



## The Health and Well-Being Impacts of Protected Areas in Finland

Journal:	<i>Journal of Sustainable Tourism</i>
Manuscript ID	JOST-3312.R2
Manuscript Type:	Special Issue Paper
Keywords:	Nature-based tourism, Protected areas, National parks, Health, Well-being
Abstract:	<p>Following the growth of nature-based tourism, national parks and other protected areas have become important tourist attractions and tools for regional development. Meanwhile, research on the impact of nature on human health and well-being is increasing and taken into account in park management. This study examines health and well-being benefits perceived by visitors to Finland's protected areas. It is based on survey data from five national parks and one strict nature reserve in 2013–2015: an on-site visitor survey (N=3 152) and an internet-based health and well-being survey (N=1 054). The study indicates that visitors' perceived benefits to their well-being were highly positive. Visits to protected areas promoted psychological, physical, and social benefits. In particular, park visits were found to provide strong and multi-faceted, long lasting, embodied and sensory well-being experiences as well as escape from everyday life and work. Overnight visitors reported more well-being benefits than day visitors, and different types of park had different well-being benefits. The study suggests that the potential benefits of protected areas for public health are significant, emphasizing the need to integrate health and well-being arguments into the neoliberalist politics assessing the economic benefits of protected areas and their role in regional development.</p>

1  
2  
3 JOST3312FR  
4

5 **The Health and Well-Being Impacts of Protected Areas in Finland**  
6  
7

8  
9 Abstract  
10

11 Following the growth of nature-based tourism, national parks and other protected areas have  
12 become important tourist attractions and tools for regional development. Meanwhile, research  
13 on the impact of nature on human health and well-being is increasing and taken into account  
14 in park management. This study examines health and well-being benefits perceived by  
15 visitors to Finland's protected areas. It is based on survey data from five national parks and  
16 one strict nature reserve in 2013–2015: an on-site visitor survey (N=3 152) and an internet-  
17 based health and well-being survey (N=1 054). The study indicates that visitors' perceived  
18 benefits to their well-being were highly positive. Visits to protected areas promoted  
19 psychological, physical, and social benefits. In particular, park visits were found to provide  
20 strong and multi-faceted, long lasting, embodied and sensory well-being experiences as well  
21 as escape from everyday life and work. Overnight visitors reported more well-being benefits  
22 than day visitors, and different types of park had different well-being benefits. The study  
23 suggests that the potential benefits of protected areas for public health are significant,  
24 emphasizing the need to integrate health and well-being arguments into the neoliberalist  
25 politics assessing the economic benefits of protected areas and their role in regional  
26 development.  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Keywords: nature-based tourism, protected areas, national parks, health, well-being, Finland

## Introduction

Following the growth of nature-based tourism, national parks and other protected areas have become important tourist attractions and tools for regional development. According to recent modeling, protected areas are globally visited c. 8 billion times annually: 80 % of those visits are in Europe and North America (Balmford et al., 2015). Visitor numbers in protected areas have also increased in northern Europe, including Finland (Puhakka & Saarinen, 2013). In particular, the national park label has been shown to increase the attractiveness of protected areas (Wall Reinius & Fredman, 2007). Therefore, the global tourism industry has become a significant user, stakeholder, and element of change in protected areas. Coordinating conservation and the utilization of nature is often considered advantageous for both conservation and regional development goals. The touristic attractiveness of natural areas is seen as offering potential income for local peripheral communities struggling with economic restructuring (Hammer, Mose, Siegrist, & Weixlbaumer, 2007; cf. Byström & Müller, 2014; Mayer, 2014). Thus, protected areas increasingly justify their existence by local and regional economic gain and by satisfying visitor need. This discursive policy shift reflects the rise of neoliberalist politics in which nature conservation has become more instrumental and market oriented than before (Puhakka & Saarinen, 2013). These developments have important and far reaching management implications.

Although recreation has been an integral part of national parks since the beginning, interest in the potential role of parks in human health and well-being is relatively new. Meanwhile, there are growing efforts to develop nature-based well-being tourism (e.g. Hjalager et al., 2011). Empirical evidence is mounting that contact with nature promotes mental and physical health. Direct physical and emotional health benefits arise from the opportunity to observe nature and be in a natural environment (Maller et al., 2008). Natural settings activate people to move, which produces indirect health benefits (Björk et al., 2008). Nature also promotes people's mutual interaction and their sense of community (Health Council..., 2004). It has been argued that current health care practices alone cannot deal with the growing stress and other problems connected with urban living and contemporary work practices (Karjalainen, Sarjala, & Raitio, 2010). The economic implications of the benefits of natural environments to health and well-being have been considered substantial. Utilizing green spaces effectively

1  
2  
3 in health promotion could reduce public health care budgets and create new sources of  
4 income (see Nilsson, Baines, & Konijnendijk, 2007).  
5  
6  
7  
8

9 National parks and other nature reserves with recreational value can thus be seen as a  
10 fundamental health resource, particularly in terms of disease and illness prevention (Maller et  
11 al., 2008; Stolton & Dudley, 2010). While research on the health and well-being benefits of  
12 nature has a long history, previous studies have focused on the effects on physical health,  
13 psychological well-being, and cognitive ability (Keniger, Gaston, Irvine, & Fuller, 2013).  
14 And, research has largely focused on urban and suburban parks while the perceived health  
15 benefits of visitors to national parks and nature reserves have not been widely studied (see  
16 Bowler, Buyung-Ali, Knight, & Pullin, 2010). Also, most of the research has been carried out  
17 in North America (e.g. Lemieux, Eagles, Slocombe, Doherty, Elliott, & Mock, 2012;  
18 Lemieux et al., 2015), and comparisons between different kinds of protected areas have been  
19 rare (see Weber & Anderson, 2010). Accordingly, more research on the perceived health and  
20 well-being outcomes associated with visiting different types of protected areas is needed.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

32 This study examines the health and well-being benefits perceived by visitors to national parks  
33 (IUCN Category II) and strict nature reserves (IUCN Category IA) in Finland. First, the  
34 article analyses the type and strength of health and well-being benefits. Second, the article  
35 explores if different demographic characteristics or characteristics of a park visit lead to  
36 different perceived health and well-being outcomes. The study is based on two types of  
37 survey data collected in five national parks and one strict nature reserve: an on-site visitor  
38 survey (N=3 152) and an internet-based health and well-being survey (N=1 054). Data was  
39 collected during years 2013–2015. The study aims to discuss the new and additional mandate  
40 of protected areas as ‘the fountains of health and well-being’ in urbanized societies.  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

## 51 **The Impact of Nature on Human Health and Well-Being**

### 52 *Psychological and Cognitive Benefits*

53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Previous studies on the psychological benefits of interacting with nature can broadly be  
4 divided into psychological well-being benefits and those associated with cognitive  
5 performance, i.e. positive effects on mental processes and cognitive ability or function  
6  
7 (Keniger et al., 2013; see Bowler et al., 2010).  
8  
9

10  
11  
12 Interaction with nature has been shown to increase self-esteem and mood (Kuo & Sullivan,  
13 2001), reduce anger (Moore, Townsend, & Oldroyd, 2007), and improve general  
14 psychological well-being with positive effects on emotions and behavior (Kaplan, 2001). The  
15 positive impacts of nature on children's self-esteem and mental well-being has also been  
16 discovered (Maller, 2009).  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

22  
23  
24 Several studies have focused on the psychological well-being effects of exercising in a  
25 natural environment (Keniger et al., 2013). The multi-study analysis by Barton and Pretty  
26 (2010) showed that acute short-term exposures to facilitated 'green exercise' improved both  
27 self-esteem and mood irrespective of duration, intensity, location, gender, age, and health  
28 status (see also Pretty, Peacock, Hine, Sellens, South & Griffin, 2007). Considerable  
29 improvements in well-being, mood, relaxation, joy, and other health and well-being  
30 indicators were also perceived by hikers, runners and walkers in national parks (Wolf &  
31 Wohlfart, 2014). Research suggests that exercise is more beneficial, leading to the relief of  
32 anxiety and depression, when it occurs in natural rather than urban settings (Hartig, Mang, &  
33 Evans, 1991). A national study in Finland indicated that repeated exercise in nature was, in  
34 particular, connected to better emotional well-being (Pasanen, Tyrväinen, & Korpela, 2014).  
35 A green environment is considered to encourage people to exercise more often and for longer  
36 periods than a non-natural environment which has positive benefits for both mental health  
37 and physical fitness (Health Council..., 2004; Kaczynski & Henderson, 2007). Besides  
38 exercise, intentional interactions with nature, such as watching wildlife, have been shown to  
39 increase psychological well-being (Curtin, 2009).  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51

52  
53  
54 In terms of cognitive benefits, it has been hypothesized that green spaces are restorative,  
55 contributing to attentional recovery and reducing mental fatigue (Björk et al., 2008; Hartig,  
56 Evans, Jamner, Davis, & Gärling, 2003; Kaplan, 2001; Tyrväinen, Ojala, Korpela, Lanki,  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Tsunetsugu, & Kagawa, 2014). In a Finnish study, Korpela, Borodulin, Neuvonen, Paronen,  
4 and Tyrväinen (2014) discovered that the longer the time in nature-based recreation  
5 associated with restorative experiences, the better emotional well-being is perceived. Many of  
6 the health and well-being benefits from outdoor activities can be ascribed to the restorative  
7 capacity of natural environments (Wolf, Stricker, & Hagenloh, 2015). Research findings  
8 suggest that exposure to nature in urban and wilderness settings has positive effects on  
9 academic performance and the ability to perform mentally challenging tasks (Berman,  
10 Jonides, & Kaplan, 2008). For instance, Hartig et al. (1991) concluded that a prolonged  
11 wilderness experience had restorative effects. Van den Berg, Koole and van der Wulp (2003)  
12 showed that, compared with urban environments, natural environments have positive impacts  
13 on the ability to concentrate. Performing activities in green areas has been found to reduce the  
14 symptoms of attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (AD/HD) in children (Kuo & Taylor,  
15 2004). In addition, positive, restorative experiences in natural environments may promote  
16 greater ecological behavior (Hartig, Kaiser, & Strumse 2007).  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

29  
30 According to Han (2010), natural environments differ in their restorative potential. Many  
31 studies have explored, for instance, the positive contribution of the forest environment on  
32 psychological health and well-being (see Karjalainen et al., 2010; Shin, Yeoun, Yoo, & Shin,  
33 2010). Barton and Pretty (2010) concluded that spending time near waterside (e.g. beach or  
34 river) or participating in water-based activities may give a greater benefit although all green  
35 environments improved their participants' self-esteem and mood. Fuller, Irvine, Devine-  
36 Wright, Warren and Gaston (2007), in turn, found that the restorative benefits to urban park  
37 users increased with plant species richness in urban green spaces.  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

### 46 ***Physiological Benefits***

47  
48  
49  
50

51 Research has identified a broad range of physiological benefits from interacting with nature,  
52 i.e. positive effects on physical function and/or physical health. Research findings suggest  
53 that contacts with green space alleviate the negative physiological effects of various stressors  
54 in urban environments (Lee, Li, Tyrväinen, Tsunetsugu, Park, Kagawa, & Miyazaki, 2012;  
55 Tsunetsugu, Park, Ishii, Hirano, Kagawa & Miyazaki, 2007). Compared with urban  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 environments, natural environments produce positive changes in human physiology after  
4 stressful or attention-demanding situations (van den Berg et al., 2003; Hansmann, Hug, &  
5 Seeland, 2007; Hartig et al., 2003). For instance, blood pressure, heart rate, skin conductivity,  
6 and muscle tension are at lower levels in natural environments than in urban settings. Forest  
7 visits also reduce salivary cortisol levels (stress hormone), suppress sympathetic nervous  
8 activity, and enhance para-sympathetic nervous activity (Hartig et al., 2003; Lee et al., 2012;  
9 Tyrväinen et al., 2014).  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17

18 Natural settings activate people to move and, thus, increase energy expenditure and produce  
19 indirect physical health benefits. For instance, Björk et al. (2007) found that recreational  
20 values for nearby natural environments were positively associated with physical activity and  
21 also with a normal or low Body Mass Index (BMI) for tenants. Wolf and Wohlfart (2014)  
22 observed that although hiking in national parks was performed with the primary motivation to  
23 experience nature and not to exercise, hikers burned more energy than runners and walkers as  
24 they preferred more difficult tracks with greater slopes.  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

33 Visits to green areas may also strengthen the human immune system by increasing natural  
34 killer (NK) activity. NK cells can kill tumor cells by releasing anticancer proteins and, thus,  
35 nature visits may have a preventive effect on cancer generation and development (see Lee et  
36 al., 2012). Furthermore, interactions with the natural environment influence the composition  
37 of the human commensal microbiota and its immunomodulatory capacity. The “biodiversity  
38 hypothesis” proposes that reduced contact with natural environment and biodiversity,  
39 including environmental microbiota, leads to poor human microbiota, immune dysfunction  
40 and finally to chronic inflammatory diseases (Hanski et al., 2012).  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

### 51 *Social and Spiritual Benefits*

52  
53  
54

55 Nature can also have a beneficial effect on health by promoting social contact (Health  
56 Council..., 2004). Natural environments and shared nature experiences provide opportunity  
57 for social interaction and strengthen bonds within families and communities (Wolf et al.,  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 2015). Research suggests that provision and access to natural environments may ameliorate  
4 or even reverse some of the social challenges in urban areas (Keniger et al., 2013). Natural  
5 environments foster social empowerment, enhance interracial interaction, and promote social  
6 cohesion and support (e.g. Kuo & Sullivan, 2001; Maller, 2009). Nature can help in personal  
7 and community identity formation, social activity, and social participation (Irvine & Warber,  
8 2002). In comparison with urban areas with limited greenery, significantly lower levels in  
9 crime rates and violent behavior have been observed in urban areas with surrounding green  
10 space or vegetation (Kuo & Sullivan, 2001; Moore, Townsend & Oldroyd, 2007).  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

20 A small number of studies have focused on the spiritual benefits of interacting with nature.  
21 Spiritual benefits identified include the increased inspiration and feelings of connectedness to  
22 a broader reality (e.g. Curtin, 2009; Fredrickson & Anderson, 1999; Humberstone, 2011).  
23 Participation in rural tourism has also been found to elicit a deeper, emotional or spiritual  
24 experience (Jepson & Sharpley, 2015).  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

### 31 **Study Areas**

32  
33  
34  
35

36 Parks & Wildlife Finland (formerly Natural Heritage Services) manages state-owned  
37 protected areas in Finland, including 39 national parks and 19 strict nature reserves. Parks &  
38 Wildlife Finland is a unit of the state-owned enterprise *Metsähallitus* which runs business  
39 activities on state-owned land and water areas while also fulfilling public administration  
40 duties, such as nature conservation, facilities and services for outdoor recreation, and  
41 protected area management planning. While national parks are important destinations for  
42 recreation, strict nature reserves are primarily reserved for the purposes of nature  
43 conservation and research (see *Metsähallitus*, 2016a).  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52

53 In 2010, Parks & Wildlife Finland launched the *Healthy Parks, Healthy People Finland*  
54 program that aims to improve public health by activating people to get out into natural  
55 settings, enjoy positive and genuine experiences, and improve their physical health through  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 outdoor activities. The key objective is to effectively monitor and measure the health benefits  
4 of protected areas so that the findings can be used to enhance services.  
5  
6  
7

8  
9  
10 This study is based on survey data collected by Parks & Wildlife Finland in six protected  
11 areas: Kurjenrahka, Patvinsuo, Repovesi, Pyhä-Luosto, and Syöte National Parks as well as  
12 Kevo Strict Nature Reserve. These areas were selected to represent parks located in different  
13 parts of Finland and with different geographical and visitor characteristics (see Figure 1, in  
14 Supplemental Data in the on line version of this paper). The results of Puustinen, Pouta,  
15 Neuvonen and Sievänen (2009) indicated that both the natural characteristics of national  
16 parks, recreation services and the tourism services in the surrounding municipalities were  
17 associated with the number of park visits in Finland (see Table 1). The number of visits is the  
18 highest in northern parks characterized by fells (i.e relatively mountainous formations) and  
19 abundant recreation and tourism services (e.g. Pyhä-Luosto), while in parks dominated by  
20 bog land or mires (e.g. Patvinsuo) the recreation service level has not affected the number of  
21 visits. Biodiversity has also been shown to be linked with the perceived attractiveness of  
22 Finnish national parks – parks with high biodiversity values are more attractive for visitors  
23 than parks with lower biodiversity values (Siikamäki, Kangas, Paasivaara, & Schoderus,  
24 2015).  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

38 [Figure 1 near here]  
39  
40  
41  
42

43 Kevo Strict Nature Reserve in the northernmost Finland was established in 1956 and  
44 extended in 1982. Kevo is the largest strict nature reserve in Finland with an area of over 712  
45 km<sup>2</sup>. As Kevo is located in a sparsely populated area and far away from the major tourist  
46 centers of northern Finland, the number of yearly visits is only about 5000 (Table 1). Kevo is  
47 popular especially for long-distance wilderness hikes; the 40-km-long canyon-like valley of  
48 the River Kevojoki forms the core of the area. Inside the strict nature reserve visitors are  
49 allowed to walk only on marked trails.  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57

58 [Table 1 near here]  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 Pyhä-Luosto and Syöte National Parks are located near middle-sized skiing resorts in  
6 sparsely populated northern Finland. Pyhätunturi National Park was established in 1938, but  
7 the entire Pyhä-Luosto area, with an area of 142 km<sup>2</sup>, was designated as a national park in  
8 2005. Pyhä-Luosto National Park combining two popular fell areas attracts both day trippers  
9 and long-distance hikers; the number of yearly visits is over 115000 (Table 1). Syöte  
10 National Park was established in 2000 and it covers an area of 299 km<sup>2</sup>. In Syöte, landscape  
11 changes from broad aapa mires<sup>1</sup> to wilderness-like hills growing spruce forests. There are  
12 marked trails for day trips as well as for longer hikes. According to visitor studies, in Pyhä-  
13 Luosto, Syöte, and Kevo approximately 90% of the visitors stay overnight in the surrounding  
14 area or in the park and the share of local visitors is low.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

25 Patvinsuo National Park, established in 1982, is located in sparsely populated eastern  
26 Finland, and it covers an area of 105 km<sup>2</sup>. There are both raised bogs and open aapa mires in  
27 the park. The park is suitable for one or two-day hikes and observing the natural environment  
28 of the wilderness. Patvinsuo is the least visited national park in this study, and over half of its  
29 visitors come from the surrounding area or nearby cities (Table 1).  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36

37 Kurjenrahka and Repovesi National Parks are located in more densely populated southern  
38 Finland, and they are much smaller than the other study areas. Kurjenrahka National Park, 29  
39 km<sup>2</sup>, was designated as a national park in 1998. Kurjenrahka includes the largest raised bogs  
40 of southwestern Finland, which are in their natural state. Within an easy access from the city  
41 of Turku with 186 000 inhabitants, Kurjenrahka is the only close-to-home-recreation area in  
42 this study. Kurjenrahka is a destination for day trips but also for longer excursions. Repovesi  
43 National Park was established in 2003, and it covers an area of 15 km<sup>2</sup>. Rugged forests in  
44 Repovesi are dotted with lakes and ponds, and it is located within a two hour drive from the  
45 capital city Helsinki. Repovesi is one of the most popular hiking areas in southern Finland  
46 and suitable for both day trippers and overnight hikers. The number of yearly visits has  
47 grown fast to over 140000 (Metsähallitus, 2016b; see Table 1).  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Materials and methods

This study was inspired by the study of Lemieux et al. (2012) exploring the perceived health and well-being benefits of two protected areas in Canada. In their study, a questionnaire was developed to reflect a comprehensive suite of health and well-being indicators (or attributes): physical, psychological/emotional, social, intellectual, spiritual, ecological, environmental, cultural, occupational, and economic well-being. The perceived benefits received from protected area experiences were substantial; the greatest well-being benefits were psychological/emotional, social, cultural, and environmental.

In this study two types of survey data were used (Table 2). In the first phase, data was collected through an on-site visitor survey (N=3152). Visitor surveys are conducted by Parks & Wildlife Finland on state-owned conservation and recreational areas every five years. The survey questionnaire includes questions on the length of a visit, travelling to the destination, motives, activities, service demand and rating as well as spending of money. To find out about health and well-being benefits, the visitors were asked to what extent they thought that the visit increased their social, psychological and physical well-being respectively (1=strongly disagree ...5=strongly agree) and to estimate the monetary value of perceived well-being benefits. Social well-being was specified as “e.g., improved working capacity, strengthened social relations, enjoyed doing things alone or together,” psychological well-being as “e.g., satisfaction with life, improved the mood, recovery from mental stress, learned something new”, and physical well-being as “e.g., enjoyed sensing the nature, maintained the fitness, learned new skills, perceived physical well-being”. In addition, visitors were prompted to leave their email address to participate in the more detailed second survey.

[Table 2 near here]

In the second phase, those respondents who had left their contact details were emailed a web questionnaire approximately one week after their visit (N=1054). The web survey included 36 statements of different well-being effects assessed with a 5-point Likert-scale (1=strongly

1  
2  
3 disagree...5=strongly agree). The statements covered different aspects of physical well-being  
4 benefits (activities, sensations), psychological well-being (restoration, relaxation, being  
5 creative, intellectual stimulation), and social well-being (interaction, togetherness, bonding,  
6 occupational well-being). The statements were designed based on the Canadian study  
7 (Lemieux et al., 2012) but adapted to the Finnish context. Questions related to economic,  
8 cultural, and ecological well-being were left out of the survey. In addition, the questionnaire  
9 included a structured question on the visitors' estimation on the duration of the positive  
10 impacts ("for a long time", "for some time", "during the visit", "no positive impacts"), the  
11 monetary valuation of the impacts (open-ended), respondents' relationship with the place of a  
12 visit (protected area), their physical exercise habits and physical characteristics, their  
13 relationship with nature, and if they travelled with children, the impacts of the visit to the  
14 children. The visitor survey was available in several languages, while the web survey was  
15 available only in Finnish (Kaikkonen, Virkkunen, Kajala, Erkkonen, Aarnio, & Korpelainen,  
16 2014). On average, the web survey was responded to three weeks after the on-site survey.  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

30 Key demographic characteristics of both studies are presented in Table 3. The share of  
31 respondents with higher education is larger in the web survey, which indicates that especially  
32 the educated respondents of the visitor survey left their contact details and answered the  
33 follow-up survey.  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

40 [Table 3 near here]  
41  
42  
43  
44

45 Data gathered through the questionnaires were combined, stored and analyzed using SPSS  
46 software. The results are reported in the following sections via the descriptive statistics of  
47 different variables. Differences between respondent groups are compared using the  
48 nonparametric Mann–Whitney U and Kruskal–Wallis tests since the data were not normally  
49 distributed.  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55

56 Factor analysis was conducted to detect the different dimensions of well-being studied with  
57 the extensive web survey and to see how they compared with those of the Canadian study  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 (Lemieux et al., 2012). Exploratory factor analysis via the principal component method and  
4 using Varimax-rotation (orthogonal) with Kaiser normalization resulted in 8 factors with  
5 eigenvalues greater than 1. Four variables that did not have a strong loading (below 0.5) at  
6 any of the factors were removed from the analysis after repeating the procedure twice. Two  
7 variables (“Weather conditions felt unpleasant”, “I found insects (mosquitos, elk flies, wasps,  
8 mites etc.) disturbing”) were removed from the analysis as weather and insect conditions are  
9 highly changeable and dependent on the time of the visit. The remaining 30 variables had 6  
10 factors with eigenvalues above 1 and explain together 59.5% of the variance. The factors  
11 were turned into composite variables by calculating an average of the variables assigned to  
12 each of the factor. These 6 variables were used as dependent variables in the analysis.  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

### 23 **Results of the on-site visitor survey**

#### 24 *Type and strength of well-being benefits*

25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33 Visitors’ perceived benefits to their health and well-being were highly positive. All three  
34 dimensions of well-being (social, physical, psychological) had means above 4 on the 5-point  
35 Likert-scale (Table 4). Physical and psychological well-being scored mean values above 4.4  
36 and social well-being 4.2.  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

43 [Table 4 near here]

44  
45  
46  
47  
48 As another indicator of the strength of the perceived well-being effects, the monetary value of  
49 the well-being benefits of the visit was surveyed in an open-ended question. As a reference,  
50 the respondents were given examples of prices of commercial wellness services ranging from  
51 a gym visit (€5) to a trip abroad (€3000). Responses ranged from 0 to €100,000, the median  
52 being €150. In the on-site survey 31.9% of respondents gave values under or equal to €50 and  
53 16.1% between 51–€100. Forty-two percent of respondents estimated the value to be in the  
54 range of 101–€500, 1.6% between 501–€999, and 8.4% above or equal to €1000.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

### *Impact of background and visitor variables*

The impact of background variables on the perception of well-being benefits was studied comparing respondent groups of different gender, age, and education. The impact of the characteristics of the visit, in turn, was studied comparing visitors to different protected areas, day and overnight visitors, those who travelled alone vs. in a group, and first-time vs. repeat visitors (Table 4).

In general, women rated all well-being benefits higher than men. The oldest (65 and older) and the youngest (under 30) age group rated the three types of well-being benefits the lowest, while those between 30–64 years of age gave higher ratings. The youngest and the oldest differed significantly from others in terms of social and psychological well-being, while in terms of physical well-being only the difference between the youngest and middle age group (45–64 years old) was significant.

Differences between the visitor ratings of different areas were significant, especially in relation to social and physical well-being. The visitors to Kevo, Syöte, Pyhä-Luosto, and Patvinsuo in northern and eastern Finland rated higher the different forms of well-being benefits they had gained during the visit. In turn, Kurjenrahka and Repovesi visitors in more densely populated southern Finland gave the most moderate ratings.

In terms of length of stay, overnight visitors perceived the impacts more positively than those who stayed a shorter time. Especially psychological well-being was rated higher by overnight respondents. Travel companion affected people's perceptions so that those who travelled alone rated physical well-being higher than others, whereas those who had company rated social well-being higher than others. There were no significant differences between first-time and repeat visitors.

## Results of the web survey

### *Type and strength of well-being benefits*

The six latent factors identified by factor analysis from the extensive web survey gave a more detailed understanding about the different dimensions of health and well-being benefits than the three dimensions used in the on-site survey (Table 5). The first factor includes variables related to restoration and relaxation (“My vitality and energy increased”, “I calmed down”, “My concentration improved”) as well as self-esteem (“My self-confidence increased”, “I got better hope for tomorrow”, “My life was put into perspective”). These have often been listed as the key psychological well-being benefits of nature (Keniger et al., 2013) as well as protected areas (Lemieux et al., 2012). In this study, psychological well-being was associated with improved work motivation and motivation for everyday life that is occupational well-being as defined by Lemieux et al. (ibid). Therefore, the first factor was named as *Psychological and occupational well-being*.

[Table 5 near here]

Variables relating to cognitive skills and opportunities to engage in creative and stimulating activities (see Lemieux et al., 2012) were loaded into the second factor (“I learned new skills”, “I learned more about nature”, “My interest towards nature increased”), which was named as *Intellectual well-being*. Also the variable “I enjoyed meeting new people during the visit” had the highest loading to the second factor.

Related to psychological well-being, a separate third factor was formed by variables “I forgot everyday worries”, “I had a chance to get away from work” and “I had a chance to get away from everyday life”. These are all variables related to finding a counterbalance to stressful everyday life and work: this factor was named as *Escape*.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 The fourth factor was called *Social well-being*. It consists of variables promoting  
6  
7 togetherness, social contact, participation, and bonding that have been found to be important  
8  
9 social well-being benefits from nature (“I enjoyed spending time with people I cherish”, “I  
10  
11 enjoyed shared activities with people I cherish”, “I found it easier to talk about personal  
12  
13 matters in nature”, “Being in nature fostered my relationship with people I cherish”) (see  
14  
15 Lemieux et al., 2012). In addition, the variable “Having company increased my feeling of  
16  
17 security” loaded to the factor, which suggests that common experiences in somewhat  
18  
19 challenging natural environments may strengthen bonds with family members and friends.  
20  
21

22 Variables related to the perceived benefit to *Physical well-being* were loaded to the fifth  
23  
24 factor. These included variables related to exercise (“During my visit to the area I exercised  
25  
26 more than in everyday life”, “I felt the nature exercise improved my physical condition”),  
27  
28 being able to test one’s physical strength (“I was able to test my physical strength”), and in  
29  
30 general the feeling of physical well-being (“I felt my physical well-being improved”) (see  
31  
32 Lemieux et al., 2012).  
33  
34

35 Separate from physical fitness, strength, and exercise, the sixth factor was formed by  
36  
37 variables emphasizing the different sensations provided by the visit. These were related to  
38  
39 sound (“I enjoyed sounds of nature”, “I enjoyed silence”), sight (“I enjoyed beautiful  
40  
41 nature”), smell (“I enjoyed the fragrance of nature”, “It felt good to breathe fresh air”), and  
42  
43 feel (“The feel of nature was pleasant (wind on my face, soft moss, the shapes of different  
44  
45 surfaces”). These variables are related to the often instantaneous and momentary feelings  
46  
47 provided by nature, and the factor was named as *Sensory satisfaction*.  
48  
49

50 Out of these six factors, *Sensory satisfaction* (factor 6) and *Escape* (factor 3) scored the  
51  
52 highest mean values, above 4.5, while *Intellectual well-being* (factor 2) as well as  
53  
54 *Psychological* and *occupational well-being* (factor 1) received the lowest ratings with mean  
55  
56 values below 4. The web survey thus deepens the result of the on-site visitor survey by  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 suggesting that, in terms of physical well-being and psychological well-being, sensory  
4 satisfaction and escape from everyday life are especially important.  
5  
6  
7  
8

9  
10 In line with the visitor survey, the web survey included a question on the monetary value of  
11 the perceived well-being benefits. The estimations of respondents on monetary value ranged  
12 from 0 euros to a billion with the median of €150. Thirty-one percent gave values under or  
13 equal to €50 and 15.6% between €51–€100. In turn, 40.1% estimated the value of well-being  
14 impacts between €101–€500, 2.2% between €501–€999, and 10.9% gave values equal to or  
15 above €100.  
16  
17  
18  
19

20  
21  
22  
23 From those respondents who replied to both surveys, 28.1% gave higher values in the on-site  
24 visitor survey. Similarly, 27.9% of those respondents gave higher values in the web survey.  
25 In both cases, the median for the value change was €100. Forty-four percent of respondents  
26 did not change their mind about the monetary value of well-being effects. Therefore, for the  
27 largest share of the respondents the benefits of the park visit did not decrease after they  
28 returned home.  
29  
30  
31  
32

33  
34  
35 Web survey respondents were also asked to estimate the duration of the physical,  
36 psychological, and social well-being impacts of their visit. In general, respondents agreed that  
37 the impacts were not restricted only to the visit, but lasted longer. Psychological impacts were  
38 estimated to last the longest: 50.8% of the respondents answered that the mental impacts  
39 would last “for a long time after the visit”, 45.8% estimated they would last “for some time  
40 after the visit”. In turn, 3.3% responded the visit had psychological impacts only “during the  
41 visit” and 0.2% answered the visit “did not have positive impacts”. The same percentages for  
42 social impacts were the following: “for a long time” – 40.3%, “for some time” – 46.5%,  
43 “during the visit” – 10.9%, “no positive impacts” – 2.3%, and for physical impacts: “for a  
44 long time” – 13.5%, “for some time” – 67.6%, “during the visit” – 17.4%, “no positive  
45 impacts” – 1.6%.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55

56  
57 *Impact of background and visitor variables*  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 Likewise to the on-site visitor survey, the perceived well-being benefits of groups of  
6 respondents of different gender, age, and education were compared. In addition, respondents'  
7 body mass indices (BMI) were calculated based on their height and weight asked in the web  
8 survey (Table S1, in Supplemental Data in the on line version of this paper). The following  
9 equation was used:  
10  
11  
12

$$13 \quad BMI = \frac{weight}{height^2}$$

14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20 For weight and height kilograms and meters were used, respectively. Twenty-five was used  
21 as the threshold value with those of BMI equal to 25 or lower were categorized as normal or  
22 underweight, and those above 25 as overweight.  
23  
24  
25

26  
27  
28  
29 [see Table S1 in near here]  
30  
31  
32

33  
34 Similarly to the visitor survey, women ranked all well-being effects higher except from  
35 *Intellectual well-being* (factor 2). Both genders rated *Sensory satisfaction* as the highest  
36 (factor 5). In contrast to the visitor survey, age groups differed from each other only in terms  
37 of *Psychological* and *Occupational well-being* (factor 1) as well as *Escape* (factor 3). The  
38 well-being benefits of these were rated lower by those above 65 years of age. This is  
39 explained by the importance of work related variables in both factors and the fact that most of  
40 those in the oldest age group are likely to be retired.  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

46  
47  
48 In terms of education, those with higher education rated *Intellectual well-being* (factor 2)  
49 higher than others. Thus, while in the visitor survey psychological well-being was rated  
50 higher by the more educated, this might have been due to the cognitive dimensions of  
51 psychological well-being, not necessarily restoration, emotions, or stress relief.  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Respondents who were overweight gave higher ratings to *Physical well-being* (factor 7)  
4 benefits than the rest. Those within the recommended or underweight category, in turn,  
5 appreciated higher the benefits of *Escape* (factor 3), *Social well-being* (factor 4), and *Sensory*  
6 *satisfaction* (factor 6).  
7  
8  
9

10  
11  
12 When visitors to different protected areas were compared, the web survey gave even clearer  
13 proof that different types of parks have potentially different well-being benefits, partly due to  
14 different visitor profiles and characteristics of their visits. Similarly to the on-site survey,  
15 visitors to Kevo gave the highest ratings, and Syöte and Pyhä-Luosto visitors also gave high  
16 scores. Kurjenrahka and Repovesi visitors, in contrast, gave the lowest ratings. Overnight  
17 visitors reported higher well-being with respect to all six dimensions of well-being. Travel  
18 companion affected people's perceptions so that those who travelled alone rated  
19 *Psychological and occupational well-being* (factor 1) higher whereas those who had  
20 company rated *Social well-being* (factor 3) higher. While no differences between first-time  
21 and repeat visitors were found in the visitor survey, the first-time visitors gave higher scores  
22 to *Intellectual well-being* (factor 2), *Escape* (factor 3), *Social well-being* (factor 4) as well as  
23 *Physical well-being* (factor 5) benefits in the web survey.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

## 36 **Discussion**

37  
38  
39  
40  
41 Our results confirm the positive effects of protected areas for visitors' psychological,  
42 physical, and social health and well-being. The perceived benefits of Finnish national parks  
43 and strict nature reserves were strong and long-lasting. Visitors highly rated their benefits  
44 during the visit as well as after returning home. Valuations in monetary terms were similar  
45 during and after the visit. On average, the health benefits of visiting a protected area were  
46 estimated to be equal to many popular commercial wellness services, but the range of  
47 monetary values was wide.  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55

56 Six factors of well-being identified in the study corresponded to previous literature, but the  
57 study also revealed new aspects and deepen the understanding of different dimensions of  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 well-being protected areas can offer. In terms of psychological well-being, three factors with  
4 a slightly different emphasis were distinguished. Firstly, restorative and occupational well-  
5 being benefits formed one factor suggesting that a visit to a protected area can increase a  
6 person's psychological capacities and positive mood (see Barton & Pretty, 2010; Wolf &  
7 Wohlfart, 2014). Secondly, protected areas stimulate a person's brain and skills providing  
8 intellectual well-being benefits (see Berman et al., 2008; Hartig et al., 1991). In our study  
9 also meeting new people in the park was associated with intellectual rather than social well-  
10 being suggesting that, at least in the Finnish context, cognitive skills can equally be about  
11 nature, activities, and social relations.  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17

18  
19  
20  
21 Thirdly, a visit to a protected area has a potential of providing a needed counterbalance to,  
22 and escape from, everyday life and routine environments. Escape is an aspect that has not  
23 been previously discussed as a separate well-being benefit of protected areas, but it is a  
24 common tourism motive (e.g. Iso-Ahola, 1982). Dunn Ross and Iso-Ahola (1991) suggested  
25 that the psychological benefits of recreational travel emanate from the interplay of escaping  
26 and seeking personal and interpersonal opportunities. The identification of escape as a  
27 separate well-being dimension indicates that a visit to a protected area has also potential of  
28 providing many well-being benefits looked for from other types of tourist trips. For instance,  
29 Gilbert and Abdullah (2004) showed that taking a holiday changed the sense of well-being  
30 and enabled individuals to enhance their sense of happiness (see Dolnicar, Yanamandram, &  
31 Cliff, 2012). When operationalizing and empirically testing Iso-Ahola's (1982) motivation  
32 theory, Snepenger, King, Marshall and Uysal (2006) observed that motivational items for  
33 personal and interpersonal escape as well as for personal and interpersonal seeking were  
34 higher for the tourism experience (e.g. in a national park) than for similar recreation  
35 experience (e.g. in a local park). Weber and Anderson (2010), in turn, showed that escapism,  
36 either from personal or physical pressures, was a very important motivation for visitors in  
37 Australian urban and regional parks (see Wolf et al., 2015).  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

50  
51 Similarly to psychological well-being, physical well-being also turned out to be more  
52 multifaceted than expected. On one hand, a visit to a protected area has positive impacts  
53 through encouraging physical activities and exercise as well as testing one's physical limits  
54 and strength (see Kaczynski & Henderson, 2007). On the other hand, and separately from  
55 physical activity, being out in nature increases perceived well-being through pleasant and  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 satisfactory sensations. These sensations were stronger than other types of physical well-  
4 being, which indicates that embodied experiences of nature are memorable (see  
5 Humberstone, 2011). When studying park users' own reasons for, and benefits gained from,  
6 green space usage with open-ended interview questions, Irvine, Warber, Devine-Wright and  
7 Gaston (2013) identified an important breadth to the "experience of nature"; fresh air, getting  
8 outside and sunshine emerged strongly suggesting that these intangibles were highly valued.  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15

16 In general, the different health and well-being benefits were rated highly by most respondents  
17 and differences between the different groups of respondents were small. Women rated the  
18 well-being benefits higher than men, those aged between 30–65 higher than younger or older  
19 respondents, and differences were also found between normal and overweight respondents.  
20 Gender impact has also been noticed in previous studies (e.g. Lemieux et al., 2012, 2015). It  
21 may be a reflection of women showing a greater need for, or susceptibility to, experiences  
22 that foster well-being (Wolf & Wohlfart, 2014) or of women's better health literacy  
23 (Niemelä, Ek, Eriksson-Backa, & Huotari, 2012). This means that women are more  
24 motivated to obtain health information and are more able to reflect their own well-being.  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

34 Although differences between younger and older people have been observed in other studies  
35 (e.g. Barton & Pretty, 2010), the small difference between age groups in our study seemed to  
36 be related to different life phase and time use patterns, rather than age or generational  
37 differences. The oldest and for the most part retired respondents gave lower ratings to the  
38 work-related benefits than others. However, this does not mean that these benefits were  
39 unimportant for the oldest age group; for instance, they rated escape with a mean value above  
40 4. Although retired people seek less of a counterbalance to work, they may seek personal and  
41 interpersonal opportunities and escape from everyday life. For instance, Hunter-Jones and  
42 Blackburn (2007) observed that taking a holiday offered significant benefits to senior tourists  
43 in terms of personal health and social effectiveness (e.g. interaction with others, feelings of  
44 inclusion). Wolf et al. (2015) highlighted the role of guided activities in national parks in  
45 better integrating senior citizens into the community and providing opportunities to increase  
46 their well-being. Therefore, it might be more beneficial to compare groups of visitors with  
47 different motivations rather than gender, age, or education (see Konu & Kajala, 2012).  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 In general, our study suggests that protected areas have great potential for providing positive  
7 health and well-being experiences to a range of different groups despite their background,  
8 age, gender, or physical condition. In our study the respondents categorized as overweight  
9 rated the physical well-being benefits higher than those who were normal or underweight.  
10  
11 This result may signal that a visit to a protected area can function as a motivator to encourage  
12 exercise among groups that otherwise exercise too little (see Björk et al., 2008). Physical  
13 activity may be incidental to other activities such as sightseeing, socializing, and  
14 experiencing nature, as noticed in Wolf's and Wohlfart's (2014) study.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

20  
21  
22 One of the most interesting findings of our study is the difference between the perceived  
23 well-being benefits of different types of protected areas. In general, visitors to the northern  
24 parks Kevo, Syöte, and Pyhä-Luosto gave higher well-being ratings. The differences are  
25 partly explained by the characteristics of the parks, visits, and visitor profiles. These areas are  
26 located relatively far away from the major population centers, and most visitors are domestic  
27 tourists. In Kevo, over 90% of the visitors are hikers who stay in the park overnight (in a tent,  
28 lean-to shelter or open hut) while in Syöte and Pyhä-Luosto most visitors spend the night in  
29 the surrounding area. Since these visitors of the northern parks spend several days in the area,  
30 they are probably very motivated to travel to the area and prepared for the trip. Similarly,  
31 Kaikkonen and Rautiainen (2014) found that the well-being benefits perceived by fishermen  
32 and hunters were higher in the vast expanses of hunting areas in northern Finland. Lower  
33 rated Kurjenrahka and Repovesi parks, in turn, are within a day or weekend trip zone for city  
34 dwellers in southern Finland. Length of stay, and especially spending the night in the park,  
35 significantly increased the perceived well-being benefits in our study. Interestingly, first-time  
36 visitors gave higher scores to several dimensions of well-being than repeat visitors in the web  
37 survey. The differences are partly explained by the high share (71%) of first-time visitors in  
38 Kevo Strict Nature Reserve which received the highest ratings. As Kevo is a remote  
39 destination for long-distance hikes, there are fewer repeat visitors than in other study areas.  
40 Also, motivation-based visitor segments have been shown to be different in parks (Konu &  
41 Kajala, 2012).  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 The results emphasize the importance of both close-to-home recreation and nature-based  
4 tourism destinations for human health and well-being. Protected areas located further away  
5 from people's living environments encourage people to spend longer times in nature and have  
6 potential to provide stronger benefits, including escape from everyday life, than other types  
7 of green spaces. While political attention (e.g. in EU) is increasingly directed towards urban  
8 parks and nature-based solutions in producing healthy and sustainable living environments,  
9 the contribution of rural and more peripheral natural areas to population health should not be  
10 forgotten. Visitor rates in these areas and the popularity of nature-based tourism constantly  
11 increase (see Jepson & Sharpley, 2015; Lane & Kastenzholz, 2015). This conclusion is echoed  
12 by Weber and Anderson's (2010) result of a greater attainment for several benefits by visitors  
13 in regional rather than urban parks, emphasizing the importance of maintaining or expanding  
14 existing low development conservation zones. Meanwhile, it is important to manage  
15 problems (e.g. crowding, littering or erosion) caused by increasing visitor numbers as they  
16 may also influence perceived well-being benefits.  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

30 While our study indicates the potential dimensions of well-being in protected areas and  
31 differences between the respondent groups, our study does not decipher what exactly are the  
32 intrinsic qualities of nature itself that originate these perceptions or which qualities make  
33 benefits stronger and last longer. The importance of considering biological diversity and  
34 complexity as opposed to loosely defined "nature" when investigating the benefits of  
35 interacting with nature has increasingly been emphasized as a solution to this problem (Fuller  
36 et al., 2007; Keniger et al., 2013). Although the highest rated northern parks are located in  
37 landscapes dominated by fells or hills, any further conclusions about the influence of  
38 topography, land cover, or biodiversity on the perceived benefits would require a more  
39 detailed study. Furthermore, while the importance of different sensations and sensory  
40 satisfaction was highlighted in our study, it was also noted in Portugal (Carneiro, Lima, &  
41 Lavrador Silva, 2015): further research on the reasons for this and its management and  
42 marketing implications is needed. In northern countries such as Finland these sensations may  
43 be very different in summer than in winter, which emphasizes the importance of studying  
44 perceived well-being benefits in different seasons. Also, Irvine et al. (2013) found in their  
45 qualitative study that when asked directly, users of urban green space gave more motivations  
46 and benefits than suggested by any existing theories or identified through the use of a closed-  
47 ended checklist drawn from previous research.  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7 In Finland and other western societies national parks and other protected areas have been  
8 increasingly assigned the new mandate as ‘the fountains of health and well-being’ for the  
9 urbanized population. For instance, the global movement *Healthy Parks Healthy People* (see:  
10 <http://www.hphpcentral.com/>) harnesses the power of parks and public lands in contributing  
11 to a healthy civil society. Accordingly, health and well-being benefits are increasingly used to  
12 justify financial and political support for parks and committing to the preservation of  
13 biological diversity and ecosystem services (see Stolton & Dudley, 2010). Our findings  
14 suggest that this new mandate and objectives are well justified. At least in the Finnish  
15 context, protected areas have the potential of significantly contributing to public health. In  
16 2013 the total value of the perceived health and well-being benefits of Finnish national parks  
17 was estimated €226 million (Vähäsarja, 2014) while the total maintenance cost of parks was  
18 over €6 million according to Parks & Wildlife Finland. The value of the health and well-  
19 being benefits of all state-owned natural areas was estimated €1.1 billion while the total  
20 expenditure on Finnish health care was €17.1 billion in 2011 (ibid.). However, the health and  
21 well-being impacts of protected areas should not be taken for granted, and the new mandate  
22 should not be assigned to parks without scientific evidence and appropriate indicators to  
23 monitor the benefits.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

38 Our results indicate that different well-being impacts of protected areas are not yet  
39 sufficiently identified. Our respondents rated highest the benefits related to escape and  
40 sensory satisfaction. These types of well-being impacts have not been thoroughly identified  
41 or discussed separately in previous studies (e.g. Lemieux et al., 2012). However, it should be  
42 acknowledged that exploratory factor analysis used in the study is driven by the items  
43 included. Additional dimensions of well-being may exist that were not adequately covered by  
44 the item set used in the study. Similarly, our study revealed differences in the perceived well-  
45 being between respondents of different demographic groups that may partially be explained  
46 by different capacities to interpret and reflect the survey questions. Therefore, more research,  
47 including qualitative studies, is needed to deepen the understanding of the different  
48 dimensions of health and well-being provided by protected areas and for developing  
49 appropriate and demographically sensitive/equal indicators to monitor the health and well-  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 being benefits. And finally, the implications of this paper and of future studies need to be  
4 considered by Park and edge of Park planners in terms of infrastructure and especially  
5 accommodation development. Much could be learned from the comparison between low  
6 intensity and high intensity park management discussed in Getzner, Lange Vik, Brendehaug,  
7 and Lane (2014).  
8  
9  
10

## 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 **References**

18  
19  
20  
21 Balmford, A., Green, J. M. H., Anderson, M., Beresford, J., Huang, J., Naidoo, R., ...  
22 Manica, A. (2015). Walk on the wild side: Estimating the global magnitude of visits to  
23 protected areas. *PLoS Biology*, 13, e1002074. doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.1002074  
24  
25  
26

27  
28  
29  
30 Barton, J., & Pretty, J. (2010). What is the best dose of nature and green exercise for  
31 improving mental health? A multi-study analysis. *Environmental Science & Technology*, 44,  
32 3947–3955.  
33  
34

35  
36  
37  
38 van den Berg, A. E., Koole, S. L., & van der Wulp, N. Y. (2003). Environmental preference  
39 and restoration: (How) are they related? *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 23, 135–146.  
40  
41  
42

43  
44  
45 Berman, M. G., Jonides, J., & Kaplan, S. (2008). The cognitive benefits of interacting with  
46 nature. *Psychological Science*, 19, 1207–1212.  
47  
48

49  
50  
51 Björk, J., Albin, M., Grahn, P., Jacobsson, H., Ardö, J., Wadbro, J., ... Skärbäck, E. (2008).  
52 Recreational values of the natural environment in relation to neighbourhood satisfaction,  
53 physical activity, obesity and wellbeing. *Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health*,  
54 62:e2. doi:10.1136/jech.2007.062414  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Bowler, D. E., Buyung-Ali, L. M., Knight, T. M., & Pullin, A. S. (2010). A systemic review of evidence for the added benefits to health of exposure to natural environments. *BMC Public Health*, 10:456. doi: 10.1186/1471-2458-10-456

Byström, J., & Müller, D. K. (2014). Tourism labor market impacts of national parks. The case of Swedish Lapland. *Zeitschrift für Wirtschaftsgeographie*, 58, 115–126.

Carneiro, M. J., Lima, J., & Lavrador Silva, A. (2015). Landscape and the rural tourism experience: Identifying key elements, addressing potential, and implications for the future. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 23, 1217–1235.

Curtin, S. (2009). Wildlife tourism: The intangible, psychological benefits of human-wildlife encounters. *Current Issues Tourism*, 12, 451–474.

Dolnicar, S., Yanamandram, V., & Cliff, K. (2012). The contribution of vacations to quality of life. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 39, 59–83.

Dunn Ross, E. L., & Iso-Ahola, S. E. (1991). Sightseeing tourists' motivation and satisfaction. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 18, 226–237.

Fredrickson, L. M., & Anderson, D. H. (1999). A qualitative exploration of the wilderness experience as a source of spiritual inspiration. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 19, 21–39.

Fuller, R. A., Irvine, K. N., Devine-Wright, P., Warren, P. H., & Gaston, K. J. (2007). Psychological benefits of greenspace increase with biodiversity. *Biology Letters*, 3, 390–394.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Getzner, M., Lange Vik, M., Brendehaug, E., & Lane, B. (2014). Governance and management strategies in national parks: Implications for sustainable regional development. *International Journal of Sustainable Society*, 6, 82–101.

Gilbert, D., & Abdullah, J. (2004). Holidaytaking and the sense of well-being. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 31, 103–121.

Hammer, T., Mose, I., Siegrist, D., & Weixlbaumer, N. (2007). Protected areas and regional development in Europe: Towards a new model for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century. In I. Mose (Ed.), *Protected areas and regional development in Europe. Towards a new model for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century* (pp. 233–246). Aldershot: Ashgate.

Han, K. (2010). An exploration of relationships among the responses to natural scenes: Scenic beauty, preference and restoration. *Environment and Behavior*, 42, 243–270.

Hanski, I., von Herten, L., Fyhrquist, N., Koskinen, K., Torppa, K., Laatikainen, T., ... Haahtela, T. (2012). Environmental biodiversity, human microbiota, and allergy are interrelated. *PNAS*, 109, 8334–8339.

Hansmann, R., Hug, S., & Seeland, K. (2007). Restoration and stress relief through physical activities in forests and parks. *Urban Forestry Urban Greening*, 6, 213–225.

Hartig, T., Mang, M., & Evans, G. W. (1991). Restorative effects of natural environment experiences. *Environment & Behavior*, 23, 3–26.

1  
2  
3 Hartig, T., Evans, G. W., Jamner, L. D., Davis, D. S., & Gärling, T. (2003). Tracking  
4 restoration in natural and urban field settings. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 23,  
5 109–123.  
6  
7

8  
9  
10  
11 Hartig, T., Kaiser, F. G., & Strumse, E. (2007). Psychological restoration in nature as a  
12 source of motivation for ecological behaviour. *Environmental Conservation*, 34, 291–299.  
13  
14

15  
16  
17  
18 Health Council of the Netherlands and Dutch Advisory Council for Research on Spatial  
19 Planning, Nature and the Environment. (2004). *Nature and health. The influence of nature on*  
20 *social, psychological and physical well-being*. The Hague: Health Council of the Netherlands  
21 and RMNO. Retrieved (20.9.2016) from  
22 [https://www.gezondheidsraad.nl/sites/default/files/Nature\\_and\\_health.pdf](https://www.gezondheidsraad.nl/sites/default/files/Nature_and_health.pdf)  
23  
24  
25  
26

27  
28  
29 Hjalager, A-M., Konu, H., Huijbens, E. H., Björk, P., Flagestad, A., Nordin, S., & Tuohino,  
30 A. (2011). *Innovation and re-branding Nordic wellbeing tourism*. Nordic Innovation Centre.  
31 Retrieved (20.9.2016) from  
32 [http://www.nordicinnovation.org/Global/\\_Publications/Reports/2011/2011\\_NordicWellbeing](http://www.nordicinnovation.org/Global/_Publications/Reports/2011/2011_NordicWellbeingTourism_report.pdf)  
33 [Tourism\\_report.pdf](http://www.nordicinnovation.org/Global/_Publications/Reports/2011/2011_NordicWellbeingTourism_report.pdf)  
34  
35  
36  
37

38  
39  
40  
41 Humberstone, B. (2011). Embodiment and social and environmental action in nature-based  
42 sport: Spiritual spaces. *Leisure Studies*, 30, 495–512.  
43  
44

45  
46  
47  
48 Hunter-Jones, P., & Blackburn, A. (2007). Understanding the relationship between holiday-  
49 taking and self-assessed health: An exploratory study of senior tourism. *International Journal*  
50 *of Consumer Studies*, 31, 509–516.  
51  
52

53  
54  
55  
56 Irvine K. N., & Warber, S. L. (2002). Greening healthcare: Practicing as if the natural  
57 environment really mattered. *Alternative Therapies in Health and Medicine*, 8, 76–83.  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Irvine, K. N., Warber, S. L., Devine-Wright, P., & Gaston, K. J. (2013). Understanding urban green space as a health resource: A qualitative comparison of visit motivation and derived effects among park users in Sheffield, UK. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 10, 417–442.

Iso-Ahola, S. E. (1982). Toward a social psychological theory of tourism motivation: A rejoinder. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 9, 256–262.

Jepson, D., & Sharpley, R. (2015). More than sense of place? Exploring the emotional dimension of rural tourism experiences. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 23, 1157–1178.

Kaczynski, A. T., & Henderson, K. A. (2007). Environmental correlates of physical activity: A review of evidence about parks and recreation. *Leisure Sciences*, 29, 315–354.

Kaikkonen, H., & Rautiainen, M. (2014). *Terveyttä ja hyvinvointia valtion mailta – tarkastelussa metsästäjät ja kalastajat* [Health and well-being in State-owned land – study of hunters and fisherman]. Nature Protection Publications of Metsähallitus. Series A 209. Vantaa: Metsähallitus. Retrieved (20.9.2016) from <https://julkaisut.metsa.fi/assets/pdf/lp/Asarja/a209.pdf>

Kaikkonen, H., Virkkunen, V., Kajala, L., Erkkonen, J., Aarnio, M., & Korpelainen, R. (2014). *Terveyttä ja hyvinvointia kansallispuistoista – tutkimus kävijöiden kokemista vaikutuksista* [Health and well-being from Finnish national parks – A study on benefits perceived by visitors]. Executive summary in English. Nature Protection Publications of Metsähallitus. Series A 208. Vantaa: Metsähallitus. Retrieved (20.9.2016) from <https://julkaisut.metsa.fi/assets/pdf/lp/Asarja/a208.pdf>

1  
2  
3 Kaplan, R. (2001). The nature of the view from home: Psychological benefits. *Environment*  
4 *and Behavior*, 33, 507–542.  
5  
6

7  
8  
9 Karjalainen, E., Sarjala, T., & Raitio, H. (2010). Promoting human health through forests:  
10 Overview and major challenges. *Environmental Health and Preventive Medicine*, 15, 1–8.  
11  
12

13  
14  
15 Keniger, L., Gaston, K., Irvine, K. N., & Fuller, R. (2013). What are the benefits of  
16 interacting with nature? *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*,  
17 10, 913–935.  
18  
19  
20

21  
22  
23 Konu, H., & Kajala, L. (2012). *Segmenting protected area visitors based on their*  
24 *motivations*. Nature Protection Publications by Metsähallitus. Series A 194. Vantaa:  
25 Metsähallitus. Retrieved (20.9.2016) from  
26 <https://julkaisut.metsa.fi/assets/pdf/lp/Asarja/a194.pdf>  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

32  
33  
34 Korpela, K., Borodulin, K., Neuvonen, M., Paronen, O., & Tyrväinen, L. (2014). Analyzing  
35 the mediators between nature-based outdoor recreation and emotional well-being. *Journal of*  
36 *Environmental Psychology*, 37, 1–7.  
37  
38  
39

40  
41  
42 Kuo, F. E., & Sullivan, W. C. (2001). Aggression and violence in the inner city. Effects of  
43 environment via mental fatigue. *Environment and Behavior*, 33, 543 –571.  
44  
45  
46  
47

48  
49 Kuo F. E., & Taylor A. F. (2004). A potential natural treatment for attention-  
50 deficit/hyperactivity disorder: Evidence from a national study. *American Journal of Public*  
51 *Health*, 94, 1580–6.  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Lane, B., & Kastenholtz, E. (2015). Rural tourism: The evolution of practice and research  
4 approaches – towards a new generation concept? *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 23, 1133–  
5 1156.  
6  
7

8  
9  
10 Lee, J., Li, Q., Tyrväinen, L., Tsunetsugu, Y., Park, B-J., Kagawa, T., & Miyazaki, Y. (2012).  
11 Nature therapy and preventive medicine. In J. Maddock (Ed.), *Public health – Social and*  
12 *behavioral health*, InTech Open (pp. 325–350). Retrieved (20.9.2016) from  
13 [http://www.intechopen.com/books/howtoreference/public-health-social-and-behavioral-](http://www.intechopen.com/books/howtoreference/public-health-social-and-behavioral-health/nature-therapy-and-preventive-medicine)  
14 [health/nature-therapy-and-preventive-medicine](http://www.intechopen.com/books/howtoreference/public-health-social-and-behavioral-health/nature-therapy-and-preventive-medicine)  
15  
16  
17

18  
19  
20  
21  
22 Lemieux, C., Eagles, P., Slocombe, D., Doherty, S., Elliott, S., & Mock S. (2012). Human  
23 health and well-being motivations and benefits associated with protected area experiences: an  
24 opportunity for transforming policy and management in Canada. *PARKS: the International*  
25 *Journal of Conservation and Protected Areas*, 18, 71–86.  
26  
27  
28

29  
30  
31  
32 Lemieux, C. J., Doherty, S. T., Eagles, P. F. J., Gould, J., Hvenegaard, G. T., Nisbet, E., &  
33 Groulx, M. W. (2015). *Healthy outside-healthy inside: The human health and well-being*  
34 *benefits of Alberta's protected areas - towards a benefits-based management agenda*. Ottawa:  
35 CCEA Secretariat. Retrieved (20.9.2016) from  
36 [http://scholars.wlu.ca/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1024&context=geog\\_faculty](http://scholars.wlu.ca/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1024&context=geog_faculty)  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

43 Maller, C. J. (2009). Promoting children's mental, emotional and social health through  
44 contact with nature: a model. *Health Education*, 109, 522–543.  
45  
46  
47  
48

49  
50 Maller, C., Townsend, M., Brown, P., St Leger, L., Henderson-Wilson, C., Pryor, A., ...  
51 Moore, M. (2008). *Healthy parks healthy people: The health benefits of contact with nature*  
52 *in a park context. A review of relevant literature* (2nd ed.). Melbourne: Deakin University  
53 and Parks Victoria. Retrieved (20.9.2016) from  
54 [http://www.deakin.edu.au/\\_\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0016/310750/HPHP-2nd-Edition.pdf](http://www.deakin.edu.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0016/310750/HPHP-2nd-Edition.pdf)  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 Mayer, M. (2014). Can nature-based tourism benefits compensate for the costs of national  
6 parks? A study of the Bavarian Forest National Park, Germany. *Journal of Sustainable*  
7 *Tourism*, 22, 561–583.  
8  
9

10  
11  
12 Metsähallitus. (2016a). *Principles of Protected Area Management in Finland*. Nature  
13 Protection Publications of Metsähallitus. Series B 217. Vantaa: Metsähallitus. Retrieved  
14 (20.9.2016) <https://julkaisut.metsa.fi/assets/pdf/lp/Bsarja/b217.pdf>  
15  
16

17  
18  
19  
20  
21 Metsähallitus. (2016b). Kansallispuistojen, valtion retkeilyalueiden ja muiden  
22 virkistyskäytöllisesti merkittävimpien Metsähallituksen hallinnoimien suojelualueiden ja  
23 retkeilykohteiden käyntimäärät vuonna 2015 [Number of visits in national parks, national  
24 hiking areas and other conservation and recreation areas managed by Metsähallitus in 2015].  
25 Retrieved (20.9.2016) from  
26 [http://www.metsa.fi/documents/10739/3335805/kayntimaarat2015\\_fi.pdf/0e3f3835-17e8-](http://www.metsa.fi/documents/10739/3335805/kayntimaarat2015_fi.pdf/0e3f3835-17e8-4a99-9b4c-51f1b1d1b9a5)  
27 [4a99-9b4c-51f1b1d1b9a5](http://www.metsa.fi/documents/10739/3335805/kayntimaarat2015_fi.pdf/0e3f3835-17e8-4a99-9b4c-51f1b1d1b9a5)  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

33  
34  
35 Moore, M., Townsend, M., & Oldroyd, J. (2006). Linking human and ecosystem health: The  
36 benefits of community involvement in conservation groups. *EcoHealth*, 3, 255–261.  
37  
38

39  
40  
41 Niemelä, R., Ek, S., Eriksson-Backa, K. & Huotari, M-L. (2012). A screening tool for  
42 assessing everyday health information literacy. *Libri*, 62, 125–134.  
43  
44

45  
46  
47 Nilsson, K., Baines, C., & Konijnendik, C. C. (2007). *Health and the natural outdoors*.  
48 Larnaka: COST Strategic Workshop, Final Report. Retrieved (20.9.2016) from  
49 [http://www.umb.no/statisk/greencare/general/strategic\\_workshop\\_final\\_report.pdf](http://www.umb.no/statisk/greencare/general/strategic_workshop_final_report.pdf)  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 Pasanen, T., Tyrväinen, L., & Korpela, K. M. (2014). The relationship between perceived  
4 health and physical activity indoors, outdoors in built environments, and outdoors in nature.  
5 *Applied Psychology: Health and Well-Being*, 6, 324–346.  
6  
7

8  
9  
10  
11 Pretty, J., Peacock, J., Hine, R., Sellens, M., South, N., & Griffin, M. (2007). Green exercise  
12 in the UK Countryside: Effects on health and psychological well-being, and implications for  
13 policy and planning. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management*, 50, 211–231.  
14  
15  
16

17  
18  
19 Puhakka, R., & Saarinen, J. (2013). New role of tourism in national park planning in Finland.  
20 *The Journal of Environment and Development*, 22, 411–434.  
21  
22  
23

24  
25 Puustinen, J., Pouta, E., Neuvonen, M., & Sievänen, T. (2009). Visits to national parks and  
26 the provision of natural and man-made recreation and tourism resources. *Journal of*  
27 *Ecotourism*, 8, 18–31.  
28  
29  
30

31  
32  
33 Shin, W. S., Yeoun, P. S., Yoo, R. W., & Shin, C. S. (2010). Forest experience and  
34 psychological health benefits. *Environmental Health and Preventive Medicine*, 15, 38–47.  
35  
36  
37

38  
39  
40 Siikamäki, P., Kangas, K., Paasivaara, A., & Schoderus, S. (2015). Biodiversity attracts  
41 visitors to national parks. *Biodiversity and Conservation*, 24, 2521–2534.  
42  
43  
44

45  
46  
47 Snepenger, D., King, J., Marshall, E., & Uysal, M. (2006). Modeling Iso-Ahola's motivation  
48 theory in the tourism context. *Journal of Travel Research*, 45, 140–149.  
49  
50

51  
52  
53 Stolton, S., & Dudley, N. (2010). *Vital sites: The contribution of protected areas to human*  
54 *health*. The Arguments for Protection Series. Gland: WWF. Retrieved (20.9.2016) from  
55 [http://assets.panda.org/downloads/vital\\_sites.pdf](http://assets.panda.org/downloads/vital_sites.pdf)  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Tsunetsugu, Y., Park, B. J., Ishii, H., Hirano, H., Kagawa, T., & Miyazaki, Y. (2007). Physiological effects of Shinrin-yoku (taking in the atmosphere of the forest) in an old-growth broadleaf forest in Yamagata prefecture, Japan. *Journal of Physiological Anthropology*, 26, 135–142.

Tyrväinen, L., Ojala, A., Korpela, K., Lanki, T., Tsunetsugu, Y., & Kagawa, T. (2014). The influence of urban green environments on stress relief measures: A field experiment. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 38, 1–9.

Vähäsarja, V. (2014). Luontoympäristön terveys- ja hyvinvointivaikutusten taloudellinen arvottaminen [Assessment of the financial value of the health and well-being benefits of natural environments]. Nature Protection Publications of Metsähallitus. Series A 210. Vantaa: Metsähallitus. Retrieved (20.9.2016) from <https://julkaisut.metsa.fi/assets/pdf/lp/Asarja/a210.pdf>

Wall Reinius, S., & Fredman, P. (2007). Protected areas as attractions. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 34, 839–854.

Weber, D., & Anderson, D. (2010). Contact with nature: Recreation experience preferences in Australian parks. *Annals of Leisure Research*, 13, 46–69.

Wolf, I. D., & Wohlfart, T. (2014). Walking, hiking and running in parks: A multidisciplinary assessment of health and well-being benefits. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 130, 89–103.

Wolf, I. D., Stricker, H. K., & Hagenloh, G. (2015). Outcome-focused national park experience management: Transforming participants, promoting social well-being, and fostering place attachment. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 23, 358–381.

Table 1. Characteristics of study areas.

Name of the protected area	Classification of nature <sup>1</sup>	Recreational facilities <sup>1</sup>	Tourism services outside the park <sup>1</sup>	Population density in the surrounding area <sup>2</sup>	Description of the surrounding area <sup>2</sup>	Number of visits (year)
Kevo Strict Nature Reserve				0.3	Countryside	5 000 (2013)
Kurjenrahka National Park	Mire	Low	High	94.9	Population centre	32 100 (2013)
Patvinsuo National Park	Mire	Moderate	High	3.1	Countryside	12 900 (2013)
Pyhä-Luosto National Park	Fell	High	Moderate	1	Tourist centre	115 100 (2015)
Repovesi National Park	Water and scenery	Moderate	Moderate	26.8	Population centre	93 200 (2013)
Syöte National Park	Forest	High	Moderate	2	Tourist centre	40 300 (2015)

<sup>1</sup>Puustinen et al., 2009

<sup>2</sup>Inhabitans per km<sup>2</sup>; Statistics Finland and Parks & Wildlife Finland 2011

Peer Review

Table 2. Data used in the study.

Name of the protected area	On-site visitor survey N (year)	Web survey N (year)
Kevo Strict Nature Reserve	524 (2013)	290 (2013)
Kurjenrahka National Park	413 (2013)	132 (2013)
Patvinsuo National Park	213 (2013)	50 (2013)
Pyhä-Luosto National Park	760 (2015-2016)	109 (2015-2016)
Reponvesi National Park	902 (2013-2014)	399 (2013-2014)
Syöte National Park	375 (2015)	74 (2015)
TOTAL	3 152	1 054

For Peer Review

Table 3. Demographic characteristics of survey respondents.

		On-site visitor survey		Web survey	
		N	%	N	%
Gender	Male	1409	44.7	453	43.3
	Female	1743	55.3	590	56.7
Age	Under 30 years	650	20.8	214	20.7
	30–44 years	945	30.2	337	32.6
	45–64 years	1225	39.2	411	39.7
	65 years or older	305	9.8	73	7.1
Education	Less than bachelors	1537	49.4	465	45.0
	Bachelors or higher	1572	50.6	569	55.0
BMI	Normal or underweight			594	57.3
	Overweight			443	42.7

Table 4. Descriptive statistics and tests of significance for the ratings of health and well-being benefits between different groups of the on-site visitor survey.

	Social well-being	Mental well-being	Physical well-being
N	3116	3115	3118
Mean	4.23	4.41	4.43
Std. Deviation	0.80	0.70	0.69
<i>Gender</i> (p-value)	< 0.01**	< 0.01**	< 0.01**
<i>Male</i> (N)	1384	1382	1384
Mean	4.10	4.32	4.32
Std. Deviation	0.82	0.72	0.72
<i>Female</i> (N)	1721	1722	1723
Mean	4.32	4.47	4.51
Std. Deviation	0.77	0.67	0.65
<i>Age</i> (p-value)	< 0.01**	< 0.01**	0.024*
<i>Under 30 years</i> (N)	647	646	647
Mean	4.13	4.34	4.37
Std. Deviation	0.85	0.77	0.69
<i>30–44 years</i> (N)	938	940	937
Mean	4.28	4.48	4.44
Std. Deviation	0.77	0.64	0.69
<i>45–64 years</i> (N)	1205	1203	1208
Mean	4.26	4.43	4.46
Std. Deviation	0.78	0.66	0.67
<i>65 years or older</i> (N)	292	292	292
Mean	4.10	4.22	4.37
Std. Deviation	0.81	0.74	0.73
<i>Education</i> (p-value)	0.063	0.008*	0.887
<i>Less than bachelors</i> (N)	1519	1515	1518
Mean	4.20	4.37	4.42

Std. Deviation	0.80	0.71	0.71
<i>Bachelors or higher</i> (N)	1553	1556	1556
Mean	4.25	4.44	4.43
Std. Deviation	0.81	0.68	0.68
<i>BMI</i> (p-value)	0.120	0.600	0.746
<i>Normal or underweight</i> (N)	587	587	588
Mean	4.33	4.47	4.47
Std. Deviation	0.76	0.65	0.67
<i>Overweight</i> (N)	438	439	439
Mean	4.27	4.46	4.46
Std. Deviation	0.74	0.61	0.64
<i>Park</i>	0.009*	0.081	0.001**
<i>Kevo Strict Nature Reserve</i> (N)	516	514	514
Mean	4.22	4.47	4.47
Std. Deviation	0.77	0.64	0.64
<i>Kurjenrahka National Park</i> (N)	404	404	405
Mean	4.13	4.38	4.33
Std. Deviation	0.88	0.71	0.72
<i>Patvinsuo National Park</i> (N)	210	210	210
Mean	4.37	4.49	4.47
Std. Deviation	0.72	0.65	0.68
<i>Pyhä-Luosto National Park</i> (N)	743	746	746
Mean	4.17	4.38	4.43
Std. Deviation	0.81	0.72	0.68
<i>Reponvesi National Park</i> (N)	882	880	882
Mean	4.27	4.37	4.38
Std. Deviation	0.78	0.72	0.72
<i>Syöte National Park</i> (N)	361	361	361
Mean	4.26	4.43	4.52

Std. Deviation	0.79	0.66	0.65
<i>Overnight</i> (p-value)	0.342	0.004*	0.370
<i>Overnight visitors</i> (N)	1161	1160	1161
Mean	4.25	4.45	4.44
Std. Deviation	0.78	0.68	0.68
<i>Day visitors</i> (N)	1777	1777	1779
Mean	4.21	4.38	4.41
Std. Deviation	0.81	0.71	0.70
Alone or group (p-value)	0.004*	0.084	0.042*
<i>Alone</i> (N)	214	216	216
Mean	4.05	4.50	4.53
Std. Deviation	0.92	0.63	0.61
<i>Group</i> (N)	2902	2899	2902
Mean	4.24	4.40	4.42
Std. Deviation	0.79	0.70	0.70
First time visitor (p-value)	0.178	0.879	0.760
<i>First time visitor</i> (N)	1212	1211	1212
Mean	4.20	4.40	4.42
Std. Deviation	0.82	0.73	0.69
<i>Repeat visitor</i> (N)	1904	1904	1906
Mean	4.24	4.41	4.43
Std. Deviation	0.79	0.68	0.69

\*Result significant at 0.05 level

\*\*Result significant at 0.01 level



Table 5. Factor loadings.

Scale items	Factors					
	Psychological and occupational	Intellectual	Escape	Social	Physical	Sensory satisfaction
Total variance explained	59.5					
Cronbach's $\alpha$ (alfa)	0.86	0.70	0.70	0.82	0.78	0.83
My vitality and energy increased	0.614					
I got better hope for tomorrow	0.766					
My concentration improved	0.764					
My self-confidence increased	0.679					
I calmed down	0.568					
My life was put into perspective	0.751					
My work motivation improved	0.523					
My motivation for everyday life improved	0.600					
I learned new skills		0.709				
I learned more about nature		0.731				
My interest towards nature increased		0.565				
I enjoyed meeting new people during the visit		0.601				
I forgot everyday worries			0.686			
I had a chance to get away from work			0.775			
I had a change to get away from everyday			0.700			
I enjoyed spending time with people I cherish				0.875		
I enjoyed shared activities with people I cherish				0.873		
I found it easier to talk about personal matters in nature				0.555		
Having company increased my feeling of security				0.659		
Being in nature fostered my relationship with people I cherish				0.746		
During my visit to the area I exercised more than in everyday life					0.823	
I was able to test my physical strenght					0.730	
I felt that nature excercise improved my physical condition					0.800	
I felt my physical well-being improved					0.593	
I enjoyed silence						0.689
I enjoyed sounds of nature						0.830
I enjoyed the fragrance of nature						0.828
It felt good to breathe fresh air						0.759
I enjoyed beautiful nature						0.629
The feel of nature was pleasant (wind on my face. soft moss. shapes of different surfaces)						0.653

Table S1. Descriptive statistics and tests of significance for the ratings of health and well-being benefits between different groups of the web survey.

	Psychologic al and occupational	Intellectual	Escape	Social	Physical	Sensory satisfaction
N	1029	1034	1045	1041	1040	1040
Mean	3.89	3.59	4.53	4.02	4.00	4.79
Std. Deviation	0.59	0.73	0.56	0.74	0.78	0.34
<i>Gender</i> (p-value)	0.001**	0.121	< 0.01**	< 0.01**	< 0.01**	< 0.01**
<i>Male</i> (N)	446	447	447	446	446	447
Mean	3.83	3.55	4.46	3.87	3.87	4.72
Std. Deviation	0.56	0.69	0.56	0.74	0.77	0.39
<i>Female</i> (N)	572	577	587	584	583	583
Mean	3.94	3.62	4.58	4.13	4.10	4.85
Std. Deviation	0.61	0.75	0.55	0.73	0.77	0.29
<i>Age</i> (p-value)	0.014*	0.847	< 0.01**	0.051	0.911	0.114
<i>Under 30 years</i> (N)	212	210	214	213	212	213
Mean	3.93	3.60	4.57	4.07	4.00	4.80
Std. Deviation	0.56	0.82	0.53	0.71	0.82	0.35
<i>30–44 years</i> (N)	330	330	335	334	333	336
Mean	3.94	3.57	4.60	4.08	4.00	4.79
Std. Deviation	0.60	0.72	0.51	0.72	0.77	0.35
<i>45–64 years</i> (N)	398	404	407	405	405	405
Mean	3.88	3.60	4.53	3.97	4.02	4.81
Std. Deviation	0.59	0.68	0.58	0.79	0.77	0.30
<i>65 years or older</i> (N)	70	71	70	71	72	69
Mean	3.71	3.56	4.12	3.91	3.97	4.67
Std. Deviation	0.53	0.72	0.61	0.70	0.78	0.43
<i>Education</i> (p-	0.266	0.009*	0.917	0.880	0.086	0.104

value)						
<i>Less than bachelors</i> (N)	453	457	459	456	460	457
Mean	3.92	3.65	4.53	4.02	4.05	4.80
Std. Deviation	0.59	0.70	0.57	0.77	0.74	0.34
<i>Bachelors or higher</i> (N)	556	557	566	566	560	564
Mean	3.87	3.53	4.53	4.02	3.95	4.78
Std. Deviation	0.59	0.75	0.56	0.74	0.81	0.34
<i>BMI</i> (p-value)	0.208	0.762	0.009*	0.024*	0.022*	0.034*
<i>Normal or underweight</i> (N)	584	582	591	588	588	589
Mean	3.87	3.58	4.58	4.06	3.95	4.81
Std. Deviation	0.60	0.75	0.52	0.74	0.79	0.32
<i>Overweight</i> (N)	428	435	437	436	436	434
Mean	3.93	3.61	4.48	3.97	4.07	4.77
Std. Deviation	0.56	0.69	0.60	0.75	0.76	0.36
<i>Park</i>	0.003*	< 0.01**	< 0.01**	0.039*	< 0.01**	0.001**
<i>Kevo Strict Nature Reserve</i> (N)	285	285	289	288	290	290
Mean	4	3.80	4.68	4.04	4.30	4.86
Std. Deviation	0.59	0.70	0.48	0.81	0.69	0.28
<i>Kurjenrahka National Park</i> (N)	130	130	130	130	130	129
Mean	3.86	3.31	4.38	3.86	3.62	4.80
Std. Deviation	0.56	0.64	0.59	0.80	0.81	0.31
<i>Patvinsuo National Park</i> (N)	50	50	50	50	50	50
Mean	3.85	3.79	4.58	3.88	3.70	4.82
Std. Deviation	0.56	0.58	0.45	0.96	0.82	0.31

1						
2						
3	<i>Pyhä-Luosto</i>					
4	<i>National Park</i>	106	107	107	108	108
5	(N)					105
6	Mean	3.91	3.63	4.53	4.17	4.08
7	Std. Deviation	0.58	0.64	0.61	0.60	0.69
8						0.35
9						
10						
11	<i>Repovesi</i>					
12	<i>National Park</i>	386	389	395	391	390
13	(N)					396
14	Mean	3.82	3.49	4.47	4.03	3.86
15	Std. Deviation	0.58	0.75	0.59	0.67	0.77
16						0.38
17						
18						
19	<i>Syöte National</i>					
20	<i>Park (N)</i>	72	73	74	74	72
21	Mean	3.93	3.55	4.50	4.02	4.33
22	Std. Deviation	0.64	0.78	0.53	0.75	0.62
23						0.32
24						
25	<i>Overnight (p-</i>					
26	<i>value)</i>	< 0.01**	< 0.01**	< 0.01**	0.002*	< 0.01**
27						0.004*
28	<i>Overnight</i>					
29	<i>visitors (N)</i>	501	501	505	504	505
30	Mean	3.96	3.75	4.62	4.07	4.17
31	Std. Deviation	0.57	0.72	0.52	0.76	0.74
32						0.33
33						
34	<i>Day visitors (N)</i>	490	494	500	497	496
35	Mean	3.83	3.40	4.44	3.96	3.80
36	Std. Deviation	0.60	0.68	0.58	0.73	0.78
37						0.35
38						
39						
40	<i>Alone or group</i>					
41	<i>(p-value)</i>	0.012*	0.303	0.99	< 0.01**	0.198
42						0.135
43	<i>Alone (N)</i>	84	86	87	87	85
44	Mean	4.04	3.67	4.53	2.71	4.09
45	Std. Deviation	0.57	0.64	0.59	0.93	0.79
46						0.25
47						
48	<i>Group (N)</i>	945	948	958	954	955
49	Mean	3.88	3.58	4.53	4.14	3.99
50	Std. Deviation	0.59	0.73	0.56	0.60	0.78
51						0.35
52						
53						
54	<i>First time visitor</i>					
55	<i>(p-value)</i>	0.082	< 0.01**	< 0.01**	0.001*	< 0.01**
56						0.531
57						
58						
59						
60						

<i>First time visitor</i> (N)	416	423	425	424	424	424
Mean	3.93	3.74	4.61	4.11	4.18	4.81
Std. Deviation	0.62	0.72	0.53	0.69	0.73	0.32
<i>Repeat visitor</i> (N)	613	611	620	617	616	616
Mean	3.87	3.48	4.48	3.95	3.88	4.78
Std. Deviation	0.57	0.71	0.57	0.77	0.79	0.35

---

\*Result significant at 0.05 level

\*\*Result significant at 0.01 level

For Peer Review

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Figure 1. Map of study areas

For Peer Review

---

<sup>i</sup> a broad wetland with an open area in its center: see <http://eunis.eea.europa.eu/habitats/10154>

For Peer Review

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



Figure 1. Map of study areas

97x150mm (300 x 300 DPI)