

Profiles of the Domestic Visitors of Dubrovnik Beaches in the Context of Altman's Theory of Territoriality

Profili domaćih posjetitelja dubrovačkih plaža u kontekstu Altmanove teorije teritorijalnosti

Joško Sindik

Institute for Anthropological Research
Zagreb
email: josko.sindik@inantro.hr

Nives Vidak

Sveučilište u Dubrovniku
email: nives.vidak@unidu.hr

DOI 10.17818/NM/2015/2.12

UDK 323(497.58 Dubrovnik)

Prethodno priopćenje / Preliminary communication
Rukopis primljen / Paper accepted: 19. 2. 2015.

Summary

The experience of the beach as a territory in the context of Altman's theory of territoriality, to our knowledge, has rarely been explored. The main research objective is cluster analysis of the participants (visitors of beaches in Dubrovnik) with respect to the intensity of the experience of the beaches as certain types of territory according to Altman's concept of territoriality, taking into consideration the age and work experience in relation to gender, place of residence, type of beach and profession. The second objective was to determine the differences in the average scores according to preferences of the beach as a primary, secondary or public territory. The research was carried out on a sample of 81 participants (40 men and 41 women) from Dubrovnik (hometown), using the questionnaire Territorialism on the beaches. In a preliminary survey the questionnaire was successfully construed and showed good psychometric properties. The results showed that participants largely experience beach as a primary territory and rarely as a public one. The participants are grouped into three profiles, with specific characteristics, while within each profile the participants are grouped according to the dominant experience of the beach as a specific type of territory.

KEY WORDS

cluster
experience
Dubrovnik
profile
territory

Sažetak

Doživljaj plaže kao teritorija u kontekstu Altmanove teorije teritorijalnosti po našim je saznanjima rijetko istraživano pitanje. Kao glavni cilj istraživanja postavili smo analizu svrstavanja u skupine sudionika našeg istraživanja (posjetitelja dubrovačkih plaža) u odnosu prema intenzitetu doživljavanja plaža kao određenih vrsta teritorija po Altmanovom konceptu teritorijalnosti, dobi i radnog staža, a u odnosu prema rodu, mjestu stanovanja, vrsti plaže te vrsti zanimanja. Drugi cilj bio je utvrditi razlike u prosječnim rezultatima prema preferencijama plaže kao primarnog, sekundarnog ili javnog teritorija. Istraživanje je provedeno na uzorku od 81 sudionika/ca (40 muškaraca i 41 žena) iz Dubrovnika (mjesto rođenja), primjenom upitnika „Teritorijalnost na plažama“. U prethodnom istraživanju upitnik je uspješno konstruiran, pokazavši dobre metrijske karakteristike. Rezultati su pokazali da sudionici u najvećoj mjeri plažu doživljavaju kao primarni teritorij, a najrjeđe kao javni. Sudionici se dijele u tri profila, sa specifičnim profilima karakteristika, a u svakom profilu su sudionici po principu dominantnog doživljavanja plaže kao specifične vrste teritorija.

KLJUČNE RIJEČI

klaster
doživljaj
Dubrovnik
razlike
profili
teritorij

INTRODUCTION / Uvod

The paper analyses the experience of Dubrovnik beaches as territories in the context of Altman's theory of territoriality [1] [2] [3]. The experience of the beach as a territory, to our knowledge, has

rarely been explored. However, there are reasons to believe that certain personal characteristics and traits (socio-cultural, psychological, demographic, socio-economic) largely influence the degree

to which an individual claims the beach as "his own".

The term territory is used to denote a fixed space which an individual or a group of individuals experience as their

own. This term must be differentiated from the personal space, which can shift with the individual, like an invisible "balloon" [1] [2] [3] [4]. The experience of a territory is a subjective experience of control over a territory and not the real ownership over the territory. There are three types of territory an individual or a group may claim: primary, secondary and tertiary (public) [1]. The primary territory is a private space where the owner has an exclusive right on use, which is mostly long-term. Individuals often personalise, i.e. mark their spaces with personal markings, thus the best examples of this type of territory would be a person's flat or room. Secondary territories are "semi-public" spaces where a person is interaction with neighbours on a relatively daily and regular basis. Conflicts between groups of users of secondary territories may occur only if this type of territory is not personalised (marked) by the owners or regular users. Consequently, "usurpers" do not have information on having made "unauthorised occupation" of someone's territory. In other words, it is not rare that individuals share secondary territories with others, but they use them on regular basis. The best examples of this type of territory can be found in an individual's favourite place in a library, or a restaurant table used on specific days by a group of friends. Public or tertiary territories are common spaces where almost anyone has a temporary access (the best examples are public parks, waiting rooms, recreational areas, museums, town squares) [1] [2] [4]. Namely, Altman presumed that the main dimensions of the three territory types vary according to the importance of the space for an individual (centrality) and time mechanism regulating relationships between individuals and the local society. Consequently, the rules concerning usage of certain territories form both the physical and social relations in these environments [4].

Privacy, visual and auditory, is related to the degree of possibility to approach a territory. This means that privacy is not only restricted access to a territory: regulation of privacy is achieved by, for example, going into a crowded pub looking for social interaction, or by avoiding frequent social contacts. To put it differently, privacy is in correlation with communication, i.e. the level of communication an individual wishes to

achieve in a certain environment [19]. This wanted level of social interaction depends on the personal traits, social impacts, physical environment and specific culture. It can vary depending on the person and time lapse, i.e. as a function of chronological age [12]. The level of social interaction may vary, but the need to control the social relations is universal for all human beings [26]. Almost everyone has their own territory, i.e. the personal space zone, which determines the distance from the others. Everyone "owns" a range of territories with different degrees of control over them, in an effort to protect one's self from intrusions of others onto "his/her" territory [3]. The inhabitants of rural settlements and suburbs, for example, in comparison with the urban ones have better perception of control over secondary and public territories [25]. Primary and secondary territories may presume interaction on different levels of formality, but they may also exclude unwanted contacts. Privacy could be defined as a dynamic dialectic process which depends both on the social and technical environment of an individual [18]. It is a generic process found in all cultures, but it also differs from culture to culture representing allowed or not allowed, usual or unusual behaviour in a certain culture. This is why the mechanisms used to determine the wanted level of privacy are so varied. Namely, privacy is a universal process involving culturally unique regulatory mechanisms [3]. Privacy can be regulated in different environments, including in virtual social nets [14], by setting prohibitions and preferences for some forms of communications. Nevertheless, privacy can be regulated in completely different life situations: for example, when using an ATM users spend the same quantity of time at the machine, regardless of the people waiting nearby and disturbing their privacy. It is to be presumed that the individuals do not consider the space near an ATM as "their" (primary) territory. Consequently, they always behave in the same way, regardless of the number of people near the machine [23]. Furthermore, in offices in which people work alongside robots, people are bothered even by these non-living things, so they have negative experience even with robots intruding "their own" territory, which is related with the individual's age as well [20]. Even car

drivers experience the road to a lesser or greater degree as a primary territory [10]. Since relationships between individuals and objects in organisations clearly and significantly influence the relationships between individuals, as well as the relationship between individuals and organisations, research on territoriality is a particularly important research field in the work organisation domain as well [6]. In this context even territories on desktops in spaces where desks are shared by more employees are studied, since agreements must be reached on dividing the territory among individuals (tabletop territory theory) [21]. To sum up, spatial relations among individuals are used in accordance with complex rules and strong personal preferences. Although they may not always be aware of these rules and preferences, the importance of the rules is brought to attention when the individuals' needs related to usage of a certain space are in jeopardy [15].

Although beaches are at the same time natural, social and economic resources, in Croatia they are considered as maritime domain, public property that cannot be sold and/or owned by anyone [15]. From the cultural aspect, beaches are places where different cultures and lifestyles of individuals and groups come into contact and interfere. On the other hand, beaches are part of daily life, living culture and events relevant for the local community [24]. Since beaches represent an important and sensitive part of nature in the coastal area, obviously, arrangements for their management must be made [11]. For example, females on the beaches generally tolerated male intrusions on their beach territory. The frequency of going to the beach and the use of assertive female behavioural strategies were linked with the number of times men approached them, while female attractiveness was not associated with male territorial intrusions [13]. In the broader context, human territoriality can be monitored as one factor that can influence tourist experiences, and one empirical test of territorial functioning among tour groups at a tourism attraction supports the idea that some level of territoriality exists in certain tourism venues [5].

In a research carried out among visitors of beaches in Split, conclusions were made on the type of visitors and the

situation regarding beach management system. Participants in the research mostly showed "loyalty" to a specific beach: as many as 40% of the participants come to the same beach on daily basis, some 18% come to the same beach whenever they go swimming and occasional or random bathers are relatively rare [11]. An important criterion for choosing a specific beach is often the proximity (from home or from work, school place): 42% of bathers in Split need half an hour to reach the beach, 38% reach the beach in only a couple of minutes, while 18% need from 30 to 60 minutes to get to the beach. Among the reasons for coming to the specific beach the proximity of home is an important factor (30%), 20% go to the beach on recommendation from a person they know or a friend of theirs. There are as many as 18% of respondents who traditionally and regularly swim on a specific beach in Split [11]. Only 16% of the respondents find that they randomly came to the specific beach, and some 14% learned about the beach via internet or other sources. Most frequent visitors to Split beaches are between the ages from 20 to 40 (38%), then visitors who are aged 20 or younger (24%), while the numbers of visitors between the age range from 40 to 60 or these over 60 are somewhat smaller (18% respectively) [11].

Dubrovnik beaches are subjectively important places for people who grew there, hung out, practiced or were only recreationally involved in individual sports. These areas are officially public territories (according to terminology used by Altman) [2], with open, free access. However, hotels and some other catering objects in Dubrovnik also consider the beaches as their "own", to be used by tourists staying in their objects or using their services. This raises the question of the actual "public" feature of the beaches, i.e. whether the access is open to everyone [24]. Initiatives, sometimes taken by individuals, are being launched lately to preserve Dubrovnik beaches [7]. Even tourism media often present the beaches in Dubrovnik by linking a certain form of recreational activity on the beach as one of its characteristic features. For example, water-polo and tradition of playing the Wild League are pointed out as the main features and identified with the beach Danče situated in the vicinity of the Old City of Dubrovnik, beach Copacabana on the Lapad peninsula

and beach Bellevue on Montovjerna [8]. These examples show that a more creative and diverse approach should be taken when presenting Dubrovnik beaches, by surpassing the usual descriptions of beaches as the places where the sun and the sea mix together, or very dry descriptions of infrastructure and tourism offer on the beach, similar to descriptions of most tourist destinations by the seaside [24]. To contribute towards a more creative presentation of some urban (and rural) beaches, the research of tourist needs and interests could be carried out, involving a study to ascertain the extent to which visitors perceive the beaches as a type of territory.

In a previous research on the basis of the same data collected, a questionnaire *Territoriality on beaches* was construed, covering aspects from Altman's [1] concept of territoriality. Significant differences were found between territoriality and gender, place of residence, type of beach and occupation, as well as correlations with age and work experience [22]. The variables age and work experience of the participants showed no statistically significant correlations with any of the aspects of territoriality or the beach as a primary, public or secondary territory. Within the context of territoriality, no statistically significant differences according to gender were found, and as far as type of beach is concerned, the city ("cult") beaches (such as Danče, Porporela, etc.) are more frequently experienced as primary territories unlike the beaches on Lapad and other beaches (mostly remote urban beaches or rural beaches). Population living in the Old City rarely experience beaches as public territory, while population from Dubrovnik-Neretva County experience beaches as public territory. Those employed in education rarely experience beaches as primary territory and for employees in tourism most frequently the beach is primary territory [22].

The aim of this research was to find out whether there are taxa according to which the participants of our research (visitors at Dubrovnik beaches) could be grouped with respect to the intensity of experiencing beaches as certain types of territories in the context of Altman's concept of territoriality in relation to gender, place of residence, type of beach and occupation. The second objective

was to determine the differences in the average scores according to the preferences of the beaches the visitors regularly use as a primary, secondary or public territory.

METHOD / Metodologija **Participants / Sudionici**

The participants were selected by a combined method: snowball sample (distribution by e-mail) and convenience sample (visitors of web-pages www.dance.hr). The research was carried out on a sample of 83 adult participants (40 men and 41 women) from Dubrovnik. The average age of participants was 38.26 ± 8.87 ($M \pm SD$) (range 17-67) and average work experience was 14.14 ± 8.36 ($M \pm SD$) years (range 0-40). According to the type of beach the participants experienced: city beaches (N=27), Lapad beaches (N=39) and other beaches (N=15). According to the place of residence, the distribution of participants was as follows: Old City (N=3), wider city area (N=51), Dubrovnik-Neretva County (N=9), other counties (N=18). Occupations of the participants were distributed as follows: education (N=17), medicine (N=13), engineers (N=18), students (N=4), tourism (N=9), administrative officers (N=12), while other participants did not submit data on the occupation.

Data collection / Postupak **prikupljanja podataka**

In a previous research the author [22] made a preliminary study of validity of the questionnaire *Territoriality on beaches* (23 statements to be evaluated on a five-point Likert scale (from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree). The calculations showed that for this group of variables three-component solution was the most appropriate, and after Varimax rotation three main components were obtained, explaining 49% of the total variance. The first component was defined by nine variables describing subjective experience of the beach as a primary territory, consequently, it was named **Beach as a primary territory**, with high reliability score ($\alpha=0.877$). The second component consisted of seven variables describing subjective experience of the beach as a tertiary (public) territory, therefore, it was named **Beach as a public territory**, with medium reliability

score ($\alpha=0.765$). The third component was defined by seven variables (subjective experience of the beach as a secondary territory) and it was named **Beach as a secondary territory**, with medium reliability score ($\alpha=0.765$).

Questionnaires were distributed online in April and May 2014. Participants were guaranteed anonymity and the scientific purpose of the research was pointed out. Furthermore, the respondents were instructed to ask for clarifications on any ambiguities within individual statements, which ultimately was not necessary.

Statistical analysis / Statistička analiza

Statistical analysis of the data was performed by K-means non-hierarchical cluster analysis which was applied on the interval variables and ratio variables: the variables describing territorial behaviour of individuals and age and work experience variables. The initial cluster centres were automatically determined and a three-cluster solution was found as the most suitable, since a larger number of clusters results in clusters containing a smaller number of entities unevenly distributed. After the cluster analysis, individual cases were distributed according to the variables gender, occupation and type of beach and place of residence. Frequency of distribution of participants in individual clusters with respect to these variables was analysed. Territoriality variables were obtained on the basis of Principal Component Analysis (PCA) with Varimax rotation, using Scree Plot, Guttman-Kaiser's extraction criteria and interpretability. Results for individual components (type of territoriality) were expressed in regression factor scores (in K-means clustering), while in the analysis of the differences, the territoriality variables are defined as simple linear combinations of the items that define certain type of the territoriality, according to the results of previous study [22]. For all dimensions of all scales obtained in PCA, internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha) reliability was satisfactory [22]. Friedman test for dependent samples was used to determine the differences in the experience of certain types of territoriality at same individuals. For data analysis the statistical package SPSS 11 was used.

Table 1 Results of K-means cluster analysis – visitors of Dubrovnik beaches according to their experience of the beach as a territory, the age and work experience (selected according to gender, occupation category, type of beach, place of residence) (N=81)

Tablica 1. Rezultati taksonomske analize – posjetitelji dubrovačkih plaža prema doživljajima plaže kao teritorija, dobi i stažu (razvrstani po rodu, kategoriji zanimanja, vrsti plaža, mjestu življenja) (N=81)

Variable	Clusters		
	1	2	3
Beach as a primary territory	.406	.120	-.139
Beach as a public territory	-.044	-.175	.150
Beach as a secondary territory	-.652	.080	-.005
Age	57	30	43
Work experience	33	6	19
Number of cases in cluster	4	35	42
Men	3	21	16
Women	1	14	26
City beaches	1	15	11
Lapad beaches	3	14	23
Other beaches	0	6	8
Education	1	6	8
Medicine	1	5	6
Engineers	0	7	8
Students	0	4	0
Administrative officers	1	4	7
Tourism	0	6	1
Old City	1	2	0
Wider city area	3	23	23
County	0	3	7
Other counties	0	6	12

RESULTS / Rezultati

Table 1 shows the results of taxonomic analysis for visitors of Dubrovnik beaches, distributed according to their experience of the beach as a territory, age and work experience (selected according to gender, occupation category, type of beach, place of residence).

The results indicate that women are dominantly prevailing in the third cluster and men in the second (Table 1). In the second cluster visitors of city beaches are dominant, and in the third visitors of Lapad and other beaches (urban and rural). Administrative officers are more dominant in the third cluster while those employed in tourism and students are more dominant in the second cluster. Employees in education, medicine and engineers are equally represented in the second and third cluster. Inhabitants of the wider city area are dominantly represented in the second cluster, while the inhabitants of the County and other counties are dominantly represented in the third cluster.

The largest distances between cluster centres have been found between the first and second cluster (38,046), then

between the first and third cluster (19,920), while the distance is the smallest between the first and third cluster (18,144).

For participants in the first cluster, which is the smallest (only 4 participants), the most dominant is the experience of the beach as a primary territory. The participants in this cluster are the oldest ones and with the longest work experience, mostly men visiting Lapad beaches and living in the wider city area.

In the second cluster (total 35 participants) the participants mostly experience the beach as a secondary territory. In this cluster there are mostly the youngest participants with the shortest work experience, mostly men, visiting Lapad beaches and other beaches (rural). According to occupation, these participants are mostly employed in education, tourism, medicine, engineers or students, living and living in the wider city area.

Participants in the largest third cluster (total 42 participants) dominantly experience the beach as a public territory. These participants are middle aged with medium long work experience, mostly

Table 2 Differences in experiencing the beach as a territory according to the age and work experience (N=81)

Tablica 2. Razlike u doživljajima plaže kao teritorija, dobi i stažu (N=81)

	Mean	Standard Deviation	F (df=2)	Friedman test (df=2)
Beach as a primary territory	3.139	.914	9.751**	
Beach as a public territory	2.470	.809		13.380**
Beach as a secondary territory	2.635	.792		

Note: variables of territoriality are calculated according to the dimensions of the questionnaire *Territoriality on beaches*, obtained using Principal Component Analysis (PCA)

women, visiting city of Lapad beaches. According to type of occupation they are mostly employed in education, medicine, engineers or administrative officers, and living in the wider city area, in the County or other counties.

Statistically significant differences in experiencing the beach as a type of territory, according to Altman classification, were found. The participants most frequently experience the beach as a primary territory, in relation to public territory ($t= 4.149$; $r= -0.328$; $p= 0.01$), and in relation to secondary territory ($t= 3.761$; $r= 0.069$; $p= 0.01$), while the difference between experiencing the beach as a public or secondary territory is not statistically significant ($t= 4.149$; $r= -0.075$; $p= 0.22$).

DISCUSSION / Rasprava

The main findings of this research indicate that participants to the largest degree experience the beach as a primary territory and to the least degree as a public territory. In other words, it has been confirmed that beaches are important for visitors and also there is a large possibility that most participants visit one beach on regular basis, whenever possible, similar as in Split [11]. Regular visits to the beach can probably contribute in perceiving the beach as one's "own" i.e. as a primary territory.

Participants are grouped in three clusters, with specific profiles, and in each cluster, the participants are grouped by the principle of dominant experience of the beach as a specific type of territory. The least number of participants is in the first cluster and it consists of the participants experiencing the beach as a primary territory: those are the eldest men who usually visit Lapad beaches and live in the wider city area (probably on the Lapad peninsula). Consequently, vicinity of a territory [14] in this case probably determines whether individuals

experience the territory as primary. On the other hand, men more often "claim the right" on a territory (they more often experience it as primary territory), consequently, they are prepared to be more aggressive in defending it [17].

Participants in the second cluster experience the beach as a secondary territory. Those are mostly relatively young men, visiting Lapad beaches or beaches in remote parts of rural beaches) and living in the wider city area. Although we cannot offer a convincing explanation of the occupations of participants visiting the said beaches, it is to be presumed that participants from this cluster besides the vicinity criteria use other criteria when choosing the beach, such as "peacefulness". Nevertheless, although these participants are aware of the fact that the beach cannot be their exclusive "property", it can still be noticed that the gender criteria (predominantly men) [4] [17] is emphasised, even in the youngest group of participants.

The third cluster participants experience the beach as a public territory. They are mostly women in their middle ages, visiting city or Lapad beaches, and living in the wider city area, the Count or other counties. It is to be presumed that territorial vicinity is not the prevailing factor in this group having in mind the usual relations between genders with respect to territory [9], but also having in mind the needs of a middle-aged group.

Even though the previous research indicated no differences among the participants in experiencing the beach as a type of territory with respect to the age, work experience or gender [22], it seems that the combination of some characteristics, obtained by taxonomical analysis, can offer a better insight into motives and preferences of Dubrovnik beaches' visitors. However, the factors influencing visits to certain city beaches are most probably similar to those in

Split, such as vicinity of the beach, circle of acquaintances at the beach [11]. There are reasons to believe that certain beach happenings (e.g. water-polo wild league, as described in [24]), or some other attractive tourist services [15] can to a certain degree augment the experience of the beach as a primary or at least secondary territory. On the other hand, it is too pretentious to attempt to make conclusions regarding occupation as an important factor in experiencing the beach as a territory.

The crucial advantage of this research would be construction of a new instrument in the research where groups of participants are formed, i.e. visitors of Dubrovnik beaches in the context of Altman's theory [1] [2] [3] [4]. Furthermore, this is the first study of this topic in Croatia, and especially in Dubrovnik.

Shortcoming of this research is a relatively small and not sufficiently representative sample (for all adult visitors of Dubrovnik beaches), which was not randomly selected nor was it stratified. Therefore, the sample is not homogenously represented in sub-groups of participants (the number of participants living in the Old City of Dubrovnik is particularly small). Consequently, both this and the previous research [22] may be considered as a pilot study.

In future research the construed instrument (questionnaire) should be applied in other parts of Croatia (and also in Dubrovnik), on larger and more representative (random or stratified) samples of participants in order to test metric characteristics of the instrument. It would also be useful to collect data about some more socio-demographic characteristics of visitors of the beaches, or on certain personal traits or the environment, which may be relevant for visiting beaches and experiencing them as territories. Such research should involve tourists as well, particularly those who visit Dubrovnik and its beaches on regular basis but also those visiting occasionally or even rarely. Thus a more reliable insight into factors attracting tourists to return to the same place, in a longer or shorter period, would be obtained. It would also give answers as to why they come more often or rarely to the same beach.

Once these factors have been ascertained, including this pilot study, but primarily from more extensive studies carried out by the construed

instrument and other research tools, measures for extending the tourism supply on Dubrovnik beaches could be taken, transportation better organised, more services for different population profiles could be arranged, etc. Namely, targeted emphasis on specific features of some beaches that are beyond traditional “phrases” used in tourism supply, development and improvement of services offered to individuals and groups regularly visiting those beaches [22] might lead to more frequent visits of both the inhabitants and tourists to certain beaches. Namely, in general, the importance of territoriality could be emphasized, as a theoretical foundation for tourism research and implications for management of visitor experiences and satisfaction [5].

CONCLUSION / Zaključak

Analysis of groups of visitors at Dubrovnik beaches in relation to the intensity of experiencing the beach as some kind of territory in the context of Altman's concept of territoriality, along with the socio-demographic variables, has shown that there are three taxa of participants with specific socio-demographic profiles: in each cluster, the participants are selected with respect to the dominant experience of the beach as a specific type of territory. Also, the results indicate that the participants mostly experience the beach as a primary territory and to a lesser degree as a public territory.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS / Zahvale

The authors want to thank Ana Perinić Lewis, PhD and Maja Adžija, mag. for their help in planning the research and for the support.

REFERENCES / Literatura

- [1] Altman, I. (1975). *The Environment and Social Behavior: Privacy, Personal Space, Territory, Crowding*. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.
- [2] Altman, I. (1976). Privacy: conceptual analysis. *Environment and Behavior*, god. 8, str. 7-28.
- [3] Altman, I. (1977). Privacy Regulation: Culturally Universal or Culturally Specific? *Journal of Social Issues*, god. 33, sv. 3, str. 66-84.
- [4] Altman, I., Chemers, M. (1980). *Culture and Environment*. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.
- [5] Andereck, K. L. (1997). Territorial functioning in a tourism setting. *Annals of Tourism Research*, god. 24, sv. 3, str. 706-720.
- [6] Brown, G., Lawrence, T. B., Robinson, S.L. (2005). Territoriality in organizations. *University of British Columbia Academy of Management Review*, god. 30, sv. 3, str. 577-594.
- [7] Divlja liga. (2014). Retrieved from: <http://www.divjaliga.eu>
- [8] Dubrovnik Guide. (2014). <http://www.dubrovnik-guide.net/plazeHR.htm>
- [9] Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (2012). *Improving Gender Equality in Territorial Issues (IGETI) - Integrated Guidelines*. Rome: United Nation.
- [10] Fraine, G., Smith, S.G., Zinkiewicz, L., Chapman, R.L., Sheehan, M.C. (2007). At home on the road? Can drivers' relationships with their cars be associated with territoriality? *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, god. 27, sv. 3, str. 204-214.
- [11] Gaće, I. (2011). *Održivo upravljanje plažama – studij slučaja Grad Split*. Završni rad. Split: Sveučilište u Splitu.
- [12] Gifford, R. (1997). *Environmental psychology*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- [13] Jasona, L. A., Reichler, A., Ruckera, W. (1981). Territorial Behavior on Beaches. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, god. 14, sv. 1, str. 43-50.
- [14] Karr-Wisniewski, P., Wilson, D., Richter-Lipford, A. (2011). A New Social Order: Mechanisms for Social Network Site Boundary Regulation. *AMCIS 2011 Proceedings - All Submissions*. Paper 101. Retrieved from: http://aisel.aisnet.org/amcis2011_submissions/101
- [15] Kovačić, M., Komać, A. (2011). The Issues of Beach Management in Croatia, with Emphasis on Zadar County. *Naše more*, god. 58, sv. 5-6, str. 244-255.
- [16] Martin, P.R., Cheung, F.M., Knowles, M.C., Kyrios, M., Littlefield, L., Overmier, J.B., Prieto, J.M. (ur.). (2011). *The IAAP Handbook of Applied Psychology*. New York: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- [17] Neave, N., Wolfson, S. (2003). Testosterone, territoriality and the 'home advantage'. *Physiology and Behavior*, 78, 269-275.
- [18] Palen, L., Dourish, P. (2003). Unpacking "Privacy" for a Networked World. In: *Proceeding CHI '03 Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, April 5-10, 2003. Ft. Lauderdale, Florida, USA: ACM, str. 129-136.
- [19] Pedersen, D.M. (1997). Psychological functions of privacy. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, god. 17, str. 147-156.
- [20] Reichert, K. (2013). *Robotic Infringement of Human Territories in Office Environments*. Bachelor Thesis. Hamburg: University of Hamburg.
- [21] Scott, S.D., Carpendale, S. (2010). Theory of Tabletop Territoriality. U: Müller-Tomfelde, C. (ur.) *Tabletops - Horizontal Interactive Displays*. Springer, str. 375-406.
- [22] Sindik, J. (2015). *Dubrovačke plaže u kontekstu Altmanove tipologije teritorijalnosti*. Naše more (u tisku).
- [23] Stemigl, M., Kim, H.Y. (2011). Waiting for an ATM: Territorial Behavior at Automated Teller Machines. *Sentience*, god. 4, str. 8-10.
- [24] Šiljeg, K., Perinić Lewis, A., Sindik, J. (2014). Lokalna sportska tradicija kao dio dubrovačkoga kulturnog identiteta. *Zbornik radova Sveučilišta u Dubrovniku*, god. 1(1), str. 193-208.
- [25] Taylor, R. B., Stough, R.R. (1978). Territorial Cognition: Assessing Altman's Typology. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, god. 36, sv. 4, str. 418-423.
- [26] Van Dorst, M.J. (2005). Physical conditions for social interaction in the home environment. U: van Dorst, M.J. (ur.), *Doing, thinking, feeling home: The mental geography of residential environments*, str. 1-7. Retrieved from: repository.tudelft.nl/assets/uuid...f0e1.../Conference_paper_Dorst.pdf