

Zbornik gozdarstva in lesarstva 90 (2009), s. 57 - 65

GDK: 226:9(045)=163.6

Prispelo / Received: 18. 03. 2009

Sprejeto / Accepted: 28. 12. 2009

UDK: 502.131.1:630*22(045)=163.6

Pregledni znanstveni članek

Scientific review paper

SOCIAL CONTEXT AS A PILLAR OF SUSTAINABLE FOREST MANAGEMENT - A SLOVENIAN CASENevenka BOGATAJ¹**Abstract**

Social context as more or less neglected field of sustainable development is crucial for the implementation of forest management measures. We can consider it as a basis to cope with (changing) social structure characteristics. Rationalisation of public services, which we face when coping with economic crisis, might take this into consideration. The Forest Service network serves as a scanner of needs in their social context. It is also a respondent to local specifics in the form of forest management measures.

Evidence of research on the social research in Slovenian forestry is weak, although not non-existent. We tested a system approach, a structuring method of general public. Segmentation, a method presented, is generally known in marketing and has not been used in Slovenian forestry up to now. The two-step clustering analysis of quantitative and qualitative data gathered with an inquiry of study circles (form of community learning) was used and is described herewith. The results show three general value based segments of study circle participants.

The role of Slovenian forestry is changing and is not independent of its dynamic and colourful social contexts. Recognition of the society structure and dynamics may contribute to the rationalisation of organisational models during the crisis period. However, grounded actualisation of recent organisational models is possible only by considering priorities of the society's segments. We conclude with a suggestion for more R&D engagement in the social pillar of multifunctional forest management, in particular as the Slovenian social context is defined by dominance of private property and forest owners' ageing, which are far from being analysed and responded to.

Key words: forestry, sustainable development, Slovenia, structure of society, segmentation, information/knowledge flow

DRUŽBENI KONTEKST KOT STEBER GOSPODARJENJA Z GOZDOM PO NAČELIH TRAJNOSTI - SLOVENSKI PRIMER**Izvleček**

Družbeni steber je bolj ali manj zapostavljeno področje trajnostnega razvoja, čeprav je za gozdnogospodarske ukrepe ključen. Razumemo ga lahko kot temelj pri seznanjanju z značilnostmi spreminjajoče se družbene strukture. Pomemben je zlasti za racionalizacijo javnih služb med gospodarsko krizo. Mreža enot Zavoda za gozdove je namreč lahko uporabna pri opazovanju družbenih kontekstov in odzivu na lokalne posebnosti z gozdnogospodarskimi ukrepi.

Družboslovnih raziskav v slovenskem gozdarstvu ni veliko, vendar obstajajo. Kot primer sistemskega pristopa smo preizkusili metodo strukturiranja splošne javnosti. Predstavljena metoda segmentacije je pogosta v marketingu, v slovenskem gozdarstvu pa doslej še ni bila uporabljena. Za analizo kvantitativnih in kvalitativnih podatkov, zbranih z intervjuvanjem udeležencev študijskih krožkov kot oblike skupnostnega učenja, smo uporabili dvostopenjsko analizo gruč. Rezultati kažejo tri skupine udeležencev študijskih krožkov, katerih odgovori temeljijo na njihovi vrednotni usmeritvi.

Vloga slovenskega gozdarstva se spreminja in ni neodvisna od njegove notranje dinamike in od raznolikih družbenih kontekstov. Prepoznavanje strukture in dinamike družbe lahko prispeva k racionalizaciji organizacijskih modelov gozdarstva, aktualni v času krize. Utemeljeno posodabljanje obstoječih organizacijskih modelov je namreč možno le ob upoštevanju prioritete različnih segmentov družbe. Zaključujemo s predlogom okrepitve družboslovnega raziskovalno-razvojnega delovanja večnamenskega gospodarjenja z gozdom, še posebej, ker slednjega v Sloveniji določata prevladujoča zasebna gozdna posest in staranje lastnikov gozda, na kar se z analizami in ukrepi še nismo odzvali.

Ključne besede: gozdarstvo, trajnostni razvoj, Slovenija, družbena struktura, segmentacija, kroženje informacij/znanja

UVOD**INTRODUCTION**

Traditionally, Slovenian forestry has been focused on forest utilisation, protection and management with particular attention to wood cycle. Interpretation of the forest status, trends and other measures is people based, therefore knowledge about society, thus its structure and functioning are also extremely important for forestry. It is not only the matter

of public relation; it is an issue on forest users and their impact on forest.

Forest users are part of a plural society. Social success in a plural society is more or less primarily dependent on knowledge and information flow; therefore, we speak about an information society or knowledge society. The concept of lifelong learning is therefore used to cope with the issue. However, it is not clear which and whose knowledge we talk about. When speaking about the topic of forests/forestry, in-

¹ dr. N. B., Andragoški center Slovenije, Šmartinska 134 a, 1000 Ljubljana, T: (+386) (0)1 5842 579, E: nevenka.bogataj@acs.si

formation/knowledge flow circulates among certain structures – professional or not. The process of learning is crucial in this respect, while objects of learning are forest, its management, forest users' structure and behaviour. Slovenian social context of forest use is defined by both, social structures and social processes. Structural elements have been studied rather continuously, focused mainly on forest owners (Medved 1994, 1997, 2002, Kotnik 2005, Veselič *et al.* 2008). Social processes and expectations of the majority of the people are poorly known. The main characteristics of processes are their high diversity and lively dynamics. In Slovenia, private and small forest property dominates. Social groups of forest users cannot be equated with forest owners' structure. Despite the fact that it is hard to find someone who is not a forest user in some way as a huge share of Slovenia's surface area is covered by forest, characteristics of forest users are seldom addressed out of the general framework of forestry, e.g. forest owners studies, public opinion data (Šinko and Malnar 2000) or unrelated case studies (Oršanič 2005, Golob 2008). Approaches that prevail are technological (productivity, safety), educational (formal level of education) or organisational (forest owners' associations). The »motivated part of public« is generally better studied than the »non-motivated part«, which is invisible, difficult to get in touch with and difficult to get its response.

Addressing the social context is not easy. It is simply too narrow to understand the relation between forest users, organised or not, and institutions (e.g. professional, civil society, public services) as social context. The circumstances are dynamic and standpoints of diverse social strata, e.g. towards forest, are probably not homogeneous and usually unknown. Generally, social structure is changing from predominantly rural to urban society. Statistical data on the rural population show the following characteristics:

- low formal education of farmers (Korošec 2002, Kovačič *et al.* 2006, Jelenc Krašovec and Kump 2007),
- changed women's role (Černič-Istenič *et al.* 2003),
- poorly developed lifelong and life wide learning (Gouglakis and Bogataj 2007),
- lack of initiatives, interpreted as a developmental problem of structural nature (Klemenčič *et al.* 2005).

We refuse to accept the stereotype about dichotomous division of population into urban and rural one; however, we expect certain general differences in relationship to the forest of these two segments of society. Rural inhabitants ge-

nerally have a long tradition of forest related experience, so they might have stronger ties with forest. In order to avoid classical questions about property size, annual cut and forest equipment quality, we were interested in general opinion on these ties in the form of daily practised personal standpoints.

The situation is related with another context: relatively high material welfare and low social coherence of European society, which faces economic and social crisis. State services are under the pressure of rationalisation, existing documents and strategies are under the procedures of renovation. Solutions might evolve through the dialogue in plural environments or through less democratic procedures we know from the past. In both cases, the subjectivity of individual perceptions is crucial (comp. Luckmann 1966 cit. in Luckmann 2007), therefore value based forest related behaviours gain role.

Who can count on forestry as a partner if we hypothesise that »partners« have positive attitudes towards forest/forestry and/or at least some knowledge about it? What do we know about attitudes of general public towards forest/forestry? Who do we intend to communicate with primarily - partners or conflict makers? Can we imagine as partners' young urban inhabitants, ICT literate but without forest related experience and low interest in forest/forestry issues? Are we more used to older rural inhabitants, who cut and manage their forests on their own, and are on the other side of the digital barrier? Does the »non-motivated part of society« prevail or not? Quantitative description of such (speculative) divisions might illustrate a complexity of the question and an urgent need for both quantitative and qualitative data on forest owners, forest users and society in general.

The aim and focus of this text is to present the general public stratification as a contribution to sociological studies in Slovenian forestry. We tested the marketing method, segmentation based on triangulation of data gathering methods and analytical tools. The basic question was: is it possible to structure study circle participants according to the non-classical indicators that define their relation towards forest? Our hypothesis was that structuring of the general public is possible.

METHOD DESCRIPTION

OPIS METODE

Segmentation is a densification and delineation of dispersed characteristics on the basis of their equity and their presentation. The questionnaire respondents were found in

community learning groups (<http://sk.acs.si>, Bogataj 2005). Study groups are a key reference of non-formal adult learning in Slovenia, present in diverse local environments all over Slovenia. They are regularly yearly documented and in touch with socially deprived groups of people, those who are difficult to access. The segmentation used study circles as a representation of the general society. They were understood as forestry information channels as some study circles (app. 10 % of all) are organised regularly by the Forest Service. This umbrella organisation uses forest professionals of local origin as study circle mentors, well acquainted with the local informal information flow. Data collection was therefore nationally based, partly forest related and rational. This contributed to the definition of segmentation variables. Indicators we used were:

- social structure of study circle participants (age, formal education, the number of family members, income, etc.);
- subjective perceptions of study circle participants about forest and forest management.

Variables were both quantitative and qualitative characteristics of the study circle participants: their age, formal education, elements of their lifestyle and parts of their biographies. Special care was given to the questions of individuals' link to the forest, their knowledge and learning about it and their personal attitude to the forest. Three phases of segmentation were performed:

1. monitoring of the basic sample characteristics (its geography, demography, psychology, socio-cultural aspects, behavioural types) and defining of criteria for the units' inclusion into the sample,
2. analysis of the sample and its elements:
 - selection of the data analysis method (in advance or post hoc); we opted for the two-step post hoc cluster analysis, as it enables large datasets and analyses numerical and categorical data at the same time;
 - we have sent inquiries to all the study circles in 2003; response in two weeks period was 73%; our sample consisted of 354 units (questionnaires);
 - defining of variables and omitting of those which were connected;
 - the questionnaire consisted of 80 questions;
 - sample definition
 - Study circle participants
 - data collection;

- data analysis (SPSS programme).

The two-step cluster method takes a minimal distance between individual units as a clustering criterion. It groups individual data around cores of the group, making a draft Cluster Feature Tree (CFT). The number of clusters was defined automatically according to the Bayes informational criteria (BIC) as we omitted defining the number of clusters in advance (AIC criteria). Individual data were then adjusted to the cluster according to the distance of their centre by searching for the maximum distance between the closest clusters in every hierarchical phase. The distance measure was the Log Likelihood Distance, as variables were nominal and ordinal at the same time.

CFT has more nodes. New facts enter through the leaves, nodes without leaves serve for directing to the right node with leave. An entrance is defined by the cluster tree, described with the number of units, average and variance for numerical variables and number of categorical variables. If the unit is within the distance of the closest entrance, it absorbs it while the entrance is defined once again. If there is no space for the new entrance on the node, the node is divided into two; its content is delineated between them according the same procedure while the most different data are used as seeds. In case of maximum CFT growth, a new CFT is created by the rise of criteria distance. CFT growth is dependent on data entering; therefore we entered the data randomly. The data not included into any of the groups are understood as extremes, if there are less than 25% of the largest leave entrances.

3. Defining segment profiles and their description

Segments were definable, measurable, accessible (for eventual communication), responsive (to eventual offer) and relatively stable (in order to reduce the costs). Weaknesses of data gathering were identified (one of the segments was defined by several unanswered questions; we had to exclude the segment with the statistically non-representative size). Profile was defined for the three segments. They were titled with their typical characteristics.

Stratification of the target group into segments has an important characteristic: segment is defined with the *prevailing* characteristic of its units. Therefore, segments are not exclusive and include unspecific individual units. Differences among segments are relative, dependent on the average of the sam-

ple. Legitimacy of χ^2 might therefore be partly questionable as the sample is not representatively gathered, but the strength of relation is documented by the Pearson and Spearman coefficients.

The subjectivity of the questionnaire, rising out of individual perception of basic terms, possibility of weak questions, defining of clustering indicators, led us to the triangulation of sources, methods and perspective, last but not least to the period of observations, which exceeded five years.

We have chosen logistic regression to identify questions which contributed the most to our findings.

RESULTS REZULTATI

Our sample consisted of 354 units, with 80 answers each. On the basis of the distance/ comparability of respondents' answers, the segmentation process resulted in five groups-segments. Two of them were reduced: in one case, segment C, the number of units was low (eight units only), while one case, segment D, was defined by unanswered questions (it consists of 15% of units). Final result: three segments, titled according to their main characteristics, are:

- segment A represent study circle participants *with* co-natural characteristics; there are 41.4% valid units – study circle participants; segment consists of more men than woman (23% men in the sample, in segment A 30% respectively), its average age is 47.7 years, its participants are active in their local settlement, usually they help without payment, feel rural identity and feel deprived in comparison with other people.
- segment B represent study circle participants *without* co-natural characteristics; there are 29.0% – study circle participants; they are self-defined by urban identity, the lowest average age (42.4 years), developmental passivity, lack of ties among people and relative absence of feeling deprived. Proportion of women is higher than in other two segments (77% in sample, 89% in this segment);
- segment I represents study circle participants who share both characteristics of previous segments; there are 14.2% valid units – study circle participants; the group is smaller and defined by higher average age (54.8 years); several characteristics do not differ statistically from the other two segments, while participants in this segment feel the same identity as in segment A.

Segment characteristics differ. In order to contextualise forest related standpoints, we observed and measured three general affiliations, which prove to correspond to the segments:

- 44 % of respondents considered as »rural« inhabitants; they argued this decision with time, spent living in the rural environment; their decision was based on physical characteristics of the rural environment they live in and emotional ties to their locality; sometimes they cited as a reason their vocation/source of income, usually farming; some described particular emotional feelings towards the rural areas' characteristics;
- 25% of respondents did not declare their affiliation to either urban or rural environment or argued in favour of both of them (e.g. for they are able to adjust to the characteristics of both),
- 31% of respondents expressed their »urban« affiliation.

Focusing on forest relation, we have found that these expressions were extremely positive in all cases. According to our data, the Slovenian forest is crucial for spare time and accommodation. Only one fifth of the respondents see its importance for work and income as well. Those susceptible to urban identity expected (for the sample and the observed year) statistically different forest roles than those susceptible to rural identity. The general clustering of forest roles perceptions was the clearest in the case of known forest area of Notranjska (Table 1). More roles were expected by the respondents susceptible to »urban« identity.

It is not by chance that we got different expectations for locations, offered to respondents. Forest related expectations were relatively homogeneous for certain areas, selected as typical Slovenian forest areas:

- Rožnik, the green recreational area of the capital of Slovenia;
- Kras, typical geographical area characterised by Mediterranean karst forest cover;
- Prekmurje, characterised by the Pannonian plain with forests along the rivers or on hilly agricultural tracts of land;
- Pokljuka, recreational resort and respected Alpine spruce production area;
- Notranjska, vast productive forest area without surface water and hence with scarce population.

Logically, the term »home place« (home surrounding) represented a far richer palette of different forest covers experi-

Table 1: What do study circle participants who feel as »rural« expect from forest – the case for Notranjska region ($\chi^2 = 0.018$)

Preglednica 1: Kaj pričakujejo od gozda udeleženci študijskih krožkov, ki se opredeljujejo za prebivalce podeželja – primer Notranjske ($\chi^2 = 0.018$)

| Segment share (%) Delež v segmentu (%) | | Prevailing forest role / Prevladujoča vloga gozda | | | | Sample share Delež v vzorcu (%) |
|---|--|---|---|--------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------------|
| | | Wood production Proizvodnja lesa | Ecology (forest ground, water, climate) Ekološka vloga (gozdna tla, voda, klima) | Recreation Rekreacija | Multiple roles Več vlog | |
| Self-identity of the study circle participant Samoopredelitev identitete udeleženca študijskega krožka | Rural inhabitant Prebivalec podeželja | 54.40 | 42.90 | 54.50 | 26.70 | 44.10 |
| | Urban inhabitant Prebivalec mesta | 24.30 | 25.90 | 36.40 | 41.70 | 29.00 |
| | Both Oboje | 21.40 | 31.30 | 9.10 | 31.70 | 26.90 |
| Sum Skupaj | | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |

enced by the respondents. Therefore forest roles expectations are more diverse in case of »home place« than in case of typical Slovenian locations (Figure 1).

Relation of respondents to forest is more precisely illustrated by their practical behaviour and standpoints (Table 2). The most of daily practices, e.g. communication, awareness and self-awareness, perception of visitors and personal feeling about forest differ among segments. Bold letters indicate significance of these differences, e.g. a significantly higher share of respondents »aware of forest related conflicts« are in the segment A than in the whole sample of respondents.

DISCUSSION RAZPRAVA

»To be a forester« has a certain mark of identity (comp. Suopajarvi 2009). Forestry profession status amongst the general public decreases and is, at least in Slovenia, hardly perceived. European authors introduce sociological studies (Niskanen 2001, Elands and Wiersum 2001, 2003, Rametsteiner and Kraxner 2003, Elands *et al.* 2004, Niskanen *et al.* 2007), while in Slovenia we lack complex forest related social studies. The cited European rural studies and bibliography on gen-




Fig. 1: Forest roles expectations of the study circle participants for typical Slovenian locations and »home place«

Slika 1: Vloge gozda, ki jih udeleženci študijskih krožkov pričakujejo za tipične slovenske lokacije in okolico domačega kraja

Table 2: Selected characteristics of the three key groups of study circle participants e.g. segments associated with forest

Preglednica 2: Izbrane značilnosti treh skupin oz. segmentov udeležencev študijskih krožkov glede na njihov odnos do gozda

| Questionnaire question <i>Anketno vprašanje</i> | A study circle participants <u>with</u> co-natural characteristics <i>udeleženci študijskih krožkov s sonaravnimi značilnostmi</i> | I intermediate group <i>vmesna skupina</i> | B study circle participants <u>without</u> co-natural characteristics <i>udeleženci študijskih krožkov brez sonaravnih značilnosti</i> |
|--|--|--|--|
| Whom with have you talked about forest the most? <i>S kom ste večinoma govorili o gozdu?</i> | With friends, with local people <i>S prijatelji, sosedi</i> | With forest manage- ment holders <i>Z lastniki gozda</i> | With nobody <i>Z nikomer</i> |
| Have you ever intentionally learned about forest ? <i>Ali ste se o gozdu namensko učili?</i> | Yes <i>Da</i> | Yes-no <i>Da-Ne</i> | No <i>Ne</i> |
| Self-evaluation of knowledge about forest (according to school grades) is ... <i>Samo-ocena znanja o gozdu (s šolsko oceno) ...</i> | Some 4 – A lot 5 <i>Precej 4 – Veliko 5</i> | Not much 3–Some 4 <i>Nekaj 3 - Precej 4</i> | A little 2 <i>Malo 2</i> |
| Have you ever admired forest (through the window)? <i>Ali ste kdaj gozd občudovali?</i> | Usually <i>Pogosto</i> | Usually <i>Pogosto</i> | Seldom-no <i>Redko - Ne</i> |
| Are you aware of any forest related conflicts ? (α 0.000) <i>Ali poznate konflikte, povezane z gozdom?</i> | Yes (segment 69 , sample 56%) <i>Da</i> (segment 69 , vzorec 56%) | Segment has no typical structure for this indicator <i>Segment nima tipične structure za ta kazalec</i> | No (segment 62 , sample 44%) <i>Ne</i> (segment 62 , vzorec 44%) |
| Have you ever attended public presentation of the Forest Management Plan ? <i>Ali te se kdaj udeležili razgrnitve gozdnogospodarkse- ga načrta?</i> | Yes <i>Da</i> | No <i>Ne</i> | No <i>Ne</i> |
| Are you annoyed by forest visitors ? (α 0.009) <i>Ali vas obiskovalci v gozdu motijo?</i> | Yes (segment 20 , sample 14%) <i>Da</i> (segment 20 , vzorec 14%) | Segment has no typical structure for this indicator <i>Segment nima tipične structure za ta kazalec</i> | No (segment 94 , sample 86%) <i>Ne</i> (segment 20 , vzorec 14%) |

der issue in forestry (e.g. Lidestav and Sjölander 2007) seem important as they give a clear message about the functioning of institutional forestry practice. Until recently, the society has simply not been a »forestry field of work«. To improve forest management practice along social transformation from rural to urban society, it would be important to know how many foresters and how many forest owners still feel personally related to forest. Our contribution to the analysis of social context of sustainable forest management was a test of a rational analytical approach to the general society or at least (direct?) forest users as a heterogeneous social structure.

Segmentation, tested in a pilot study of community learning groups, study circles, may play a role of such an analytical rational tool. One of the findings was that segments are not strictly delimited categories. However, the main message is that value based groups of society, e.g. forest users, can be generated; in our case, results prove to be logical. The process of society structuring is comparable with other planning approaches. However, it should be kept in mind that:

- the society is changing quickly, so constant monitoring of social needs is legitimate;
- data from inquiries are complex and subjective in particular.

Complementary use of forestry and sociological methods might bring useful results. Although the one presented herewith is not new, it has not been used in forestry so far. As segmentation is based on several subjective decisions (e.g. variables selection, methods of analysis), we have to know population quite well, choose large samples and triangulate sources, data and methods. In the segmentation presented, we took into consideration all this potential sources of subjectivity. We tested it on the group that we have monitored over a decade and is documented in detail. We used triangulation in observations (personal observation, questionnaire, interviews and regular reports on study group analysis). The questionnaire consisted of more than eighty questions, so the procedures were heavily supported by the gathered data.

Results of this pilot study confirm a certain usefulness of the method. They enable us to resume our analyses and to use the rich internal information flow infrastructure developed during the last decade. They also enable us to choose communication channels, educational offer and information forms. The segmentation does not represent the »end definition« of target public, as it is always part of the context, therefore of a broader research work. Three segments were identified as a key tool from the list of eighty, considered as non-typical indicators of sustainable behaviour.

Use of such an approach might contribute to the strengthening of European and Slovenian communication culture in forestry. Therefore we see it as a contribution to the social pillar as an element of forestry, gaining in importance. Such an approach calls for a constant contextualizing dialogue with the target public through an implementation phase in particular. This might contribute to long-term changes of the public behaviour in forests.

The aim of this text was to overcome the traditional approach to »forestry role changes« from its consequences to its causes. We have chosen to test non-formal education form from the forest relation point of view, as such learning represents intermediate institutions (between massive and individual approach), learners choose the topic, location, time and intensity of learning by themselves, this form is useful to put in force a plural society with its colourful range of living styles (comp. Bogataj 2009). The complexity of social contexts is therefore recognised and objectively analysed. Simple interpretations are not possible. For example, multipurpose expectations of »urban« respondents correspond to professional standpoint but neglect what is the main income of »rural« respondents and their experiential forest related knowledge. However, we are happy with the results even if they were gathered on a non representative sample: they correspond with the general results gathered along the process for gaining the National Forest Programme (NFP) (Golob 2008).

Diversification of values (Luckmann 1966 cit. in Luckmann 2007) is something we should count on in forest management. Developing an infrastructure for e.g. lifelong learning of forest related issues, forest management approaches and practices might be an added value for both, forestry and the broad public. It may support knowledge flow and overcome the diverse gaps. One of them is social sciences recognition in forestry. The basis for such an approach might be two concepts: the concept of lifelong learning and the concept of sustainability. They both indicate time dimension and they

both root in values. Forestry can contribute a huge knowledge and infrastructure developed, which might become an important argument for the crisis we are faced with.

CONCLUSIONS ZAKLJUČKI

The text roots in two concepts, both considering long time dimension: sustainability and lifelong learning. This case study of Slovenian practice is focused on the forest related issues grounded in social context. The sociological method described was tested in order to underline the importance of considering the forestry's social pillar. The main message is therefore that forest use is not only a result of forest characteristics but also, perhaps even mostly, a result of the society and its key groups' interests.

In a knowledge society, information/knowledge skills and flow are crucial. Plural circumstances call for open learning and constant dialogue, therefore our pilot study focused on intermediary structure, Slovenian study groups, as community learning environment based on dialogue. They have been well documented and monitored for more than a decade. The segmentation method has brought some useful results, which have confirmed our hypothesis: structuring of general public according to the non-classical indicators of forest related perceptions is possible.

We conclude that forest professionals have an important opportunity to engage all those who care for forest to make forest related knowledge flow. Engagement of this knowledge into local needs is a special challenge in this respect. Intermediary structure, e.g. Slovenian Forest Service's local professionals, may be an important communication channel for inclusion of less motivated public, which is usually addressed by mass events and media (e.g. Forest Week, Earth Day) only. As they have a role of a model and are usually well incorporated in local social contexts, they might represent rational service in diverse social contexts.

The power of decision makers should therefore root in social contexts knowledge in order to get in contact with allies from diverse social environments. Potential partners in solving common issues are those who gain direct forest benefits, e.g. men and older rural inhabitants in the instance of wood production, urban inhabitants in the instance of recreation and the entire public in the instance of environmental goods. Due to Slovenia's high share of forest cover and its free access, forest is used and admired by the greater part of its population

and particularly foresters. Are foresters of the Forest Service the forestry's allies and consequently its crucial communication channel? Foreign studies of female forest professionals show that forestry unfortunately poorly know even easy identifiable target groups, external or internal. Besides, these forest roles are highly subjective: individual relation towards forest depends on perceptions, defined by quantitative (age, educational and occupational status, income, etc.) and qualitative categories, such as raising, experience, self-conscious, ties with the local people, etc. The latter are extremely difficult to measure as they change and as even the basic term »forest« can at least in Slovenia stimulate diverse perceptions.

An important imperative for further research and professional work and communication with social structures is therefore a non-instrumentalised interest in social structure and social context. Here is the key for solving conflicts and consequently avoiding irreversible consequences in forest. The stratification presented was just one of the steps to improve forest management in this respect. Unfortunately, the staff, finances and R&D support is weak in this field of Slovenian forestry. Our conclusion strives for the broadening of the set of indicators, which define public and target groups from quantitative (age, educational level, e-accessibility) to new, qualitative indicators, e.g. expectations (from forest), responsibility of personal impact on the forest, participation in the public life – active citizenship, information channels, perception of professional measures and responsibility on them. It also underlines the importance of acknowledging and activation of the:

- leading (numerically or by its role) part of the public;
- range of smaller groups, usually neglected for the sake of the minority or lack of their organised public presentation; they can be an important partner for forestry/forest management, if they appreciate forest or its management in general.

Opening of forestry to its social field might strengthen forestry with »added value« without fear for its traditional roles. We also understand our example as a contribution to the social pillar of sustainability, well confirmed also by recent results of NFP.

ZAKLJUČKI

Besedilo temelji na dveh konceptih, ki upoštevata dolgoročnost: koncept trajnosti in koncept vseživljenjskega učenja.

Študijo primera slovenske prakse smo osredotočili na teme v različnih družbenih kontekstih, povezane z gozdom. Eno izmed družboslovnih metod smo preizkusili predvsem zato, da bi podčrtali pomen družbenega stebra gozdarstva. Temeljno sporočilo je torej, da raba gozda ni le rezultat značilnosti gozda, marveč tudi, morda celo zlasti, rezultat interesov ključnih družbenih skupin.

V družbi znanja so ključni informacije/znanje in njihov/njegov pretok. Pogoji pluralnosti terjajo odprto učenje in stalen dialog, zato je naša pilotna raziskava osredotočena na vmesne strukture. Taki so tudi slovenski študijski krožki, dialoško okolje skupnostnega učenja, spremljano in dokumentirano že več kot petnajst let. Metoda segmentacije je dala nekaj uporabnih rezultatov, ki so potrdili našo hipotezo: strukturiranje splošne javnosti glede na neklasične kazalce odnosa do gozda je možno.

Gozdarski strokovnjaki imajo pomembno priložnost pretoka gozdarskega znanja med vsemi, ki jim je za gozd mar. Vključitev tega znanja v lokalne potrebe je v tem kontekstu poseben izziv. Vmesna struktura, npr. strokovnjaki Zavoda za gozdove Slovenije, so lahko pomemben komunikacijski kanal za vključevanje manj motivirane javnosti, ki jo navadno naslavlja le masovni dogodki in mediji (npr. Teden gozdov, Dan Zemlje). Ker imajo vlogo zgleada in so pogosto dobro vključeni v lokalne družbene kontekste, lahko racionalno obvladujejo različne družbene kontekste.

Moč nosilcev odločanja je torej v poznavanju družbenih kontekstov in posledično možnosti za stik s partnerji v njih. Potencialni partnerji za reševanje skupnih zadev so tisti, ki imajo neposredne koristi od gozda, npr. moški in starejši prebivalci podeželja od lesa, mestni prebivalci od rekreacije in vsa javnost od ekoloških vlog gozda. Zaradi visokega deleža gozdnih površin in prostega dostopa do njih v Sloveniji gozd uporablja in občuduje večji del prebivalcev, še posebej gozdarji. Ali so gozdarji Zavoda za gozdove partnerji gozdarstva in njegov ključni komunikacijski kanal? Tuje študije gozdarskih strokovnjakinj kažejo, da gozdarstvo žal slabo pozna celo tiste skupine, zunanje ali notranje, ki jih je razmeroma preprosto opredeliti. Poleg tega so vloge gozda zelo subjektivne: posameznikov odnos do gozda je odvisen od zaznavanja, določenega s kvantitativnimi kategorijami (starost, izobrazbeni in poklicni status, dohodek ipd.) in kvalitativnimi kategorijami, kot so vzgoja, izkušnje, samozavest, vezi z domačini ipd. Slednje je izjemno težko meriti, ker se spreminjajo, saj celo temeljni pojem »gozd« lahko, vsaj v Sloveniji, zbuja zelo raznolike predstave.

Pomemben vzvod za nadaljnje raziskave, strokovno delo in komunikacijo z družbenimi strukturami je ne-instrumentalizirano zanimanje za družbene strukture in družbeni kontekst. V tem je ključ za reševanje sporov in izogibanje nepovratnim vplivom na gozd. Predstavljeno strukturiranje je le eden od korakov za izpopolnitev gospodarjenja z gozdom z vidika trajnosti. Žal je osebja, sredstev in raziskovalno-razvojne podpore na tem področju slovenskega gozdarstva malo. Stremimo k razširjenju nabora kazalcev iz kvantitativnih podatkov (starost, raven izobrazbe, e-dostopnost) na nove kvalitativno določene javnosti in ciljne skupine, npr. pričakovanja (vlog gozda), odgovornost za osebni vpliv na gozd, dejavno državljanstvo, informacijske poti, zaznavanje strokovnih ukrepov in odgovornost do njih. Podčrtujemo pomen upoštevanja in aktiviranja:

- vodilnih (po številu in vlogi) delov javnosti;
- niza manjših skupin, pogosto zapostavljenih zaradi majhnosti ali pomanjkanja njihovega organiziranega javnega nastopanja; lahko so pomemben partner gozdarstva/upravljanja z gozdom, če so gozdu in gospodarjenju z njim naklonjene.

Odpiranje gozdarstva družboslovju lahko našo stroko plemeniti z »dodano vrednostjo«, ne da bi se bali za tradicionalne vloge gozdarstva. Predstavljeni primer razumemo kot prispevek k družbenemu stebru trajnosti, ki ga potrjujejo tudi rezultati analiz ob pripravi nacionalnega gozdnega programa.

REFERENCES

REFERENCE

- BOGATAJ, N., 2005. Slovenskim študijskim krožkom v novo desetletje. V: Bogataj N. (ur.). Študijski krožki, od zamisli do sadov v prvem desetletju. Zbirka Študije in raziskave, Ljubljana, Andragoški center Slovenije 12: 83-97
- BOGATAJ, N., 2009. Gozd v učenju in izobraževanju za trajnostni razvoj: prispevek k uveljavljanju ideje trajnosti in kroženja znanja o gozdu v Sloveniji. ZRC SAZU, 108 p.
- ČERNIČ ISTENIČ, M., KVEDER, A., PERPAR, A., 2003. Socio-ekonomski kontekst kot pojasnjevalni dejavnik razlik v rodnostnem vedenju. Statistični dnevi, Radenci, 28. - 26. november 2003. <http://www.stat.si/radenci/referat/cernic,kveder,perpar.doc> (28.3.2006)
- ELANDS, B. H. M., WIERSUM, K. F., 2001. Forestry and rural development in Europe, an exploration of socio-political discourses. In: Forest policy and economics, 3: 5-16
- ELANDS, B. H. M., WIERSUM, K. F., 2003. Forestry and rural development in Europe: research results and policy implications of a comparative European study: forest and nature conservation policy group. Wageningen, Wageningen University: 178 p.
- ELANDS, B. H. M., O'LEARY, T.N., BOERWINKEL, H.W.J., WIERSUM, K. F., 2004. Forests as a mirror of rural conditions-local views on the role of forests across Europe. Forest policy and economics, 6: 469-482
- GOLOB, A., 2008. Zainteresirana slovenska javnost o pomenu gozda in gozdarstvu. GozdV 66, 2: 95-104
- GOUOULAKIS, P., BOGATAJ, N., 2007. Study circles in Sweden and Slovenia - learning for civic participation. Social capital and governance. Frane Adam. (ed.). Berlin : LIT, cop. 2007. (Gesellschaftliche transformationen); 203-235. http://www.ff.uni-lj.si/oddelki/geo/publikacije/dela/files/Dela_23/007_lampic.pdf (28.3.2006)
- JELENC KRAŠOVEC, S., KUMP, S., 2007. Ali se odrasli na podeželju učijo drugače kot v mestih? : učna dejavnost odraslih v različnih bivanjskih okoljih. Teorija in praksa 44, 1-2: 277-297.
- KLEMENČIČ, M., LAMPIČ, B., PERPAR, A., POTOČNIK SLAVIČ, I., SLABE, A., 2005: Strukturni problemi in razvojni izzivi slovenskega podeželja v evropski razsežnosti: končno poročilo CRP Konkurenčnost Slovenije 2001-2006. Ljubljana, FF, Oddelek za geografijo, BF - Inštitut za agrarno ekonomiko, Inštitut za trajnostni razvoj.
- KOROŠEC, V., 2002. Samo izkušnje so premalo. Sodobno kmetijstvo 35, 9: 360-363
- KOTNIK, A., 2005. Educational needs of forest owners in the forest management region Novo mesto. V: Forest operation improvements in farm forests, Robek R. in Arzberger U. (ur.). Workshop proceedings, Logarska dolina, 9.-14. september. Rome, FAO: 243-253
- KOVAČIČ, M., UDOVČ, A., KRAMARIČ, F., 2006. Socio-ekonomski tipi kmetij po podatkih popisa kmetijskih gospodarstev v letu 2000. V: Slovenija v EU - izzivi za kmetijstvo, živilstvo in podeželje; 3. konferenca DAES, Moravske Toplice, 10.-11. november 2005. Ljubljana: Društvo agrarnih ekonomistov Slovenije. DAES, 71-79.
- LIDESTAV, G. SJÖLANDER, A. E., 2007. Gender and forestry: a critical discourse analysis of forestry professions in Sweden, Scandinavian Journal of Forest Research, 1651-1891, Volume 22, Issue 4: 351 - 362
- LUCKMANN, T., 2007. Družba, komunikacija, smisel, transcendenca. Ljubljana: Študentska založba
- MEDVED, M., 1994. Usposobljenost zasebnih lastnikov gozdov za gospodarjenje z gozdovi. V: Gozdarsko izobraževanje. Ljubljana: Zveza gozdarskih društev Slovenije: 35-42.
- MEDVED, M., 1997. Izobraževanje zasebnih lastnikov gozdov v Sloveniji s poudarkom na varnem delu pri sečnji. GozdV.55, 1: 24-34.
- MEDVED, M., 2002. Izobraževanje zasebnih lastnikov gozdov na razpotju. GozdV 60, 3: 129-152.
- NISKANEN, A., 2001. Economic integration for urban demand and rural forestry production. COST Action proposal, draft 14.2.2001; 4 p.
- NISKANEN, A. SLEE, B. OLLONQUIST, P. et al., 2007. Entrepreneurship in the forest sector in Europe. University of Joensuu. Faculty of Forestry. Silva Carelica 52, 2007, 120 p.
- ORŠANIČ, H., 2005. Ohranjanje narave in lastništvo gozda na primeru Posavja : magistrsko delo, UL, BF, Ljubljana XVII, 193 p.
- RAMETSTEINER, E., KRAXNER, F., 2003. Europeans and Their Forests. What Do Europeans Think About Forests and Sustainable Forest Management? A Review of Representative Public Opinion Surveys in Europe. Ministerial Conference on the Protection of Forests in Europe, Liaison Unit Vienna. <http://www.mcpfe.org/publications/pdf/>
- SUOJARVI, T., 2009. Negotiation of gender in Finnish forestry. Making a difference in Theory and practice, Umea, June, 15.-18. November 2009 (internal material)
- ŠINKO, M., MALNAR, B., 2000. Slovensko javno mnenje v letu 1998 o slovenskih gozdovih. Zb. gozd. les. 62: 149-169
- VESELIČ, Ž., MIKULIČ, V., OGRIZEK, R., 2008. Lastniki gozdov o gozdarstvu, njihovem delu v gozdu in o delu Zavoda za gozdove Slovenije, Anketa ZGS v letu 2007. interno gradivo 8 p.