad..." ("foreigners") out of totally 714 inhabitants; therefore, it is not queer that in the total island population there were even 51 persons with higher or university professional qualification. If the data about school qualification of "the population in the country" (for 168 of them) were available, we are sure that among the real inhabitants of Olib we should enumerate scarcely several persons with higher or university professional qualification. This "artificial" growth of the educational level (and of the population number as well) is not so significant on the level of the whole islands (although it fogs the real state), but it essentially influences the situation on particular islands or island groups (e. g. "small islands" and "outer islands" to which Olib belongs).
- 8 The secondary education system should be conformed to the specific needs, i. e. children should be educated for double professions (activities), e. g. waiter - electrician or agricultural technician - receptionist. A "polyvalent" islander would more easily overcome misfortunes of the short tourist season. It would enable greater and better employment of the professional staff.
- 9 H. Mendras (1986: 205) writes about that: "In the society where the percentage of the old is too large, it is, obviously, difficult to establish a satisfactory and balanced social life. Moreover, aging can be considered to have repercussions on mentality, on the level of optimism and on the population business spirit".

REFERENCES

- Defilippis, J., 1997.: Koncept i mogućnosti razvitka otočne poljoprivrede, Sociologija sela, 1-4, 1-10.
 Friganović, M., 1962.: Suvremeni geografski problemi naših otoka, Geografski horizont, 1-2, 30-41.
 Kunst, I., 1997.: Turizam - sektorska studija, u: Nacionalni program razvitka otoka (ur. Nenad Starčević et al), 1997., Ministarstvo razvitka i obnove, Zagreb, 127-158.
 Lajić, I., 1989.: Utjecaj društveno-ekonomskih promjena na iseljavanje s dalmatinskih otoka u 19. i prvoj polovini 20. stoljeća, Migracijske teme, 4, 307-324.

- Lajić, I., 1992.: Stanovništvo dalmatinskih otoka: povijesne i suvremene značajke depopulacije, Consilium i Institut za migracije i narodnosti, Zagreb.
- Mendras, H., 1986.: Seljačka društva: elementi za jednu teoriju seljaštva, Globus, Zagreb.
- Mikačić, V., 1978.: Regionalni aspekt poslijeratnog iseljavanja iz SR Hrvatske u prekomorske zemlje, Centar za istraživanje migracija, Zagreb (Teme o iseljeništvu, sv. 8).
- Mikačić, V., Pepeonik, Z., 1996.: The Importance of Island Tourism to the Foreign Tourist Turnover of Croatia, in: Conditions of the Foreign Tourism Development in Central and Eastern Europe, Department of Regional and Tourism Geography Wrocław University, Wrocław.
- Montana, M., 1987.: Društveno-ekonomski razvoj jadranskih otoka, Pomorski zbornik, knj. 25, 75-100.
- Nacionalni program razvitka otoka (ur. Nenad Starčević et al), 1997., Ministarstvo razvitka i obnove, Zagreb.
- Nejašmić, I., 1991a.: Depopulacija u Hrvatskoj: korijeni, stanje, izgledi, Globus (etc.), Zagreb.
- Nejašmić, I., 1991b.: Depopulacija istočnojadranskih otoka i izumiranje kao moguća demografska perspektiva, Migracijske teme, 1, 77-99.
- Nejašmić, I., 1992.: Promjene u dobnospolnom sastavu stanovništva istočnojadranskog otočja (1953-1991), Acta Geographica Croatica, 27, 15-34.
- Nejašmić, I., 1996.: Regional Characteristics of Population Reproduction in the Republic of Croatia, Geografski glasnik, 58, Zagreb.
- Nejašmić, I., 1997.: Suvremene značajke (bio)reprodukcije stanovništva hrvatskog otočja, Migracijske teme, 1-2, 71-83.
- Rubić, I., 1952.: Naši otoci na Jadranu, Split.
- Skračić, V., 1994.: Zadarski otoci - natuknice za izradu programa revitalizacije, Društvena istraživanja, 4-5, 485-501.
- Stražičić, N., 1987.: Prirodno-geografske značajke kao poticajni i ograničavajući faktori razvoja jadranskih otoka, Pomorski zbornik, knj. 25, 39-55.
- Šimunović, I., 1994.: Otoci u svjetlu socio-ekonomskih kretanja, Društvena istraživanja, 4-5, 451-466.
- Turner, R. K., 1998.: Sustainable Environmental Management, Principles and Practice, Westview Press Boulder, Colorado.
- Wertheimer-Baletić, A., 1979.: Demografske značajke jednog otočnog depopulacijskog područja: primjer općine Cres-Lošinj, Ekonomski pregled, 1-2, 35-53.

SAŽETAK

Hrvatsko otočje: uloga demografskih značajki u razvitku turizma

by

Ivo Nejašmić

Hrvatsko otočje obuhvaća gotovo sve otoke istočne obale Jadrana, čineći drugo po veličini otočje Sredozemlja. Ukupno je u hrvatskom dijelu Jadrana 1.185 otoka, otočića, hridi i grebena. Otočno stanovništvo čini 2,6% ukupne populacije Hrvatske (popis 1991.). Gustoća naseljenosti (38,3 stanovnika na km² 1991. godine) niža je nego u ostalim sredozemnim otočnim skupinama. Stalno je naseljeno 50 otoka; naseljeni skup čine 303 stalna naselja (popis 1991.), u prosjeku s 417 stanovnika.

Hrvatsko otočje jedinstveni je sklad prirodnog i kulturnog krajolika, osebujan splet razvojnih značajki, ambijenta i mentaliteta. Stoga je u osmišljavanju strategije razvitka nužno poštovati posebnosti pojedinih otočnih skupina i otoka. To, između ostalog, znači da otočno gospodarstvo, konkretno turizam, treba ostati u granicama održivog razvoja. Valja naći ravnotežu koja će poštovati materijalno bogatstvo naroda, ali bez uništavanja temelja na kojem to bogatstvo počiva.

Razvitkom turizma iz temelja se mijenja filozofija gospodarenja kao i način života na otocima, tj. cjeloviti otočni prostor postaje glavni razvojni resurs. Može se reći da su rijetki prostori gdje svekoliki ambijent postaje resurs kao što je to na otocima. Budući da je turizam (uz poljoprivredu) temelj razvitka otočja, u ovom se radu razmatra uloga suvremenih demografskih značajki u razvitku otočnog turizma. Svrha je rada produžiti spoznaju o ljudskom resursu kao činiocu o kojem svaka strategija razvitka hrvatskog otočja mora voditi računa.

Podaci demografske statistike i rezultati istraživanja pokazuju da se na otocima odvijaju retrogradni procesi. Riječ je o jakoj depopulaciji, procesu nastalom početkom 20. stoljeća i zahuktalom poslije drugoga svjetskog rata. Desetljećima izloženo gubitku stanovništva danas je otočje (uz brdsko-planinske krajeve) populacijski najslabije područje Hrvatske. U stoljetnom razdoblju izgubljen je sav prirodni priraštaj i dio "bazične" populacije. Osim brojčanog smanjenja stanovništva posebice su razorni poremećaji u njegovoj strukturi (dob, spol i sl.), što će neprijeporno snažno utjecati i na buduće kretanje otočne naseljenosti. Prema rezultatima relevantnih analiza proistječe da će u doglednoj budućnosti izumrijeti 70-ak naselja, ili četvrtina otočnog naseljskog skupa; razumije se ako ostanu nepromijenjeni osnovni demografski činioci.

Otočno stanovništvo, koje je po svim relevantnim pokazateljima već 1953. godine bilo zahvaćeno procesom starenja, do 1991. osjetno je ostarjelo, odnosno došlo je do promjene u dobnoj strukturi u nepovoljnom smislu. Godine 1991. u otočnoj je populaciji udjel mladih godišta (0-19) iznosio 26,5%, zrelih dobni skupina (20-59) 55,9% te starih (60 i više) 17,6%. U razdoblju 1953-1991. medijalna starost (Mx) porasla je s 29,8 na visokih 38,2 godine.

Neto stopa reprodukcije, kao pokazatelj obnavljanja ženskog stanovništva, već je desetljećima ispod granične razine za jednostavnu reprodukciju (koja iznosi 1,0). Značajno smanjenje je zabilježeno u zadnjem međupopisnom razdoblju tako da neto stopa reprodukcije 1991. iznosi svega 0,79. To znači da se već duže vrijeme ne obnavlja ženska populacija (nositelj reprodukcije), tj. traje reproduksijska depopulacija. Najlošije (bio)reproduktivne značajke ima stanovništvo sjevernodalmatinskog otočja i manjih otoka.

Među otočnim stanovništvom u dobi 15 i više godina više je od polovine onih koji imaju nepotpunu osnovnu školu ili samo završenu osnovnu školu (zajedno 52,6%). Značajan je udjel osoba sa srednjim obrazovanjem (35,6%), dok je udjel onih s višom i visokom spremom (7,1%) blizu odgovarajućem udjelu na nacionalnoj razini. Na temelju predočenih podataka i usporedbi s općom populacijom možemo ustvrditi da je obrazovni sastav otočnog stanovništva razmjerno dobar. Ovdje je riječ o formalnoj strukturi, a drugo je pitanje koliko je otočana sa stručnom spremom relevantnom za turizam. Sudeći po nekim parcijalnim podacima i površnim spoznajama na otocima je nedovoljno "turističkog stručnog kadra".

Za primjenu suvremenog modela razvitka turizma već postoje određeni tržišni uvjeti, a tome se mogu prilagoditi i mjere gospodarske politike. Isto tako mogu se poboljšati i opći uvjeti infrastrukture i prometne dostupnosti. Međutim, bitna pretpostavka na koju je i najteže utjecati jest dovoljan broj radno sposobnih i obrazovnih ljudi. Imajući u vidu predočene činjenice, možemo zaključiti da se model "novog turizma" neće moći kvalitetno primjenjivati na svim otocima; posebice ne na onima s vrlo slabim demografskim potencijalom.

Zaključno možemo ustvrditi da je kod većine otoka sastav stanovništva po dobi glavni ograničavajući činitelj razvitka suvremenog turizma. Obrazovni sastav otočnog stanovništva to nije u značajnijoj mjeri, ali je nedvojbeno da u dijelu otočja također predstavlja kočnicu snažnijem razvitku; poglavito tamo gdje prevladava malobrojno i staračko pučanstvo. Prema tome, na većini otoka ljudski je resurs jedna od slabijih točaka u mogućoj primjeni koncepta "novog turizma".

Dobiveni nalazi pokazuju, između ostalog, da kod oblikovanja strategije razvitka hrvatskog otočja valja voditi računa o stvarnom demografskom stanju i perspektivama, a napustiti planiranje temeljeno na željama i nerealnim "projekcijama".

Received (Primljeno): 1998-9-20

Accepted (Prihvaćeno): 1999-2-22