

# INCLUSION OF RECREATIONALLY REPELLENT LOCATIONS AS A TOOL FOR COHESIVE LANDSCAPE PERCEPTION

**Jan Deutscher, Petr Kupec**

*Department of Landscape Management, Faculty of Forestry and Wood Technology, Mendel University in Brno, Czechia*

<https://doi.org/10.11118/978-80-7701-025-2/0142>

## Abstract

Whether conscious or unconscious, positive discrimination in the protection and care of recreationally or otherwise socially privileged (e.g., institutionalized nature conservation) localities and species or their habitats at the expense of excluded, unattractive localities is a little-discussed but binding societal problem. This problem is gaining importance, especially in the context of the constantly increasing requirements for the quality of recreational experiences, as well as in the context of selecting and defining protected areas with lower levels of protection or those protected only by general nature conservation. The value of qualitative perception is influenced mainly by the scale (knowledge) and perception of an object whose perceptual quality is considered low for any reason. The article explores the concept of incorporating so-called recreationally repellent localities into the recreational perceptions and actions of society, aiming to maintain a balanced perspective on both recreational and general landscapes.

**Key words:** recreational perception of the landscapes, recreationally social perceptual value, recreationally repellent landscapes

## Introduction

The word repellence comes from the Latin *repellere* – “to push away” or “to drive away” and in fact expresses the ability of a substance or organism to repel another organism. The original meaning of the word repellence was associated with chemistry (biochemistry), or biological sciences in general, but currently this concept is understood much more broadly. In general, repellence can be expressed as a set of properties of a certain entity that repel (drive away) another entity, usually in the quantitative ratio of one repellent entity to the set of repelled entities. It does not matter whether the repellent properties of the repelling entity are given chemically, mechanically or emotionally.

If we accept the concept of natural recreationally attractive landscapes as a set of their properties, which directly positively influence the physical and psychological setting of the vacationer and are further proposed by a certain social demand (social consensus of attractiveness), then it is obvious that in contrast to this concept there must necessarily be the concept of landscapes, or their recreationally repellent parts. This repellency is given both by the direct negative impact on the physical or psychological health or well-being of a person and by the social consensus that does not understand such landscapes as attractive.

It is obvious that the degree (quantity) of attractiveness is directly related to repellency, in other words, on a regional scale, recreationally repellent landscapes directly define the level of attractiveness of attractive recreational landscapes. The importance of recreationally repellent landscapes then lies in the fact that without recreationally repellent landscapes, the possibility of quantitative perception of recreationally attractive landscapes is significantly limited. In other words, there is no light without darkness (Burik, 2019).

## Material and methods

Landscape perception (positive or negative) is determined by the set of possibilities in which people perceive and interpret landscape elements and the environment around them (Tuan, Y.-F., 1974). It includes both individual and collective aspects of landscape perception and is largely subjective. If certain parameters of subjective evaluation become a social consensus, they can be considered at least objectified at a given time and place.

Main ways of landscape perception:

- **Aesthetic perception** - evaluation of the "beauty" of the landscape (e.g. Deutscher, J., 2014)
- **Cognitive perception** - creation of a mental map and its internal interpretation
- **Emotional perception** - perception through feelings

- **Cultural perception** - perception of the landscape defined by cultural and historical experience
- **Social perception** - perception of the landscape in the current social context
- **Ecological perception** - perception of the landscape in the context of its functional parameters (Kupec, et al., 2018)

It is obvious that although finding an objective metric for a comprehensive expression of the attractiveness or repellency of a certain recreational landscape is very problematic. This is due not only to the fact that the perception of the landscape is very subjective, but also to a certain extent to the fact that all of the above-mentioned ways of perceiving the landscape influence and condition each other to a certain extent.

However, for the definition of the recreational repellency of contemporary landscapes, it seems that the objective starting point can be the ecological perception of the landscape and the social perception linked to it. This is how the primary recreational repellency of the landscape is understood in this article.

## Results

From the point of view of the possibility of objective parameterization (setting objective metrics), the assessment of the recreational repellency of the landscape can currently be divided into three levels:

### **1. Primary recreational repellency of the landscape - ecological and social**

These types of recreational repellency can be parameterized in an objective manner to a large extent. These are landscapes with disrupted ecosystem functions, often devastated, exploited, etc. Contemporary society views them as landscapes that are significantly recreationally unattractive or repellent. Objectification of the degree of repellency is possible through standard methods of ecology and sociology.

### **2. Secondary recreational repellency of the landscape - cognitive and emotional**

These types of recreational repellency can be based on primary repellency, their objectified parameterization is significantly more complicated. They are often associated with the localization of the perceiving (evaluating) person, however, from the perspective of the vacationer, they mostly copy primary repellency.

### **3. Tertiary recreational repellency of landscapes - emotional**

Objectification of the metrics of this recreational repellency is the most difficult, especially because in the concept of "beauty is in the eye of the beholder" (Deutscher, 2014) the aesthetics of the landscape can be perceived very differently, e.g. as attractive even when, according to the perception of recreational repellency according to primary and secondary repellency, a certain landscape can be objectively described as recreationally repellent.

## Discussion and conclusion

In the previous section, three levels of recreational repellency of landscapes were defined according to the possibility of their objectified parameterization or according to how they are interconnected (interconnected primary and secondary recreational repellency of landscapes and relatively independent tertiary recreational repellency of landscapes). To assess the repellency of any specific landscape in this concept, it is possible to use standard tools of ecology and sociology (primary recreational repellency) or psycho-sociology (secondary and tertiary recreational repellency). Understanding the importance of recreationally repellent landscapes is then primarily related to the growing need for their inclusion in perceptual patterns of perception of recreational landscapes. In a situation where recreationally repellent landscapes will be excluded from this pattern for a long time, there is a risk that the role of repellent landscapes may be taken over by low-attractive landscapes and thus spiral the requirements of recreational communities for the quality of attractive landscapes. It is obvious that a permanent increase in the recreational qualities of landscapes is not sustainable in the long term in the context of other landscape functions. The inclusion of recreationally repellent landscapes into perceptual patterns of landscape perception can thus significantly contribute to maintaining coherent landscape use while preserving all of its ecosystem services.

## References

- Burik, S. (2019). Darkness and light: Absence and presence in Heidegger, Derrida, and Daoism. *Dao*, 18, 347-370.
- Deutscher, J. (2014). The visual beauty of linear green-structures in rural landscape, principles of aesthetic evaluation and its application in landscape management. In: FIALOVÁ, Jitka; PERNICOVÁ,

Dana (ed.). Public recreation and landscape protection - with man hand in hand?. 1. vyd. Brno: Vydavatelství Mendelovy univerzity v Brně, 304--307. ISBN 978-80-7375-952-0.

Kupec, P., Školoud, L. & Deutscher, J. Tree species composition influences differences in water use efficiency of upland forested microwatersheds. *Eur J Forest Res* 137, 477–487 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10342-018-1117-0>

Tuan, Y.-F. (1974). *Topophilia: A study of environmental perception, attitudes, and values*. Prentice-Hall.

## Souhrn

Článek se zabývá pojmem a významem inkluze rekreačně repelentních krajín do hodnotového sledu perceptivního vnímání rekreace v přírodě. Na základě obecné definice repelence (soubor vlastností jisté entity, které odpuzují jinou entitu, většinou v kvantitativním poměru jedné repeleční entity vůči souboru odpuzovaných entit) vymezuje koncept rekreačně repelentních lokalit v kontextu rekreačně atraktivních přírodních lokalit. Koncept přírodních rekreačně atraktivních krajín je chápán jako soubor jejich vlastností, které bezprostředně pozitivně ovlivňují fyzické i psychické nastavení rekreanta a jsou dále proponovány jistou společenskou poptávkou (společenský konsensus atraktivity), v kontrastu s tímto konceptem stojí koncept krajín, či jejich částí, které jsou rekreačně repeleční. Tato repelence je dána jednak bezprostředním negativním vlivem na fyzické či psychické zdraví či pohodu člověka a dále společenským konsenzem, který takové krajiny jako atraktivní nechápe. Přitom je zřejmé, že míra (kvantita) atraktivity jde v přímé vazbě k repelenci, jinými slovy v regionálním měřítku rekreačně repelentní krajiny bezprostředně definují výši atraktivity rekreačních krajín atraktivních. Význam rekreačně repelentních krajín pak spočívá v tom, že bez rekreačně repelentních krajín je možnost kvantitativní percepce rekreačně atraktivních krajín významně omezená.

## Contact:

Doc. Ing. Petr Kupec, Ph.D.

E-mail: [petr.kupec@mendelu.cz](mailto:petr.kupec@mendelu.cz)

Open Access. This article is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, CC-BY 4.0 (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

