

# An Integrated Approach to the Development of Tivoli Park Competitiveness

**Janez Mekinc**

*The University of Primorska, Faculty of Tourism Studies – Turistica, Portorož, Slovenia*  
*janez.mekinc@fts.upr.si*

**Polona Müller**

*The University of Primorska, Faculty of Tourism Studies – Turistica, Portorož, Slovenia*  
*polona.mueller@gmail.com*

**Mariana Rebernik**

*Biotechnical Centre Naklo – Higher Vocational College*  
*mariana.rebernik@bc-naklo.si*

The purpose of this research is to analyse the facilities and services of Tivoli Park, its cultural heritage, and natural endowments. Using a quantitative method with structured interviews, 120 interviews with park visitors, who were also residents of the city of Ljubljana, were carried out. The findings suggest that the park has many elements that are not part of the integrated services of the park and, as such, appeal to a very broad range of visitors. Tivoli Park has two aspects: sports and recreation, and culture and nature. New development should include promenade concerts, performances by small vocal and musical groups, and art and photography workshops. Events and thematic trails should reflect new landscape design trends. One of the most significant challenges is the integration of communication technologies and sustainable park development. All stakeholders, cooperating in an interdisciplinary approach, should create a comprehensive Tivoli Park landscape park management plan.

*Key words:* tourism, park, sustainable development, cultural heritage, protected area

## Introduction

Tivoli Park is classified as a landscaped park. In their study on the possibility of developing landscape parks in Slovenia, Plut et al. (2008) found that they have greater possibilities for activities such as education, recreation, tourism and agriculture, and medium-level development possibilities for activities such as research, forestry and other economic activities. Landscape parks offer opportunities that are mainly tied to local sources (e.g. agriculture, tourism, recreation), for those who are directly related to the park

(supervision, guided tours, park management, services connected to the park facilities, etc.), as well as for those who profit from the park (additional farming activities, diverse tourist services, recreational activities etc.) (Gosar et al., 2010). Despite its basis in law, the cultural aspects of the wider protected areas are rarely taken into account, and it would be necessary to identify and highlight those aspects of tangible and intangible cultural heritage that have development potential (Hribar, Šmid Hribar & Erhartič, 2011). Kus Veenliet and Sovinc (2008) and Plut et al.

(2008) point out that it is essential to include cultural heritage and its (tourism) development potential in wider protected areas in addition to nature conservation. Establishing tourism and catering activities in heritage buildings largely has no beneficial impact. Due to the development of additional activities nearby, they are a threat to the immediate surroundings. As a result, mansions and manors utilized for tourism represent the greatest threat to the interests of the garden and artistic heritage. Best practices elsewhere have shown that the major revitalizations are those that bring additional cultural value such as museums, galleries, music & theatre, and other elements, that enhance the attractiveness of the buildings but have less impact on the landscaped environment (Ogrin, 1995). Integrating heritage into tourism, and creating models based on heritage requires strategic design and technical decisions (Bogataj, 1992). The Slovene Tourism Development Strategy 2012–2016 does not devote particular attention to landscape or urban parks, but defines them as protected natural areas of Slovenia. Slovenian park tourist services and facilities can be joined to integrated products that enable tourism activities for a short (one-day) or longer (several days) holiday. The Cultural Tourism Development Strategy of Slovenia 2007–2013 stated that the development of the city can also be measured by the level of conservation, programme development and its attitude towards green areas (Lebe et al., 2009). It includes urban parks, tree-lined avenues, lawns in residential areas and city centres, green belts by railway and bus stations, as well as green areas in private ownership, such as gardens and groves around residential and commercial buildings. A systematic programme of revitalizing social and cultural events in parks as specific tourist services is the correct way of including urban green areas into tourism services. A systematic recovery programme could only be implemented in cooperation with different professions and other stakeholders. Stakeholders in tourism are directly and indirectly related individuals and groups coming from the public, private and civil sectors (Uran & Juvan, 2009).

### **Tivoli Park**

The Landscape Park of Tivoli, Rožnik, and Šišenski hill can be broken down into three zones: the landscaped zone of the urban park (Tivoli), the for-

ested zone (Rožnik and Šišenski Hill), and the zone between Koseze and Brdo. Each zone has a distinctive appearance, providing different ways of experiencing nature and leisure and offering a variety of habitats for plants and animals (Smrekar, Erhartič & Šmid Hribar, 2011). Tivoli Park is unlike the forested urban parkland and is the most visited portion of the landscape park; it already hosts several activities or events. A 2010 survey (Smrekar et al., 2011) notes that over 1,750,000 visitors visit the landscape park of Tivoli, Rožnik, and Šišenski Hill every year. Most visitors to the landscape park enter through Tivoli, via an underpass beneath the railway line in front of the Jakopič Promenade. The survey also showed that walking was the main form of recreation in the park, practiced by 73% of visitors.

Tivoli Park evolved gradually, first as a tree-lined avenue; later, Žiga Zois opened his garden to the public in 1835. The park was created; in the 1950s, Radetzky encouraged horticultural activities and eventually the city took over the park. The name Tivoli initially came from the “summer residence” of Ljubljana’s Kazin/Casino Society of Podturn Mansion, and later the mansion itself. In 1848, the name Tivoli was given to the tree-lined avenue; in the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century renovated parts of the Podturn and Cekin mansions were added. Podturn Mansion was also renamed Tivoli Mansion, and newly established Švicarija (Swiss Cottage) was renamed the Hotel Tivoli in 1908 (Ovsec, 1994).

The park’s historical development is directly linked to city growth and the formation of the first dedicated green spaces that began in the 13<sup>th</sup> century, when the so-called Turjak Gardens of Count Auersperg, with Tivoli’s western side bordering the Roman moat of Emona. On the east side, the park stretched almost to the Holy Trinity Church (Vardjan, 1994). Garden ornaments were mentioned at Podturn Fortress in 1267 (Pergovnik Cotič, 2009). The author adds that the mansion was, later, frequently rebuilt, and in the 17<sup>th</sup> century was given a pond, trails, and beds, which later became the basis for future landscaping in front of the mansion.

In one of the oldest plans of Ljubljana, Martin Stier, builder of defensive fortifications in the first half of the 17<sup>th</sup> century, made a remarkably accurate sketch of the Auersperg gardens with its distribution of footpaths and areas of rectangular shapes in

the Baroque style (Vardjan, 1994). At the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, Žiga Zois opened his gardens. The Tivoli and Cekin mansions were the main buildings in the park, with a major tree-lined avenue as the park's axis (Pergovnik Cotič, 2009). The first attempt by the town to grant public access between the Tivoli and Cekin Mansions dates back to around 1808. The most important, and also the first integrated designs for the park, were created during the period of the Illyrian Provinces, when in 1813, the French engineer Jean Blanchard planned the arrangement of three tree-lined avenues between the two Baroque mansions and the town centre. In 1815, these avenues were conceived as the parks' essential skeleton (Pergovnik Cotič, 2009). Later the park was awarded public status (Ordinance on the proclamation of Tivoli, Rožnik and Šišenski Hill natural heritage, 1984). Originally these were robinia and poplar trees, which in 1822 were replaced by chestnut trees and avenues named Latterman avenues (Pergovnik Cotič, 2009).

The gardens at Tivoli Mansion were laid out in 1835 (Kolšek in Hajós, 2004). The tree-lined avenues are preserved to this day and have become the basis for all subsequent landscape architecture on which the urban public park design has been based. In 1852, a large central staircase with sculptures of dogs was added to the front of the mansion, landscaped with bushes and a round pool with fountain and fence, accentuated by cast iron vases (Pergovnik Cotič, 2009). These bold and modern initiatives were spoiled due to the diversion of the Southern Railway through the Tivoli lawns in 1857. Almost a third of the park on the city side was changed and closed off; the railway line cut the tree circle and intersection of the Latterman Avenue in half (Vardjan, 1994).

In the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the park was wholly owned by the city (Mihelič, 1989). Later, the park was arranged with new avenues; in 1880 a pond was excavated; in 1894 a city boathouse and nurseries added. With the erection of the Jakopič Pavilion (between the train tracks and Latterman Avenue), designed in 1908 by Maks Fabiani, the park began to change radically. Complex park designs began to emerge among the avenues, the first being Jakopič Pavilion, north of Latterman Avenue and another two on the south side of the avenue and pond. The first design for a circular garden was created with the apparent involvement of Fabiani and Hejnic; the oth-

er two were created from preserved, carefully drawn and coloured illustrations by Hejnic, dated 1926 (Pergovnik Cotič, 2009).

The image of Tivoli changed in the period between the world wars, a significant part due to the designs of architect Prof. Jože Plečnik. This period represents the transformation of Tivoli towards sport, large-scale exhibitions and construction of new buildings. The central Jakopič Promenade leading to Tivoli Mansion was established between 1921 and 1934 (Vardjan, 1994). Pergovnik Cotič (2009) states that the avenue was replaced by a promenade in 1933, a wide sandy area with curbs, benches and concrete lighting along the middle. A triangular park with a children's playground and a fountain set between the rail tracks was created, following plans by Plečnik. More changes were made to the park in 1942, when, according to plans by architect Boris Kobe, the pond was transformed into a playground, thus removing one of Hejnic's designs (Pergovnik Cotič, 2009). In the subsequent period, the park underwent predominantly negative transformations, the Jakopič Pavilion was demolished in 1962, a recreation area comprising Hala Tivoli hall and a swimming pool was added to the northern part of the park in 1960. The climax was the completion of the new Prešeren Road, which severed Plečnik's promenade (Pergovnik Cotič, 2009). Korošec (1991) states that the Hala Tivoli sports hall completely overshadowed the (former) People's Revolution Museum and the National Liberation Museum, a degradation of the former greatness of the presence of Cekin Mansion. The only contribution in the last fifty years was made in 1994, when the municipality organized a competition for proposals to the playground area, nurseries and park boathouse redesigned for public use (Pergovnik Cotič, 2009).

### Research Problem and Methodology

The aim of this research, based on causal non-experimental methods, is to analyse visitor satisfaction with Tivoli Park's current facilities and services and its aspirations for the future. The sample was made up of 120 visitors to Tivoli Park, all residents of Ljubljana for at least one year before the interview. The interviewees were older than 15 years of age; the survey included 51 men and 69 women with different levels of academic achievement. More than a third (36.7%)

of respondents were university educated, followed by respondents with secondary education (29.2%); less than one-tenth had completed a master's degree, ten respondents had vocational bachelor qualifications, or 8.3%. Other respondents had vocational diplomas (7.5%), vocational secondary (5.8%) and elementary school education (3.3%).

Tivoli Park is unlike the forested parts (Rožnik and Šiška Hill) of the urban park, with higher visitor numbers and hosting several activities or events. As a part of the landscape park, Tivoli has the greatest number of existing buildings, monuments and garden sculptures, which significantly contribute or could contribute to developing a comprehensive range of tourism facilities and services. Tivoli is different from the forested areas landscape parks, in that it is arranged as a park, and, therefore, more suitable for the performance of activities or events.

In this study, we, therefore, wanted to know the opinions of visitors to Tivoli Gardens in relation to the existing park facilities. The research questions are:

- *satisfaction with the (current) services and facilities* (Are visitors satisfied with the services and facilities? Are visitors satisfied with the catering? Are outdoor exhibitions perceived to be an interesting form of park services?);
- *the frequency of park visits and the element of the park services* (How often do you visit the park? How often do you enjoy attending activities/events? How often do you view the exhibitions displayed on the Jakopič Promenade?);
- *motives for visiting the park* (What is the most common motive for your visit? What do you most often visit in the park?);
- *awareness of the park* (Where do visitors most often receive information about events/updates? Do visitors feel that they get enough information about events/updates in the park?);
- *wishes for park services* (Can you list three activities or events that you would like in the park? What would be important for you to be included as a park service/event?).

Based on the research problem and research questions, we have developed five hypotheses:

- *There are no gender differences in the frequency of visiting the park;*
- *Education of respondents does not affect the motive for visiting the park;*
- *Park visitors are satisfied with the facilities and services;*
- *Between age groups, there is no difference in satisfaction with the catering services;*
- *There is no difference in satisfaction with information about the event /updates in the park between the sexes.*

Fifteen closed-ended questions were statistically analysed, and 11 open-ended handwritten questions categorized. The statistical methods used were frequency tables and chi-square test. The aim of our research is to determine the opinions of visitors to Tivoli Park's facilities and services, and the opinion of visitors to each element of the facilities and services. Several illustrative results are presented (frequency table), while others are shown in relation to different categories, meaning whether they indicate differences in the responses between different groups (testing the null hypothesis with chi-square test).

## Results and Interpretation

In this study, we wanted to know how frequently respondents visited Tivoli Gardens. As shown in Table 1, almost one third of visitors visit the park several times a week, followed by visitors who visit the park several times a year (28.3%), and more than a fifth visit the park several times a month. A tenth of the respondents visit the park daily, with 4.2% visiting once a year or less. It was predicted that there would be respondents who visit the park on a daily basis, but we did not expect such a large number of respondents that visit the park several times a week.

Table 1 The frequency of park visits

The frequency of park visits	f	f %
Daily	13	10.8%
Several times a week	39	32.5%
Several times a month	26	21.7%
Several times a year	34	28.3%

The frequency of park visits	f	f %
Once a year or less	5	4.2%
Other	3	2.5%
Total	120	100%

Source authors

Table 2 relates to our first hypothesis, which is that there are no gender differences in the frequency of park visits. The resulting  $\chi^2$  value of 4.07 is above the critical value for 1 degree of freedom (3.841 at 5 per cent risk). Chi-squared is statistically significant, so gender differences in the frequency of visiting the park are definite. The difference is due to the difference in (visit) patterns, since nearly two-thirds of women visit the park as often as every day, or several times a week, while more than half of the men visit the park every day or several times a week.

Table 2 The frequency of park visits by gender

Gender	The frequency of park visits by gender			Total
		Daily, several times a week	Other	
Women	f	24	45	69
	f%	34.8%	65.2%	100%
Men	f	28	23	51
	f%	54.9%	45.1%	100%
Total	f	52	68	120
	f%	43.3%	56.7%	100%

Source authors

The data in Table 3 shows that almost half of the respondents stated walking to be their main motive, a fifth most frequently visited park for relaxation, followed by those respondents who come to the park for recreation (10.8%). Given that the park has (well) prepared paths (offering some activities and events) and that interviewed visitors were strolling, we anticipated 'Walking' to be a frequently stated response. We did not predict that such a large number of respondents would select "Transit" as their main motive.

Table 3 The motive for visiting the park

The reason for visiting the park	f	f%
Walking	57	47.5%
Relaxation	20	16.7%
Recreation	13	10.8%
Transit	9	7.5%
Nature	5	4.2%
Children's playground	3	2.5%
To tour the park	3	2.5%
Other	10	8.3%
Total	120	100%

Source authors

Table 4 relates to our second hypothesis that the education of the respondents does not affect the motive for visiting the park. The value of the  $\chi^2$  test of 0.6 and is below the critical value by 1 degree of freedom (3.841 at 5 per cent risk). Chi-squared is not statistically significant, so we keep the hypothesis. We generalized results to the sample, and the data define difference as more than half of visitors from high school, a university degree and a master's degree visiting the park for a walk with more than half of the respondents with lower education visiting the park for other motives (Table 4).

Table 4 The motive of the visit according to the education

Education	Visiting motive			Total
		Walking	Other motives	
ES, VS, SS, College*	f	24	31	55
	f%	43.6%	56.4%	100%
HS, UE, MD**	f	33	32	65
	f%	50.8%	49.2%	100%
Total	f	57	63	120
	f%	47.5%	52.5%	100%

\* ES, VS, SS, College - Elementary School, Vocational School, Secondary School and College \*\* HS, UE, MD - High School, University Education and a Master's Degree

Source authors

### Tivoli Park Services and Facilities

Tivoli Park visitors have the opportunity to enjoy nature (flora and fauna) as well as cultural heritage buildings, restaurants and a variety of activities and events, so we wanted to determine which elements of the park's facilities and services are most often visited.

*Table 5* The most attractive elements of the park's facilities and services to the visitors

The most attractive elements	f	f%
Outdoor exhibit	35	29.2%
Nature	20	16.7%
Flora and fauna	12	10%
Jakopič Promenade	8	6.7%
Boathouse (Café Čolnarna)	6	5%
Squirrels	4	3.3%
The whole park	4	3.3%
Path to Rožnik	3	2.5%
Walking	3	2.5%
Sports	3	2.5%
Children's playground	2	1.7%
Swimming pool	2	1.7%
Café	2	1.7%
Nothing in particular	2	1.7%
Other	11	9.2%
No answer	3	2.5%
Total	120	100%

*Source* authors

The data in Table 5 shows that most visitors (29.2%) viewed the outdoor exhibits on the Jakopič Promenade, and a fifth of respondents visited for its nature, followed by visitors interested in its flora and fauna. Eight respondents (6.7%) selected spending time on the promenade (Jakopič Promenade) without viewing the exhibits as their response, six respondents (5%) visited the boathouse (cafe). Interestingly, four visitors (3.3%) indicated that they went to see specific animals (squirrels) and four (3.3%) to see the whole park. Given that the survey was carried

out on the Jakopič Promenade, where continuous and specific activities (photo exhibition) take place, we predicted that most visitors would give that answer. The park's sport facilities are quite far from the Jakopič Promenade, so we assumed that respondents would select nature, flora or fauna, and not, for example, sports activities. We expected more frequent visits to the food outlets (boathouse, cafe) than indicated.

Based on the results of customer satisfaction for the services and facilities, we established that 82 (68.3%) of respondents were satisfied, one fifth were very satisfied, and 11 (9.2%) of respondents were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied (Table 6). We can confirm the third hypothesis.

*Table 6* Satisfaction with the facilities and services

Satisfaction with the facilities	f	f%
Very dissatisfied	3	2.5%
Dissatisfied	2	1.7%
Not dissatisfied / not satisfied	11	9.2%
Satisfied	82	68.3%
Very satisfied	20	16.7%
No answer	2	1.7%
Total	120	100%

*Source* authors

Table 7 relates to the fourth hypothesis. It states that there is no difference in satisfaction with the catering between the age groups. The value of the  $\chi^2$  test is 6.18, which is above the critical value in the 2<sup>nd</sup> stage of liberty (5.991 at 5 percent risk). Chi-squared is statistically significant, so the hypothesis is rejected. We can conclude that there are differences in satisfaction with the catering among the age groups. The difference is mainly found in the sample with respondents aged 30 years: as many as 48.6% of them are not satisfied with the catering. More than a fifth of people aged between 31 and 50 years are not satisfied. A third of respondents aged over 50 years is not satisfied with the catering services in the park. It was assumed that the highest percentage of dissatisfied visitors from catering is found among younger respondents mainly because none of the premises are intended for a young audience.



Table 7 Satisfaction with the catering services relating to the visitors age

Age group		Satisfaction with the catering		Total
		Yes	No	
30 years and less	f	19	18	37
	f%	51.4%	48.6%	100%
From 31 to 50 years	f	32	9	41
	f%	78%	22%	100%
More than 50 years	f	28	14	42
	f%	66.7%	33.3%	100%
Total	f	79	41	120
	f%	65.8%	34.2%	100%

Source authors

#### Activities and Outdoor Events in Tivoli Park

In this study, we were interested in complementary park services and facilities, so the survey attempted to establish which activities or outdoor events in Tivoli Park were most highlighted by visitors. Regular outdoor activities include those that take place throughout the year or for periods of longer than a year. Traditionally-held events are organized once a

year and may last for one day or several days in a row. Among the regular activities in the park are those such as sport activities taking place in a specific location and linked to the sport facilities (for example, in addition to ice-skating for schools, basketball, tennis, roller skating contests/competitions). Another regular park activity is the exhibits on the Jakopič Promenade, which is permanent, but given the fact that the displays change, they are considered temporary. The Library under the Treetops is also regular, where visitors can borrow a book and read it on the supplied couches. These activities are organized to take place outdoors in the park. Walking (see also Jesenkova pot trails), jogging, roller skating, playing basketball, and children's playgrounds cannot be considered to be organized activities, and similarly, when an individual takes part in recreational activities benefiting from the maintained infrastructure, it cannot be considered to be an organized activity. Even yoga and Nordic walking activities, which take place in the park but are not regularly organized, cannot be considered to be regular activities. Among the traditionally-held events are those that take place in the park every year on the same day, or at least within a similar period. These are the FORMAraton charity run, the DM Run for Women, the Moon Festival children's event, and the Party with a Purpose music event.

Table 8 The most recognizable activities and events to the visitors

Activities and events	1st place		2nd place		3rd place		Total	
	f	f%	f	f%	f	f%	f	f%
Exhibit	36	30%	10	8.3%	9	7.5%	55	15.3%
Party with Purpose	15	12.5%	8	6.7%	5	4.2%	28	7.8%
DM run for Women	10	8.3%	10	8.3%	5	4.2%	25	6.9%
Moon Festival	12	10%	6	5%	5	4.2%	23	6.4%
Jogging	6	5%	7	5.8%	7	5.8%	20	5.6%
Škis Marketplace	3	2.5%	5	4.2%	2	1.7%	10	2.8%
Children's playground	2	1.7%	4	3.3%	3	2.5%	9	2.5%
Library under the Treetops	4	3.3%	0	0%	4	3.3%	8	2.2%
Yoga	3	2.5%	2	1.7%	3	2.5%	8	2.2%
Concerts	2	1.7%	3	2.5%	3	2.5%	8	2.2%

Activities and events	1st place		2nd place		3rd place		Total	
	f	f%	f	f%	f	f%	f	f%
Walking	2	1.7%	2	1.7%	2	1.7%	6	1.7%
Boathouse (Café Čolnarna)	0	0%	2	1.7%	1	0.8%	3	0.8%
Relaxing	0	0%	2	1.7%	1	0.8%	3	0.8%
Ice-skating	0	0%	2	1.7%	1	0.8%	3	0.8%
The arrival of the Dalai Lama	0	0%	2	1.7%	0	0%	2	0.6%
Fish pond	0	0%	2	1.7%	0	0%	2	0.6%
Leisure activities	0	0%	2	1.7%	0	0%	2	0.6%
Cyclists	0	0%	0	0%	2	1.7%	2	0.6%
Sports training	0	0%	0	0%	2	1.7%	2	0.6%
To meet people	0	0%	0	0%	2	1.7%	2	0.6%
Other	14	11.7%	27	22.5%	14	11.7%	55	15.3%
No answer	11	9.2%	24	20%	49	40.8%	84	23.3%
Total	120	100%	120	100%	120	100%	360	100%

Source authors

The data in Table 8 indicate that the most visible activity or recognized event for the majority of respondents was the park exhibits (at Jakopič Promenade) (55 of all responses, or 15.3%). Exhibits were in first place, with 36 respondents, meaning 30%. It is interesting that for the second most recognizable event, respondents indicated Party with a Purpose (28 or 7.8% of all responses). This is followed by the DM Run (25 or 6.9% of all responses), and the Moon Festival (23 or 6.4% of all responses). Ten (2.8%) respondents stated the Škis Marketplace (which takes place at the Partizan summer sports ground, which does not fall within the park), with eight (2.2%) responses for Library under the Treetops. As can be seen from Table 8, the other responses relate to activities that are not classified as regular and organized activities (illustrated by yoga and ice-skating, with others as generic activities, such as jogging, walking, relaxing, sports and exercise leisure activities). Concerts are otherwise organized, but we have assumed that those performed in the Hala Tivoli venue are not among the stated activities or outdoor events.

#### Sources of Information

Of interest to our survey was where visitors most often obtained information on activities, events or updates in Tivoli Park. It is not currently possible to obtain information on activities and events in one place (from a website, publications, annual calendar of events, in the park), so we were interested in determining where visitors obtained their information. Most information about sporting events and activities is published on the website of the Ljubljana Sport and Leisure Facilities (Šport Ljubljana). Advance details of the Moon Festival and Party with a Purpose are published on there. This page also publishes promotional events, e.g. Open Days at Tivoli and Kodljevo Park tennis centres. Otherwise, event organizers (DM Run for Women, Moon Festival and Party with a Purpose) maintained their own websites. Exhibitions or opening of new photographic exhibitions and the calendar of exhibitions, valid until the end of 2013, are published on the website of the Public Service of Ljubljana Tourism. Information about the Library under the Treetops was (in 2013) published on the Municipality of Ljubljana (MOL) website. Information regarding bird watching in Tivoli Park is usually published on the websites of the daily news-



papers. Some information can also be obtained in Ljubljana, MOL Bulletin and in the Where? monthly publications, published in Slovene and English by the Ljubljana Tourism Public Service. For a given activity or event, we assume that the organizers decide in which mass media, and how long before the activity or event it is promoted (print media, television, radio, posters and other means).

Table 9 Source of information visitors used mostly

Source of information	f	f%
Radio	27	13.6%
Television	25	12.6%
Print media	40	20.1%
Advertising posters, billboards	39	19.6%
Web pages	36	18.1%
Friends, acquaintances	9	4.5%
Random	6	3%
Nowhere	5	2.5%
Word of mouth	4	2%
Not looking for information	3	1.5%
In the park	2	1%
No answer	3	1.5%
Total	199	100%

Source authors

The survey results indicate that 47 users responded to the question with more than one answer. As shown in Table 9, the most frequent stated visitor response was print media, by 40 or 20.1% of all responses. Interestingly, print media is followed by advertising posters, with 39 (19.6%) of all responses. Only then do respondents state Web pages (36 or 18.1% of responses). While we assumed a high percentage of the response for 'print media', we did not expect such a low percentage for television and radio. We assume that advertising on television and radio may not target the right audiences, or the costs are not acceptable to event organizers. Interestingly, 'friends, acquaintances' and 'random' were also given as responses to the source of information.

Given that information covering all the activities, events and news in Tivoli Park is not available in one place (on a single website or single publication), which visitors can access promptly, our survey also determined whether visitors believe that there is enough information about events and news in the park. In response, 60% of the respondents state that they obtained enough information about events and news in the park. Given that the 47 visitors who responded to the question 'Where do the usually get information about the events?' indicated more than one answer, we assume that respondents sought information on events and updates in different ways (different mass media, friends). Nevertheless, more than a third of visitors consider that they do not receive enough information.

Table 10 Informing on events / updates relating to sex

Sex		Do you get enough information about the events?		Total
		Yes	No	
Female	f	43	26	69
	f%	62.3%	37.7%	100%
Male	f	29	22	51
	f%	56.9%	43.1%	100%
Total	f	72	48	120
	f%	60%	40%	100%

Source authors

In the fifth hypothesis, we asserted there is no difference in satisfaction with information about the events/updates in the park between the sexes. The value of the  $\chi^2$  test is 0.36 and is below the critical value at 1 degrees of freedom (3.841 at 5 per cent risk). Chi-squared is not statistically significant, so we can confirm the hypothesis (table10). We generalized results to the sample, and the data did not show any difference between the sexes. Thus, more than half of men and women think that they get enough information about events/news.

- *There are no gender differences in satisfaction of information about the events/updates.*

### Visitor Wishes for Tivoli Park Services

In the survey, we were interested in what activities or events that visitors desired. The respondents could indicate three answers.

The data in Table 11 show that most visitors desired different kinds of concerts. The majority cited

concerts; some also specified specific genres (classical music, brass bands, etc.). This was followed by varied workshops (pottery, art, sports, etc.). Interestingly, the respondents stated that they want more exhibitions as well as a summer cinema, music events and sports activities. Visitors to the park also want

Table 11 Activities and events visitors would like to be organized in the park

Activities and events	1st place		2nd place		3rd place		Total	
	f	f%	f	f%	f	f%	f	f%
Various concerts	12	10%	7	5.8%	2	1.7%	21	5.8%
Various workshops	6	5%	4	3.3%	0	0%	10	2.8%
More exhibitions	6	5%	3	2.5%	0	0%	9	2.5%
Summer cinema	5	4.2%	0	0%	2	1.7%	7	1.9%
Music events	5	4.2%	2	1.7%	0	0%	7	1.9%
Sports activities (events)	4	3.3%	3	2.5%	0	0%	7	1.9%
Art workshops (forma viva)	0	0%	2	1.7%	4	3.3%	6	1.7%
Drama performances	5	4.2%	0	0%	0	0%	5	1.4%
More children's activities	5	4.2%	0	0%	0	0%	5	1.4%
Gymnastics	4	3.3%	0	0%	0	0%	4	1.1%
Yoga	0	0%	3	2.5%	0	0%	3	0.8%
Roller skating events	2	1.7%	0	0%	0	0%	2	0.6%
Tai chi	2	1.7%	0	0%	0	0%	2	0.6%
Satisfied with current offer	2	1.7%	0	0%	0	0%	2	0.6%
More events	0	0%	2	1.7%	0	0%	2	0.6%
Jogging	0	0%	2	1.7%	0	0%	2	0.6%
Boating	0	0%	2	1.7%	0	0%	2	0.6%
Culinary events	0	0%	2	1.7%	0	0%	2	0.6%
Sports workshops	0	0%	2	1.7%	0	0%	2	0.6%
Guided tours	0	0%	0	0%	2	1.7%	2	0.6%
Cycling events	0	0%	0	0%	2	1.7%	2	0.6%
Various lectures	0	0%	0	0%	2	1.7%	2	0.6%
Other	24	20%	29	24.2%	20	16.7%	73	20.3%
No answer	38	31.7%	57	47.5%	86	71.7%	181	50.3%
Total	120	100%	120	100%	120	100%	360	100%

Source authors

art workshops, such as *forma viva*, drama performances and more children's activities. Of further interest in the survey was what visitors to Tivoli Park thought is additionally needed to complete the park's services. Most responded, 'I like it as it is', followed by a variety of catering services ('lounge bar', roasted chestnut kiosks, pancake sales, bread and pastry sales, etc.). The respondents also highlighted music events, more activities for the elderly, more activities in the park, renovation of facilities, tours, recitals, more flora and fauna, gymnastics, clean-up campaigns and more dog waste bins.

### Conclusion

The survey showed that Tivoli Park can be separated into two aspects, sports and recreation, and culture and nature. When considering international requirements for landscape parks, the primary management objective is for at least three quarters of the park area to become protected areas; Tivoli Park, in its entirety, would be considered a part where this objective is not taken into account, as its area does not exceed a quarter of the landscape park.

We shall design a programme of services and facilities that can be applied to the entire landscape park, which considers the cultural-natural aspect of the park. For the basic programme, we have included the maintenance of the paths, care of flora and fauna, activities taking place in architectural buildings, sports facilities (indoor and outdoor) and catering. As an extended programme, we include outdoor activities and outdoor events. These are temporary exhibitions on the Jakopič Promenade, Library under the Treetops, workshops (organized only within the frame of the Moon Festival), outdoor sports and cultural events (DM Run for Women, Moon Festival, Party with a Purpose).

As shown in the results of the survey (conducted on the Jakopič Promenade, which is a part of the cultural and natural aspect of the park), the majority of visitors come from the urban communities adjacent to Tivoli, and almost half of them visited the park every day or several times a week (more than half of the men). This means that a high percentage of respondents are regular visitors who live near the park. We define gender differences in the frequency of visiting the park to be definite, and we have to reject the first hypothesis. The difference is due to the

difference in visit patterns, since nearly two-thirds of women visit the park as often as every day, or several times a week, while more than half of the men visit the park every day or several times a week.

Almost half of the respondents stated 'Walking' to be their main motive for visiting (respondents with higher education accounted for more than half). We cannot confirm our second hypothesis because the education of the respondents affects the motive for visiting the park. We generalized the results to the sample, and the data defined the difference to be more than half of the visitors from high school, a university degree and a master's degree visiting the park for a walk, while more than half of the respondents with lower education visited the park for other motives. Based on the results of customer satisfaction with the facilities and services, we determined that the respondents were satisfied with them and confirmed the third hypothesis.

On the supply side, we wanted to know what the most visited areas of the park were, and more than half indicated the exhibits and natural surroundings (trees, flora, fauna). However, no one indicated visiting buildings (the International Centre of Graphic Arts or city nurseries), and only a few mentioned the café. We note that visitors mainly come to the park for basic and additional outdoor events and services. The survey also showed that the offer (activities run in the architectural or catering establishments) in particular, are not sufficiently recognized. We focus on the satisfaction with the catering among the age groups of the visitors and found differences. The most dissatisfied with it were respondents aged 30 years or younger, mainly because any premises not intended for a young audience. For those over 30 years old who visit the park alone, with a partner, with the family, the facilities are more suitable. Based on the results, we rejected the fifth hypothesis.

In the case of additional services (activities and outdoor events), we find that the majority of visitors are satisfied with them; two thirds of the visitors attended the activities and outdoor events several times. The results of the survey also showed that the most recognized activities and outdoor events were the exhibitions on Jakopič Promenade, Party with a Purpose, DM Run for Women, Moon Festival. Almost all visitors to the exhibitions have been there many times, and even more visitors consider the out-

door exhibitions to be interesting events. We note that visitors are familiar with most of the activities and events, as part of the additional services, except for the Library under the Treetops, of which very few respondents were aware. In preparing the proposed comprehensive Tivoli Park programme, we wanted to take into account what activities and events visitors requested in the park. The survey showed that they look forward to activities and events that should mainly be considered as part of an additional programme. Primarily, these would be cultural activities (concerts, workshops, exhibitions, etc.).

The results of this study have also shown what aspects of the park could have greater success. The survey primarily shows this through buildings (with most visitors mentioning Jakopič Promenade, but not the City Nurseries or Hotel Tivoli - Švicarija), monuments, garden sculptures and fountains, most respondents correctly identified their number, but a high percentage of visitors did not recall any, or could not recall their names. Even among the recognizable figures such as Plečnik and Jakopič, no one mentioned the gardeners or Fran Jesenko. The offer proposal aims to develop the cultural-natural aspect of the park, mostly affecting the architectural buildings and monuments, garden sculptures and fountains. The proposal will be designed for additional events and services, i.e. outdoor activities and outdoor events, exhibitions, thematic trails and workshops. The activities can be divided into two: those that educate visitors and contribute to the conservation and protection of the park, and those that are aimed at developing new facilities in the park. Firstly, we include horticultural activities, which would also mean the revival of these activities since it was the most important activity of the park in the past. This could mean, for example, flowerbeds so that visitors would be invited to hear from specialists about different types of flowers and techniques. Such promoted exhibits would create much interest during the spring and summer and attract many people. In designing thematic trails, several examples are given: the Plečnik Trail (visit to all the park's architectural works), Discover Cultural Heritage (view heritage buildings, monuments, garden sculptures and fountains), Sculptors and Architects and their works in Tivoli, Baroque Tivoli Park (development of Baroque designs in the park and Baroque mansion, Ce-

kin Mansion is a part of sport and recreation), the Latterman Trail, Discover the Work of Vaclav Hejnic and Anton Lap, Discover the Park's Flora and Fauna, etc.

For outdoor exhibitions, it would be possible to frequently display content on the Jakopič Promenade relating to the park (for example, activities from the park's past, presentation of famous individuals and their contributions to the park). Events and workshops can be linked to the topics of the thematic trails and exhibitions (e.g. Plečnik Day, Jesenko Day, events for exhibition openings, flower bed workshops, and others). Developing new content could include, as we discovered in the research, promenade concerts, performances by small vocal and musical groups, art and photography workshops, and similar events. Events and thematic trails could be connected with new landscape design trends. Park events could be offered in conjunction with other parts of the landscape park, for example, a hike on the Jesenko trail followed by a visit to the Cankar Memorial Room at Rožnik and then back to Tivoli. Additional outdoor events could similarly be connected with architectural features; these would be reasonable in the winter when the weather conditions for outdoor activities are not the most suitable. It would be sensible to move all sports and recreational activities and outdoor events, to the sports and recreational areas of the park.

Tivoli Park is, and will continue to be, important for all city residents, so it makes sense to provide a place where they can realize the importance of protecting the park, and also get current information. For the management of the park's important information, there is no difference in satisfaction of information about the events/updates in the park between the sexes. More than half of the males and females stated that getting enough information about events/news of the park was not a problem. For a comprehensive programme for Tivoli Park that will be related to services and events in the other parts of the landscape park, additional research is required, particularly into offers that include natural heritage and the zone between Brdo and Koseze. Further research questions could investigate which sites would be appropriate, the targets for additional programmes, how to integrate information and communication technologies, and similar issues. In the fu-

ture, the landscape park will have an operator; therefore, it will be necessary for all stakeholders, cooperating from an interdisciplinary approach, to create a comprehensive Tivoli Gardens programme or Landscape Park Management Plan.

## References

- Bogataj, J. (1992). *Sto srečanj z dediščino na Sloven-skem*. Ljubljana: Prešernova družba.
- Gosar, A., Sovinc, A., Fišer Pečnikar, Ž., Kryštufek, B., & Varljen Bužan, E. (2010). CRP Konkurenčnost Slovenije 2008–2013. Oblikovanje učinkovitega sistema zavarovanih območij v Sloveniji. Retrieved from [http://www.parki.mop.gov.si/oblikovanje\\_ucinkovitega\\_sistema\\_zo.pdf](http://www.parki.mop.gov.si/oblikovanje_ucinkovitega_sistema_zo.pdf)
- Hajós, G. (2004). Gradski perivoji u Beču i u zemljama bivše Austrijske Monarhije iz europske perspektive između 1765. i 1867. In B. Bojanić Obad Šćitaroci & M. Obad Šćitaroci (Eds.), *Gradski perivoji Hrvatske u 19. stoljeću: javna perivojna arhitektura hrvatskih gradova u europskom kontekstu*, (pp. 11–48). Zagreb: Šćitaroci: Sveučilište u Zagrebu: Arhitektonski fakultet.
- Hribar, M., Šmid Hribar, M., & Erhartič, B. (2011). Premislek o razvoju in zavarovanih območjih. In J. Nared, D. Perko & N. Razpotnik Visković (Eds.), *Razvoj zavarovanih območij v Sloveniji* (pp. 11–21). Ljubljana: Založba ZRC.
- Korošec, B. (1991). *Ljubljana skozi stoletja: Mesto na načrtih, projektih in v stvarnosti*. Ljubljana: Mladinska knjiga.
- Kus Veenvliet, J. & Sovinc, A. (2008). Učinkovitost upravljanja zavarovanih območij v Sloveniji. Retrieved from [http://www.mko.gov.si/fileadmin/mko.gov.si/pageuploads/podrocja/narava/rap-pam\\_porocilo.pdf](http://www.mko.gov.si/fileadmin/mko.gov.si/pageuploads/podrocja/narava/rap-pam_porocilo.pdf)
- Lebe, S. S., Milfelner, B., Gačnik, A., Pestotnik, D., Zalokar, T., & Blažič, P. (2009). Strategija razvoja in trženja kulturnega turizma 2009–2013. Retrieved from [http://www.slovenia.info/pictures/TB\\_board/attachments\\_1/2009/SRKTS-29\\_8849.pdf.pdf](http://www.slovenia.info/pictures/TB_board/attachments_1/2009/SRKTS-29_8849.pdf.pdf)
- Mihelič, B. (1989). *Vodnik po Ljubljani*. Ljubljana: Državna založba Slovenije.
- Odlok o razglasitvi Tivolija, Rožnika in Šišenskega hriba za naravno znamenitost. (1984). Uradni list SRS, (21/84). Retrieved from <http://www.ljubljana.si/Static/upload/file/odlok-spre.pdf>
- Ogrin, D. (1995). Smisel slovenske krajinsko-arhitekturne dediščine. In J. Batič (Ed.), *Historical parks and gardens in Slovenia*, (pp. 7–12). Ljubljana: Ministrstvo za kulturo, Uprava Republike Slovenije za kulturno dediščino.
- Ovsec, J. D., (1994). Iz življenja Tivolija skozi čas. In J. Strgar (Ed.), *Tivoli, ljubljanski mestni park*, (pp. 65–94). Ljubljana: Kmečki glas.
- Pergovnik Cotič, D. (2009). Ljubljana-mestni park Tivoli. In M. Simič (Ed.), *Po zgodovinskih parkih in vrtovih Slovenije: dvainštirideset slovenskih parkov in vrtov*, (pp. 86–90). Šmarje Sap: Buča.
- Plut, D., Cigale, D., Lampič, B., Mrak, I., Kavaš, D., Erker Slabe, R., Trebše, P., Pleterski, A., Štular, B., Pirnat, J., Keršič Svetel, M., & Pečnik, M. (2008). CRP Konkurenčnost Slovenije 2006–2013. »Trajnostni razvoj varovanih območij – celostni pristop in aktivna vloga države«. Trajnostno gospodarjenje v varovanih območjih z vidika doseganja skladnejšega regionalnega razvoja. Retrieved from [http://geo.ff.uni-lj.si/sites/default/files/CRP\\_zavarovana\\_Plut\\_o8.pdf](http://geo.ff.uni-lj.si/sites/default/files/CRP_zavarovana_Plut_o8.pdf)
- Smrekar, A., Erhartič, B., & Šmid Hribar, M. (2011). *Krajinski park Tivoli, Rožnik in Šišenski hrib*. Ljubljana: Založba ZRC.
- Uran, M., & Juvan, E. (2009). *Strateški management v turizmu: Oblikovanje strategije turizma in vloga deležnikov*. Koper: Društvo za akademske in aplikativne raziskave.
- Vardjan, F. (1994). Tivolski park od nastanka do danes. In J. Strgar (Ed.), *Tivoli, ljubljanski mestni park*, (pp. 16–38). Ljubljana: Kmečki glas.
- Vlada Republike Slovenije, (2012): Strategija razvoja slovenskega turizma 2012–2016: partnerstvo za trajnostni razvoj slovenskega turizma. Retrieved from [http://www.slovenia.info/pictures/TB\\_board/attachments\\_1/2012/Strategija\\_turizem\\_sprejeto\\_7.6.2012\\_14561.pdf](http://www.slovenia.info/pictures/TB_board/attachments_1/2012/Strategija_turizem_sprejeto_7.6.2012_14561.pdf)