

Sustainable Island Tourism: the Future of the Island of Mljet

Sekulo, Edi

Undergraduate thesis / Završni rad

2018

Degree Grantor / Ustanova koja je dodijelila akademski / stručni stupanj: **RIT Croatia / RIT Croatia**

Permanent link / Trajna poveznica: <https://um.nsk.hr/um:nbn:hr:229:854023>

Rights / Prava: [In copyright](#) / [Zaštićeno autorskim pravom.](#)

Download date / Datum preuzimanja: **2025-01-28**



image not found or type unknown

Repository / Repozitorij:

[RIT Croatia Digital Repository - Rochester Institute of Technology](#)



zir.nsk.hr



image not found or type unknown

Edi Sekulo

Sustainable Island Tourism: the Future of the Island of Mljet

Dubrovnik, March 2018

Abstract

In this research paper about future of sustainable tourism on the island of Mljet, author looked into the secondary data analysis of island of Mljet. The following data were analyzed:

Economic activities, socio-demographic situation, guest arrivals, and National Park Mljet. In the introduction author also looked current situation on some nearby Croatian islands like:

Korčula, Brač, and Krk. Situation of some small island states located in the world's oceans was analyzed. Gathering all this data was essential in order to ask questions for interviewees.

Interviewees were key officials of the island of Mljet: mayor of Municipality, Director of Tourism board, and Director of National Park. Interviews were conducted in order to find out opinion of the experts. Conclusion of this research was that island of Mljet is making positive ecological growth, and partially positive economic and tourism growth. Socio-demographic situation for the future of the island of Mljet was proved to be negative.

Key words: Sustainable tourism, socio-demographics, eco-tourism, island tourism, economic activities.

Introduction

Humanity has the ability to make sustainable development by meeting the needs of the current generations, while not compromising on the needs of future generations. (UN report, 1987)

“Islands often present the antithesis of urbanized life, they offer authentic cultural and natural experiences in unique settings far from urbanized world”. (Baum, 1997).

Millions of tourists visit islands each year. There is a growing demand for island tourism, especially small island tourism and with the demands for that kind of tourism come challenges of managing such a growing industry in a sustainable way. Sustainable Island Tourism as a strategy cannot be easily defined since every island has its own cultural, demographical, economic and ecological differences (Saarinen, 2006, p. 1124).

The association between islands and tourism dates back to the ancient time and the epic journey of Odysseus across the Europe. Nowadays islands are perceived as paradises on earth, so it is not wonder why tourism marketing efforts are shifting more towards the Island tourism (Baldacchino, 2008).

Sustainable policies are hard to implement because of many obstacles. Some of the obstacles which could interfere with positive policies for tourism sustainability are: vulnerability to natural disasters, short-term planning, foreign ownership, stakeholders conflict, inadequate skills for sustainability, corruption, and disorganized government (Weaver, 2009).

Many social problems of islands are hard to explain in general because of fragmented nature of the industry. Social problems of the islands are hard to measure by quantitative method, because results are elusive and inadequate (Buckley, 2012).

One of the dominant reasons why islands are interested in more sustainable growth can be found in economic rationale. In order to reach economic growth of the Island it is important to have educated and working population. (Carlsen, 2011)

Small Island developing states (SIDS) have on average more than 20% of their GDP coming from Tourism. Situation is similar in Croatia where also more than one fifth of GDP comes from tourism (UNWTO).

Problems which small Islands states share with the Island of Mljet are: connectivity, lack of labor, community, scarce and fragile natural resources. Opportunities of small islands states which they have in common with the Island of Mljet are: promotion and protection of nature, and investments. Author finds this problems and opportunities highly applicable to the case of the Island of Mljet.

Croatian islands make 6 % of overall Croatian surface. In Croatia there are 718 islands larger than 1 square kilometers, and only Greece has more islands in the Mediterranean Sea.

(Countries with the, 2017). Out of all Islands surfaces in Croatia there is only 3 National Parks, namely: Mljet, Kornati, and Brijuni. Brijuni and Kornati are a group of smaller islands, while Mljet is the only island out of a big group of Islands which have a National Park. (Vidučić, 2007)

The Island of Mljet is the 8th Croatian Island in terms of the size (98,015,857 square meters), and it is also the 8th island in terms of the coastal length 135,185 meters. (Duplančić, 2004)

To a certain extent, it is important for this study to examine some sustainable practices found in other Croatian islands. In case of the Island of Krk, results of research have shown that this island is aiming towards “ecotourism” in the future. Interesting characteristics of this type of tourism is that they will try to preserve their nature, satisfy needs of local community, entrepreneurs and tourists, while not compromising needs of future generation. This is an

ambitious project which they are trying to apply on their island. Some of the factors which are affecting the sustainable development are: regulations and integration of plans (Nižić, 2010)

Since tourism is crucial for sustainability in future development and employment of the Island of Krk the stakeholders accepted the following propositions from the “*Proposition for measures for Agenda 21*”:

1. Stop the pressure from people and limit growth, rehabilitate terrain and coastal areas.
2. Protect onshore and sea treasures and encourage the establishment of a regional tourist ecological plan with the purpose of environmental protection.
3. Reduce the biggest harmful influences on the environment and countryside.

An important thing worth mentioning is that Krk is the only major Croatian Island connected to the mainland with a bridge, and it is most populous Croatian Island, so same rules should not be applied for Island of Krk when comparing to other Islands because of Krk’s infrastructural and geographical advantage when compared to the other Croatian Islands. (Popis naseljenih otoka, 2017).

Another case that can be used is the case of the Island of Korčula. One can see that Korčula had almost 15 times more people in 2011 than the Island Mljet in the same period (figure 8., and 5.). From 1953 to 2011 Korčula went from 19011 people to 15522 people (decline over 20%), meanwhile on the Island of Mljet from 1953 to 2011 the population has declined from 2054 people to 1088 people (decline over 50%). These numbers are worrying in both cases, especially in case of Island of Mljet because Mljet has almost 15 times less number of people than it is the case in Korčula.

Factors which could influence enormous difference in population of these two islands are: geographical location, distance to mainland, and distance to main cities. (Carlsen, 2011)

And finally, the study of the Island of Brač in which the author found some interesting aspects of shifting from mass tourism towards sustainable tourism. The case study mentioned three types of tourism development: stagnation, mass tourism, sustainable tourism. (Gamberožić, 2015).

The stagnation stage on the example of Povalja refers to stagnation of Povalja due to lack of economic and social development. This place was popular in 1980, in the era of mass tourism. Unfortunately for this place lack of development and improvement of existing limited offer led to stagnation. This place still attracts tourists, but new offer was not added, so there is no new improvement necessary for tourists of 21st century and their needs.

The mass tourism stage uses the example of Bol. This place is developing uncontrollably without urban planning. Historical center of Bol is still preserved, but everything around Zlatni Rat (one of the most attractive beaches in Croatia) is still developing without proper planning. For the consequences local community, especially apartment owners starts to feel economic and environmental consequences of uncontrollable facility development. Lack of cooperation is mentioned as main problem, and that is against sustainability of Bol (Gamberožić, 2015)

Finally, the sustainable stage refers to Postira as a place with diversified economic sectors. People are employed in agriculture, fishing, fish-processing and tourism. The local community of Postira said that they do not consider themselves as monoculture, but more as diversified economic sector activities. They are developing in tourism sense, but they are doing sustainable development where in process of developing local culture, economy, and ecology remain preserved. (Gamberožić, 2015)

All of the above cases should be used in developing and designing the future of the island of Mljet. Over the last 50 years the Island of Mljet has seen some changes in regards to population, migration, and economic activities.

Mljet is ecology driven Croatian island, and because of its natural beauties guests are arriving mostly from European nations, with small number of guests coming from US and the rest of the world. According Tourism Board Overnight stays on Island Mljet most of guests are coming from: Slovenia, UK, France, Germany, Italy, and Czech Republic. This top 6 list shows us that Island of Mljet is mainly attractive to close European nations. (Tourist Board Mljet, 2018)

National Park Mljet managed to attract over 140,000 of visitors in 2017 record breaking season for NP Mljet, which is increase of 11% when compared to the previous year. (National Park Mljet, 2018)

High number of visitors is not yet affecting sustainability of the island. Based on the observations and results for 2017, one of the issues of the island is inconsistency of demand. Inconsistency and oscillation of tourist demand could affect sustainability of island tourism. Mljet does not yet have problems like “Plitvička jezera”, which have unsustainable number of visitors in their National Park, around 1,500,000 visitors per year. (Plitvice Plan upravljanja, 2017)

In any case future of the Island of Mljet towards sustainable tourism can be achieved by working towards a common goal. In the process towards sustainable tourism these economic influencers have to be involved: tour-operators, inbound operators, private accommodation, island population, tourists, service and product suppliers, etc. (Sunara, 2013)

Public sector, financial sector, government organizations, and non-government organizations have to be involved in active process of reaching of the Island of Mljet. Without financial sector and involvement of investors sustainability cannot be reach properly. (Sunara, 2013)

The key research question of this study is reflected in the hypotheses that the author will be testing. The hypotheses that will be tested in this work are:

Hypothesis 1: the island of Mljet is making sustainable progress in terms of overnight stays and arrivals.

Hypothesis 2: The island of Mljet will not have appropriate socio-demographic support for sustainable progress.

Methodology

For the purposes of conducting a research related to the topic of the Future of sustainable tourism on the island of Mljet the chosen method was a combination of secondary data analysis and interview. Data analysis was done by analyzing demographical, economical, ecological, and tourism aspects of the island.

A new model was recreated based on existing one for purposes of this research. The model titled "*Tourist arrivals per 1000 capita*", was reshaped in order to calculate average arrivals of tourists on island of Mljet, and to compare it to some other Croatian destinations.

Interviews were done in semi-structural style via e-mail, because most detailed opinions and answers to questions could be achieved this way. Interviewees were asked questions based on secondary data analysis previously researched. Each participant was given a set of 7 open ended questions (Figure 10.)

Interviewees were the Municipality mayor of the Island of Mljet, Mr. Đivo Market, tourist board director of the island, Ms. Andrea Anelić, and director of National Park Mljet, Mr. Ivan Sršen. Each participant was given set of questions based on their field of expertise. Base of the question was similar for all participants, only difference in each question was context regarding their field of expertise.

Mr. Market had additional questions regarding demography and economy of the island, while Ms. Anelić had questions based on tourism of the island. Mr. Srsen had questions related to the ecology of National park.

Interviews with different experts of the island gave different insights and perspectives to current opportunities, strengths, threats, and weaknesses which island is facing right now.

Interviews were also done to determine future short term and long term goals.

Results

Results from secondary data analysis have shown that Island of Mljet is facing constant decrease of population since age of 1961, when island had 1963 citizens. From the last available date of Croatian population census results have shown that in 2011 on the island was living 1088 people. This dramatic decline of population over the last 60 years was due to migrations outside of island, and as well larger mortality than natality on the island (figure1.).

Results obtained from tourist board of Island Mljet have shown that there is constant increase of tourist arrivals and overnight stays on the island since 2009. (Figure 2.) Number of overnight stays on the island almost doubled from 2009(73,546 overnight stays) to 2017(140,332 overnight stays).

Due to dynamics and influence of tourism industry on the island, there was some major shift of economic activities on the island during the span from 1961 to 2001 (last available data).

In 1961 most of the population (73%) of the island did primary economic activities for living such as agriculture, fishing, animal husbandry, etc. In 2001 economic activities completely shifted from primary activities towards tertiary activities such as: tourism, municipality, National Park, etc. Number of people who worked in secondary economic activities such as industry; was marginal in 1961 only 1.7% of population, and in 2001 only 3.8% of population worked in secondary economic activities, which indicates that this phase was overlooked by population of the island. (Figure 3.)

In 1961 Mljet had 1963 people living on the Island. Most of the people during this period of time worked in primary economic activities 73 %, while 1.7% worked in secondary activities, and remaining 25.3% did tertiary jobs.

In 2001 economic activities have shifted from primary towards tertiary. The numbers in Figure 3 shows that in 2001 2.5% did primary activities, 3.8% did secondary activities, and 93.7% did tertiary activities.

Results have shown (Figure 4.) that migration of people also happened inside the island. Tradition of living in inner settlements of Island of Mljet such as Babino Polje (capital), and Govedari was because primary activities happened inland. With the emergence of tourism (tertiary activities) things have changed and new coastal settlement were created. In figure 4 boldly marked are year of census when in specific place most people have lived. In inner places like Babino Polje and Blato most people have lived there in 1948, meanwhile coastal places are constantly increasing, so from figure 4 we can see that in that 5 places on the island have had peak year in 2011, when last consensus happened on the island.

Figure 5 shows all changes in population within the island. From the table can be seen that inner places had decline in population of 70.7% from 1961 to 2011, while coastal places had increase of 227.2% from 1961 to 2011. We can also see that places inside National Park Mljet(protected area), had decrease of 18,4% from 1961 to 2011.

Original results of this senior project based on tourist arrivals per capita model (Economy tourist arrival, 2009), have shown some remarkable results when adjusted to number of visitors in year of some Croatian destination per 1 000 habitants of that place. Croatia as whole have 4 068 arrivals of tourists per 1000 citizens of Croatia, meanwhile Island of Mljet have 28 159 tourist arrivals per 1000 habitants of island, which is even more than city of Dubrovnik when adjusted to 1 000 habitants of that area. Results of this limited research have shown that Island of Mljet is only trailing Hvar Island which have 46 427 tourists per 1 000 habitants, while it has more arrivals than city of Korčula and Island of Krk based on arrival per capita model. (Figure 6.) Additional research is recommended for bigger sample size based on this model.

In case of Mljet number of people with 3 years of high school education have risen from 7.8% in 1981 to 29.9% in 2011. Meanwhile number of people with 4 years high school education have also risen from 6.2% to 17.7%. Positive trend have also been noticed in terms of college/university educated people. All results are shown in figure 7.

Rebalance of Island Mljet budget for 2017 shows that results were better than originally planned for the same year. We can see that economic factors from tourism on the island is making positive progress (Municipality Mljet, 2018).

One of the bigger issues on the island which could affect progress towards sustainable tourism are socio-demographic problems. Since 1948 population of the Island of Mljet is declining. In 1948 on Mljet was 2086 residents, while results for 2011 have shown that current number of

residents on the island is 1088. Number of residents on the island have almost decreased by half from 1948 to 2011. (Figure 5.)

In 2011 on Island was 78061 overnight stays in period of January 1st until October 1st, while in 2017 number of overnight stays grew to 140332 from the same period of time. Index 2017/2011 shows increase of 1.80 which means that number of overnight stays have almost doubled in 6 years period. (Tourism Board of Island, 2018)

Based on tourism pressure and occupancy rate model, results have shown that currently the island of Mljet is facing low tourism pressure and low occupancy rate more than 6 months per year, while during summer period it has high occupancy and high tourism pressure. (Figure 11.)

As for the results of interview following was founded for question number one which asks how they envision island of Mljet in 10 years period. All interviewees agreed that island of Mljet have promising future and as possible scenario in 10 year period they said that island should have: Nautical marina, and renewable energy sources for needs of household.

Mr. Market and Ms. Anelić agreed that island should have more hotels' capacity, because current capacities are not sufficient in quantity for growing demands of tourists for island as destination. On the other hand Mr. Sršen said that sewerage system, infrastructure, and protection of the environment should be improved in 10 years period.

Mr. Market said that socio-demographic problems should be fixed in next decade, so more should live on the island than it is living right now, more frequent boat line should also happen in 10 years period. Ms. Anelić said that the island of Mljet should be more recognizable and branded in the future.

As for the second question which asks participants what is the most unrealized potential of the island. All participants have agreed that island should benefit more from stunning natural

beauties and cultural heritage that it offers to tourists and local people as well. Mr. Market also stated that nearness to Dubrovnik should also be better promoted, while Mr. Sršen said that island should have sustainable economy, and permanent protection by now.

Third question have asked participants what is the island's competitive advantage. All participants have agreed that island's biggest competitive advantage is National Park which attracts every year more visitors. According to Mr. Sršen director of National Park Mljet 140 000 tourists visited National Park, that was increase of 11 percent from previous year.

Fourth questions was aimed towards short term goals. This questions showed various results because of different positions interviewees hold. Mr. Market municipality mayor of the island said that his short terms goals are to achieve stability of municipality, cooperation with stakeholders and local people, and to solve legal challenges which blocks development of the island. On the other hand Ms. Anelić director of Tourism Board of the island said that her short term goals are: education of stakeholders, organization of events, promotional activities, and marked cultural and natural heritage. Mr. Sršen as director of National Park Mljet have different short term goals than other two participants. His short term goals are: improvement of infrastructure, quality of service in NP Mljet, eco-transport, waste management, and cooperation with stakeholders and local population.

Fifth question was related to long term plans. Mr. Market said that he would like to preserve the nature of the island for future generations. Ms, Anelić sees that long term branding of Mljet as destination should be key, as well financing from European Union funds, and developing selective types of tourism on the island like: sustainable tourism, gastro tourism, exotic tourism, and active tourism are all different ways in which this island could succeed. Longevity of tourism season is must for this island according to Ms. Anelić. Director of National Park said that his goals in long term run are: Preserving natural and cultural heritage,

traditional life with help of modern technology for local population, using renewable sources for energy, and developing eco-agriculture.

Sixth question was related to obstacles which could affect long term goals. Results have shown that all participants agree that bureaucracy is big problem which interferes with their plans. Mr. Market mentioned that education system, emigration of youth, and lack of optimism are all challenges which could affect future of the island. Ms. Anelić said that insufficient funds, lack of tourism offer, inadequate connection with Dubrovnik, and seasonal orientation are all obstacles which could affect more sustainable tourism. Mr. Sršen mentioned: human resources problem, financial, and conditions to attract experts in different areas who would like to live and work on the island; as possible obstacles for more sustainable island.

Seventh question was: do they have something to add? Results for the last question have shown that they have positive opinion regardless future of the island, if demand for island continue to rise. Mr. Sršen had interesting final thought. He believe that National Park Mljet is far from maximum capacity of visitors unlike National Park Plitvice Lakes, which went beyond sustainability.

Discussion

The island of Mljet is making sustainable progress in terms of overnight stays and arrivals is partially proved. The current study found that the island of Mljet is going forwards in terms of overnight stays and arrivals of tourists. This trend will continue to go forwards as long as hotel's and private accommodation's rooms can answer demands of the tourists. Ms. Andrea Anelić director of Tourism Board of the Island of Mljet has mentioned that dependency on seasonality of work on the island can potentially harm sustainability. Oscillation and

inconsistency of tourist's demand throughout the year can negatively affect possibility of sustainable development.

Without whole year employment of the people in tourism industry and other sectors it is impossible to have much desired stability and progress towards sustainability. Hypothesis 1 is partially proven because of inconsistency of demand, even though that number of guests' arrivals is constantly increasing every year.

Hypothesis 2: The island of Mljet will not have appropriate socio-demographic support for sustainable progress is proved. Mr. Đivo Market municipality mayor of the island of Mljet had mention that socio-demographic aspects of the islands are still negative, so it is lack of optimism of local population. Mortality is still higher than natality so this socio-demographic aspect is still crucial in order to reach more sustainable tourism. Without positive changes in socio-demographic structure of the island it will not be possible to have sustainable tourism for future generations. Hypothesis 2 is proved, and it can highly influence hypothesis number 1 in the long run. Possible solution for socio-demographic problems is prolonging tourist season with additional offer or developing new economic activities, so in the long run more people would come to the island of the Mljet to work and live.

Ecological aspects of Mljet are island's biggest advantage towards sustainable tourism. One third of the island is covered in National Park which is completely preserved. Nature tourism is attracting more daily visitors than ever before. It is island's biggest competitive advantage, and this niche market of intact nature might be island's way forward towards whole year tourism one day. Director of National Park Mljet had mentioned: "*with sustainable planning it is possible to increase capacity of tourists without negative impact on the nature*".

Island of Mljet has bright future if it can overcome its own negative socio-demographic trends. In case of the Island of Brač according to Gamberožić was mentioned that in place Postira they have already attained sustainability. Suggestions for the Island of Mljet are to enrich local culture, prolong tourism season, and to have more diversified economic activities like it was done in case study of Brač, Postira. Results from Postira can serve as real example of sustainable development of area, without negative consequences.

Solutions related to the problems on the island of the Mljet can only happen if bureaucracy and legal problems can be solved, because they are blocking investments, development, and potential new residents of the island. Author's suggestion is to have less regulations for urban and economic development plan in the areas which are not part of the National Park, this could attract more people to live and work on the island. Other suggestion is to keep nature of the National Park Mljet intact, because it is attracting more tourists every year on the island.

Reference list

Carlsen, J., & Butler, R. W. (Eds.). (2011). *Island tourism : a sustainable perspective*.

Retrieved from <https://ebookcentral.proquest.com>

Baldacchino, G. (2008). Island tourism. In M. Luck (Ed.), *The encyclopedia of tourism and recreation in marine environments*. Oxford, UK: CABI. Retrieved from

<https://ezproxy.rit.edu/login?>

url=https://search.credoreference.com/content/entry/cabitrme/island_tourism/0?

<institutionId=3255>

Nizic, M. K., Ivanovic, S., & Drpic, D. (2010). Challenges to sustainable development in island tourism. *South East European Journal of Economics and Business*, 5(2), 43-53.

Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com.ezproxy.rit.edu/docview/1015601396?>

<accountid=108>

<http://www.un-documents.net/our-common-future.pdf>

Chambers, D., & Rakic, T. (Eds.). (2015). *Tourism research frontiers : beyond the boundaries of knowledge*, 123-140. Retrieved from <https://ebookcentral.proquest.com>

Hazdovac Bajić, N. (2013). Suvremeni demografski i socio-ekonomski problemi otoka Mljeta. *NAŠE MORE : znanstveni časopis za more i pomorstvo*, 60(5-6), S102-109. Preuzeto s <https://hrcak.srce.hr/112626>

Marinović Golubić, M. (2017). Doseljavanje na otok – suvremene migracije na otok Korčulu. *Migracijske i etničke teme*, 33(2). doi:10.11567/met.33.2.1

Sunara, Ž., Jeličić, S., Petrović, M. (2013). Održivi turizam kao konkurentska prednost Republike Hrvatske. *Zbornik radova Međimurskog veleučilišta u Čakovcu*, 4(1), 83-88. Preuzeto s <https://hrcak.srce.hr/104887>

Zlatar Gamberožić, J., Tonković, Ž. (2015). From Mass Tourism to Sustainable Tourism: A Comparative Case Study of the Island of Brač. *Socijalna ekologija : časopis za ekološku misao i sociologijska istraživanja okoline*, 24(2-3). doi:10.17234/SocEkol.24.2.1

Vidučić, V. (2007). ODRŽIVI RAZVOJ OTOČNOG TURIZMA REPUBLIKE HRVATSKE. *NAŠE MORE : znanstveni časopis za more i pomorstvo*, 54(1-2), 42-48. Preuzeto s <https://hrcak.srce.hr/13166>

Mondher Sahli, Larry Dwyer, Marie-Antoinette Maupertuis, Jean-Jacques Nowak (2007). Tourism economics. *Island tourism economies and sustainable development*. 13 (4), 494-498.

Tea Duplančić Leder, Tin Ujević, Mendi Čala (2004). Coastline lengths and areas of islands in the Croatian part of the Adriatic sea determined from the topographic maps at the scale of 1 : 25 000. Vol.9 No. 1, 5-32

Condon, P. M., & Honey, M. (2008). *Ecotourism and sustainable development : who owns paradise?*. Retrieved from <https://ebookcentral.proquest.com>

SUSTAINABLE TOURISM DEVELOPMENT: THE CASE OF THE ISLAND OF HVAR

Lim, C. C. and Cooper, C. (2009), Beyond sustainability: optimising island tourism development. *Int. J. Tourism Res.*, 11: 89–103. doi:10.1002/jtr.688

Ecotourism and sustainable development

Šulc, I., Valjak, V. (2012). Zaštićena područja u funkciji održivog razvoja hrvatskog otočja – primjer otoka Mljeta. *Hrvatski geografski glasnik*, 74.(1.).

doi:10.21861/HGG.2012.74.01.09

Tourism in Small Island developing states (SIDS), UNWTO

Personal communication sources

Municipality Of Island Mljet

Tourism Board of Island Mljet

Non-scholarly sources

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/travel/destinations/europe/croatia/galleries/best-croatian-islands/mljet/>

<http://www.nationmaster.com/country-info/stats/Economy/Tourist-arrivals/Per-capita>

<http://np-mljet.hr/>

<http://www.mljet.hr/>

<http://thedubrovniktimes.com/news/croatia/item/755-mljet-and-vis-named-in-top-european-islands-list>

<https://www.parkovihrvatske.hr/naslovnica>

<https://dnevnik.hr/vijesti/hrvatska/plitvicka-jezera-pucaju-po-savovima-hocemo-li-postati-generacija-koja-je-uspjela-ubiti-biser-hrvatskog-krsa---485495.html>

<http://www2.unwto.org/>

https://hr.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dodatak:Popis_naseljenih_otoka_u_Hrvatskoj

http://www.bbc.co.uk/schools/gcsebitesize/geography/tourism/tourism_uk_rev1.shtml

Appendix

Figure 1. Natality and mortality on island of Mljet

Time Period	Natality	Mortality	Results
1966.-1970.	82	86	-4
1971.-1975.	58	91	-33
1976.-1980.	50	114	-64
1981.-1985.	83	119	-36
1986.-1990.	61	120	-59
1991.-1995.	68	113	-45
1996.-2000.	47	111	-64
2001.-2005.	24	98	-74
2006.-2010.	25	93	-68

Figure 2. Tourism board of the island of Mljet – Overnight stays




Figure 3. Types of economic activities on the island of Mljet

	1961.			2001.				
	number	Types of economic activities (in %)			number	Types of economic activities (in %)		
		(1.) Primary	(2.) Secondary	(3.) Tertiary		(1.) Primary	(2.) Secondary	(3.) Tertiary
Settlements inside national park	100	73	1,7	25,3	79	2,5	3,8	93,7
Coastal settlements					58	17,2	10,3	72,4
Inner settlements					121	6,6	5,8	87,6
other settlements	768	83,3	6,8	9,9	179	10,1	7,3	82,7
Mljet	946	81,4	5,8	12,8	258	7,8	6,2	86
		Legend: working population						

Figure 4. Coastal vs. Inland

Place	1948.	1953.	1961.	1971.	1981.	1991.	2001.	2011.	geographic location		National Park or other area	
									Coastal	Inland	National Park	other
Babino Polje	907	857	791	660	562	398	336	270		yes		yes
Blato	174	165	141	163	91	77	46	39		yes		yes
Goveđari	274	283	278	227	182	179	165	151		yes	yes	
Korita	163	164	186	168	115	90	74	46		yes		yes
Kozarica	14	29	30	27	34	32	28	28	yes			yes
Maranovići	190	190	179	127	73	60	54	43		yes		yes
Okuklje					12	16	20	31	yes			yes
Polače	61	63	90	83	87	123	115	113	yes		yes	
Pomena	8	8	13	25	46	50	37	52	yes		yes	
Prožura	217	208	182	149	121	78	53	40		yes		yes
Prožurska luka					6	15	14	40	yes			yes
Ropa	62	60	40	29	25	19	32	37		yes		yes
Saplunara			5	8	22	32	35	67	yes			yes
Sbra	16	27	28	28	19	68	102	131	yes			yes

Figure 5. Island of Mljet Population (Hazdovac, 2013)

Year	Places inside NPMljet		Coastal places		Inner places		Mljet	
	#of people	Index	# of people	Index	# of people	Index	# of people	Index
1961.	381	100	103	100	1479	100	1963	100
1971.	335	87,9	92	89,3	1211	81,9	1638	83,4
1981.	314	82,4	109	105,8	936	63,3	1359	69,2
1991.	329	86,4	175	169,9	674	45,6	1178	60
2001.	317	83,2	231	224,3	563	38,1	1111	56,6
2011.	311	81,6	337	327,2	433	29,3	1081	55,1
		Legend:	Increase from last consensus	Decrease from last consensus	start index			

Figure 6. Arrivals per 1000 inhabitants

	year 2017.			
	Number of arrivals	Number of overnight stay	population	arrivals per 1000 inhabitants
Croatia	17 430 580	86 200 261	4 284 889	4 068
Dubrovnik Municipality	1 174 878	3 886 065	42 615	27 570
Mljet Municipality	30 637	134 471	1 088	28 159
Korčula city	80 939	376 423	5 663	14 293
Hvar Municipality	197 361	713 292	4 251	46 427
Krk Municipality	215 620	1 274 168	19 286	11 180

Figure 7. Population Census from 1981 to 2011 Island of Mljet

	Svega	Stanovništvo prema školskoj spremi									
		Bez školske spreme %	1-3 razreda osn. šk. %	4-7 razreda osn. šk. %	Osnovna škola %	Srednja škola			Više škole %	Visoke škole i umj. akademije %	Nepoznato %
					Škole za KV i VKV radnike, škole u trajanju 1-3 god. %	Škole za srednji stručni kadar, škole od 4 i više god. %	Gimnazije %				
1981.	1.197	11,4	7,2	45,8	17,5	7,8	6,2	0,8	1,6	0,5	1,3
1991.	1.052	8,4	8,4	35,2	22,5	8,7	10,6	0,9	3,4	1,4	0,6
2001.	941	2,1	8,7	24,9	22,5	23,9	8,4	2,7	3,2	3,3	0,3
2011.	967	1,1	1,4	9,1	27,3	29,9	17,7	1,9	5,8	5,8	-

Figure 8. Population of the Island of Korčula over the years

	1953.	1961.	1971.	1981.	1991.	2001.	2011.
Korčula	2414	2458	2657	2953	3232	3126	2856
Čara	744	636	661	669	797	566	616
Pupnat	758	691	772	512	488	433	391
Račišće	1057	945	644	511	456	468	432
Žrnovo	1501	1427	1363	1184	1267	1296	1368
Blato	5676	5148	5912	3861	4093	3659	3570
Potirna	111	68	25	13	14	21	23
Lumbarda	1235	1142	1068	1040	1102	1221	1213
Smokvica	1210	1137	1052	1002	1125	1012	916
Vela Luka	4310	4297	4193	4398	4464	4380	4137
Ukupno	19.016	17.949	18.347	16.143	17.038	16.182	15.522

Figure 9. Tourist's arrivals per 1,000 capita




Figure 10. Interview questions all regarding in the context of work field of participants.

1. How do you see Island of Mljet in 10 years?
2. What is biggest unrealized potential of Mljet?
3. What is strategic advantage of the Mljet when compared to other islands?
4. What are short term plans?
5. What are long terms plans?
6. What kind of obstacles are you facing

7. Would you like to add something more?

Figure 11. Tourism pressure vs occupancy rate model

		tourism pressure	
		high	low
occupancy rate	high	A) strategy (stabilize and maintain Balearic Islands Malta Gozo	C) Strategy(Increase Accomadation capacity No islands
	low	B) Strategy)design growth strategy Tremiti Islansa Fegree Islands	D) Sstrategy (Develop a targeted positioning strategy Cyprus Corsica Crete