URBEX (URBAN EXPLORATION) AND PSEUDOURBEX: WHAT IS THE ACTUAL DIFFERENCE?

Kamila TUREČKOVÁ[a]

[a] Department of Economics and Public Administration, Silesian University in Opava, Czech Republic, tureckova@opf.slu.cz

Abstract

Urban Exploration (URBEX) is a relatively modern leisure activity that is directly related to the exploration of abandoned and unused buildings, sites and other results of human activity. Urbex is often presented as the exploration of modern ruins and is characterized by a set of unwritten rules to be followed by the so-called explorers (urbexers), which defines urbex as such. Urbex is a phenomenon on the border of the law, but it is not comprehensively scientifically elaborated, especially in the field of typology and defining what urbex is and what it is not. Therefore, the aim of this paper is to elaborate the theoretical concept of urbex within the limits of scientific work, including the determination of its forms and manifestations, and within these, to establish key parameters for identifying the differences between authentic urbex and pseudo-urbex, which in the true sense of the word is not urbex as such. Defining the intermediate form between urbex in the true sense of the word and the absence of urbex is essential for further research, as it allows specifying the subject under investigation. The specification of pseudourbex is an autistic innovation and neologism and is based on a factual confrontation and synthesis of the rules of urbex and its types and forms, which is combined with the author's own knowledge. The topic of pseudourbex itself is not contentious, but is open to further scientific discussion.

Keywords: urbex; urban exploration; urbexer; pseudourbex; rurex

INTRODUCTION

Urbex, Urban Exploration, is an activity in which people (out of enthusiasm for the cause) visit and explore abandoned, inaccessible or forgotten objects and buildings. It is a phenomenon of the last decades, which has the potential for further development and can become an interesting factor in the growth of tourism.

The aim of this article is to establish the difference between urbex and pseudourbex within the limits of scientific work based on the synthesis of knowledge about what urbex should be, in which categories the research can be carried out and what rules are inherent to it. Many people, consciously or unconsciously, do not carry out urban exploration in the true sense of the word, and there is a moral and factual need to clearly distinguish these exploratory activities from each other and to set their content straight. The aim of this thesis is thus to reflect the current trends of the growing popularity of urbex and the human nature to be fashionable,

unconventional and popular. In many cases, this is not true urbex and the presented activity only pretends to be one (for various reasons). The contribution also responds to the own scientific need to precisely define the object of research, which can be generalized for further professional study of the issue of urbex. There is a factual difference between urbex and pseudourbex, which can make the results of future studies, scientific research and analytical works imprecise and limit reliable results, where this will not be strictly distinguished.

The motivation of this contribution is therefore to name a group of explorers who do not fulfill the attributes of a "true – authentic" urbexer and for this reason behave in a different way. Below in the text, a new terminological name is determined, where pseudourbex is a neologism. The introduction of the term pseudourbex has expanded the division of human society into three research subjects, in relation to urban exploration, namely urbtexers, pseudourbexers and subjects not conducting exploration. Let us add that the part of the text devoted to the typology of the research is completely new, as is the use of the term pseudourbex, including the attempt to define it and confront it with the authentic urbex.

The form of the contribution is specific; it is neither purely a traditional review paper nor a contribution containing primary research.

The contribution is structured traditionally, the Introduction is followed by Literature, which focuses on approaching the issue of urbex more comprehensively, so that the overall context of urbex is better explained to the general public, because the very intention to introduce a new designation for "partial" urbex has not yet been presented. The following is a part dedicated to the Methodology, here it should be noted that the effort to distinguish the survey into two groups is the author's own invention and has no support in other scientific studies and texts. In the Results section, the text is divided into three substantive parts. The first is the definition of the rules of conduct during urbex created by the multi-source synthesis on which urbex is based; the second part is devoted to the typology of the survey, because not every survey coincides with urbex survey; and in the last part, based on a combination of previous knowledge, pseudourbex is actually distinguished from urbex. This also makes the definition of urbex as such more precise. The Discussion section is omitted, which can be explained by the absence of confrontational texts and studies. The conclusion summarizes the most important conclusions resulting from the presented contribution.

LITERATURE

Urbex is a targeted exploration or visit to abandoned buildings, complexes and various objects that have been created by human activity and which are currently abandoned, empty, decaying and do not fulfil their original useful (practical) function (Robinson, 2015; Kuźma, 2015; Kovacs, 2023; Duda et al., 2024). Alternatively, urban exploration can be replaced by terms such as modern ruin exploration or urban exploration, where the specific purpose of this activity is to get a personal experience of the site and to record it visually in the form of photography[2] or video footage (Lesné, 2022; Garret, 2016; Mott and Roberts, 2014). The aim of urbex is therefore to document abandoned and forgotten parts of the urban structures of human settlements (urban landscapes) and at the same time to "enjoy" the sense of adventure of visiting these unique spaces and places (Roult et al., 2018). The popularity of urbex has increased significantly in the last two decades (Turečková and Dolák, 2025) and has given rise to its own global subculture (Kindynis, 2017) and a number of local urbex communities. This is linked to the significant growth in interest in abandoned properties (Borseková, et al., 2015) or other results of human activity and their non-random, planned and unique visit (Radford, 2020, Duda et al., 2024; Garrett, 2012) in particular during specific eras (Hála et al., 2023). Lesné (2022) emphasizes that the importance of scientific research into urbex has a parallel in better understanding cities, urban spaces, and urban societies. Urbex is limited by the fact that it is an activity "on the edge of the law", where violations of civil law in particular are very common (Duda et al., 2024; Duda et al., 2025; Fulton 2017; Lyden 2013) and the exploration itself is in many cases dangerous and risky.

Urbex is no longer just a modern, leisure time activity, but has transformed into an object of development of a specialized (non)consumer, authentic, more allocentric and unusual tourism industry[3] (Gonzalez, 2022; Lennon and Foley, 2000; Robinson, 2015; Fraser, 2012; Steiner and Reisinger, 2006) and its popularity is taking on global proportions (Robinson, 2015). And urbex has also been extensively described through the lens of tourism. It is considered a type of "adventure tourism" for those who like to take risks (Lebreton and Gibout, 2017) or "interior tourism" (Nieszczerzewska, 2018) for those interested in discovering, learning and rediscovering themselves. Urbex also reflects current trends in tourism, with a renewed interest in ruins (Le Gallou, 2018). But it has also become a purely fashionable affair, which has a

---

[2] Often having the character of an artistic creation after additional technical adjustments and modifications.
[3] Also referred to as urban tourism.

parallel in the growing promotion of urbex on social networks and other media (Rosa, 2013; Lavrenova, 2024) and its substance and content have been altered in a number of cases. The original meaning of urbex, i.e. to experience (adrenaline) adventure (Paiva, 2008; George, 2011) associated with the subjectively perceived excitement of learning something new, exciting, mysterious and dangerous (associated with feelings of fear, anxiety, stress, sadness, depression, etc.) (for more see Cameron, 2008), is also associated with an interest in the history and culture of the site[4] and requires the explorer to behave responsibly and considerately (see Code of Ethics and Urbex rules below). It is therefore not uncommon today that many explorers are not urbexers in the true sense of the word. Urbex is an activity combining knowledge and interest in history (Stones, 2016), architecture (Craggs, et al., 2013), culture, geography (Garrett, 2010), travelling, sport, technology (Pinder, 2005); it is a sociological topic (Prescott, 2011) with psychological content (Radford, 2020) with the possibility of presenting itself within journalism and art. The urban places and locations are relatively easy to access in terms of their number and forms (see the chapter on Typology of the exploration) combined with an acceptable commuting distance. Finally, let us add that a systematic literature review and bibliometric analysis on urbex was published by Lesné (2022).

METHODOLOGY

The methodological framework of this purely theoretical and conceptual text is defined primarily by a search of professional and popular publications and their critical analysis in the sense of a factual confrontation of available information related to the content of this paper. In the case of the developed typology of urbex activities elaborated in a separate subchapter, it was based mainly on own observation and own knowledge and experience[5], as a similar or alternative categorization was not found by the author in the framework of his own scientific and research activities[6], i.e. there are no other articles that can be relied upon when categorizing forms of urbex and creating a typology. Nevertheless, the author believes that his typology of different forms of approach to the exploration of "modern ruins" meets the condition of reality

---

[4] Urbex is also about the atmosphere of the place, where time shifts to another dimension.

[5] At present, it is not possible to rely on other scientific knowledge that can be adopted, therefore the author bases his work on his own observations in the role of an urbexer and a researcher who has been trying to publish on the given topic (for more than 3 years); the author combines this knowledge from information from the media and social networks, as well as from the author's own research, which is currently being carried out (see https://forms.gle/L71rCjDqeoamAeoy6).

[6] The topic of urbex is also often treated in a form other than the usual scientific academic texts. This is reflected in the references where popularization texts are also referenced.

and relevance, is logical and factual, and within the basic shapes and forms of the urbex, including the behaviour of the explorers themselves, relatively complex as well. The author also believes that the presented typology has its scientific potential and can be further expanded, corrected or refined.

In order to fulfil the stated goal of determining the key parameters for interpreting the differences between true urbex and pseudo-urbex, it is necessary, in addition to categorizing the different forms of research, to define the rules for urbex (the so-called code of ethics of urbex), which are supposed to define it in terms of the behaviour of the researchers themselves. Both are then also confronted with a definition of what urbex should be[7]. By critically linking these three areas of content, elaborated in the subchapters of this paper, it is possible to establish, from a professional-scientific point of view, the mutual differences in the implementation of exploration activities and to concretise the content of authentic urbex as such.

Both deductive and inductive approaches have been reflected in the processing of the article, with the key being the substantive comparison and synthesis of partial findings formulated in response to the stated objective. The formulation of the differences between urbex and pseudourbex take the form of a generalized but not definitive statement. The text is accompanied by the author's own photographs which are primarily illustrative.

RESULTS

This chapter is divided into three parts. The first subchapter defines as comprehensively as possible 11 rules of urbex, which regulate the behavior of an urbexer during his own exploration. Logically, anyone who does not behave according to them is not an urbexer. The

---

[7] The definitions of urbex themselves are often very vague and a specific clear specification of urbex itself is actually missing. In particular, the definitions lack information about ethics and standards of behavior, which, on the other hand, are contained in the urbex code of ethics. Let us give a few examples of traditional definitions: (1) Paiva (2008) has described: urbex means different things to different people. For some, it's about infiltrating a city's storm drains and subway tunnels. For others, it's climbing bridges and radio towers. Generally speaking, though, urbex is the exploration of TOADS (Temporary, Obsolete, abandoned and Derelict Spaces). The essential components of the hobby include a disused site and a means of capturing images (photography or video) to document the hobbyist's journey through that particular space. The resulting photographic images may then be collected and potentially shared with selected audiences. The urban explorer may have multiple motivations for pursuing this hobby, often thrill seeking and, importantly, capturing or documenting evidence of a visit. (2) Kindynis (2016) urbex is the practice of researching, gaining access to, and documenting forbidden, forgotten or otherwise off-limits places, including abandoned buildings, high-rise construction sites and infrastructure systems. (3) According to Garrett (2014) urban exploration is a practice of researching, rediscovering and physically exploring temporary, obsolete, abandoned, derelict and infrastructural areas within built environments without permission to do so. (4) And last one: Urbex – from urban exploration – is a leisure activity that involves scouting abandoned and/or neglected infrastructure with the aim of touring and sometimes photographing it (Lesné, 2022).

rules described here are the result of a synthesis of rules stated across the urbex spectrum, both by experts and urbexers themselves. Their list was not always uniform and complete in terms of its factual content. Now the rules should be as complete as possible, also in terms of their concretization and alternative explanation. The second part is devoted to the typology of urbex forms, the creation of which was written more in the previous part of the article. This typology is not final, but even in this form it is methodologically transferable to further research. By combining both topics, it is then possible to define both groups of explorers in the context of urbex and to determine the differences between urbex and pseudourbex.

Urban exploration rules vs. explorer behaviour

Urbex activities are fully shaped by the behaviour of the explorers themselves, who may or may not behave in accordance with the unwritten rules that institutionalise urbex to some extent. Given that the rules and instructions for behaviour in urban exploration are not legitimised in a single and binding code of ethics, but are given in various forms and in indirect reflections, there is already room for the intentional or unintentional transition of the rules to the benefit of each urbexer. However, many urbexers generally honour and respect the generally set rules, guidelines and recommendations. There are 11 most frequently mentioned rules, including the basic rule (Garett, 2014; Cuba, 2023; Půlpán, 2020; Chválová, 2021; Ninjalicious, 2005; Faiglová and Havlíková, 2014; Lang, 2008), which is "leave only footprints, take only photos" or "don't destroy or take anything, just photos and experiences". (e.g. Waitt and Cook, 2007). The other 10 rules are presented here as part of a logical and substantive synthesis of several sub-sources providing guidance and recommendations for implementing the urbex. These are:

(1) respect laws and property rights, respect privacy and property (don't trespass without permission), if a place is inaccessible, don't create entrances, if an entrance exists, leave it in the condition you discovered it;

(2) safety is a priority, don't get into situations that can endanger life and health (be aware of the safety risks and pitfalls of urbex sites, be prepared for them and don't take unnecessary risks, be aware that there may be other people or animals in the building);

(3) be cautious and find out as much information as possible about the location and the area you are exploring, avoid risky and unstable places;

(4) be discreet, the intention of the urbex is to be as unobtrusive as possible, which means not drawing attention to the ongoing research and also to the fact that the site is relevant

to the urbex (the fewer "uninterested" people know about the site, the longer it will last);

(5) be prepared in terms of appropriate equipment in case of unexpected obstacles (first aid kit, helmet, flashlight, etc.);

(6) don't take anything away (respect the owners' property, don't steal), don't damage anything (e.g. don't move furniture, don't be a vandal), don't smuggle anything (rubbish), keep the place exactly as you found it;

(7) share photos and experiences responsibly with respect for the site and its history (do not provide information that could lead to damage or misuse of the site), urbex sites are not shared publicly;

(8) urbex is not a commercial affair on which one should prosper financially;

(9) perceive the atmosphere, genius loci, honour the history and culture of the place, urbex is not only about photo (video) documentation of the location, but especially for the experience;

(10) respect other urbexers, their right to privacy and their right to explore the space in its authentic form.

These rules should be noted and followed by all who subscribe to urbex and consider themselves credible urbexers. These rules are recognized by a wide group of interested parties, including both practitioners and researchers, and the requirement to comply with them is also referred to by the above-mentioned authors of the partial formulations of the rules (see above), as well as by, for example, Israel (2022) and Fulton (2021). However, along with the media coverage and popularisation of urbex, when it is slowly becoming a mainstream issue within specific forms of leisure activities, there is a growing group of people who do not do so and who, through various forms of behaviour, devalue places (objects of urbex) (see Merrill, 2014; Stonington, 2014).

Typology of "urban" explorations

The absence of a distinction between the different forms of approach to exploration has led to the development of a classification of characteristics closely associated with this activity[8]. By

---

[8] Due to the fact that there is no similar typology, the one presented here was elaborated by the author of the article. It is their own logical concept, which is based on their experience (mainly in the form of observation) combined with the knowledge obtained in the search of professional sources and other publications.

combining the information above with the approaches to exploring the results of human activity presented here, it is possible to identify ex post the authentic – the real urbex from the pseudo urbex, which is not an urbex in the true sense of the word (see next chapter). The typology of the exploration of "modern ruins", i.e. the determination of its forms, aspects and manifestations grouped into logical and substantive categories, is presented in the table below (Tab. 1). This typology specifies possible forms of exploration typical of both urbex and pseudourbex. It is in their further articulation that we are able to determine forms typical of authentic urbex or of the pseudourbex formulated here. It should be added here that the categorization of urbex presented here is not necessarily definitive; the intention was to specify the basic types of exploration that are most recognizable in the context of urbex activities.

Table 1 Typology of the exploration

by the object of the exploration	relating to properties (brownfields: real estate* or infrastructure remains**) or other results of human activity (wrecks of planes, ships, trains) * abandoned hospitals, schools, hotels, factories ** deserted railway lines, runways
by the motive for the exploration	unintentional, purposeful (conscious)
by the type of the building inspection	internal, external, complex (internal and external)
by the legitimacy of the exploration	legitimate (with consent), unauthorized, free
by the number of explorers	individual, collective (in a group)
by the frequency of explorations	regular and relatively frequent, occasional (sporadic)
by providing information about the object	personal (private), shared
by the reason of the exploration	non-profit, commercial

Source: own

By the very nature of the object of the exploration, it may be a property or other result of human activity. In most cases, the object of an urbex is a brownfield site, which represents abandoned and neglected real estate in the form of buildings, structures, sites, open spaces, land, physical roads etc., which previously fulfilled a specific economic function, but which has been discontinued and no new use has yet been found (Turečková et al., 2021). These properties are functionally vacant, may be contaminated, structurally dilapidated and falling apart. The properties are also often sites for the creation of black dumps or a concentration of sociopathological phenomena[9]. From this perspective, they can identify actual or potential

---

[9] It is a meeting place for homeless people, drug addicts, vandals, delinquents, alcoholics, etc., who are often surrounded by stray dogs and cats, which can lead to conflict between them and the urbexers.

threats and risks that can harm the health and life of not only the explorers themselves (Duda et al., 2024).

Brownfields are formed after civic amenities and as a remnant of industrial, agricultural, residential, military, administrative, mining, transportation or other activities (Turečková, 2022; Sucháček, 2019). Typical brownfields that are in the focus of attention of researchers are non-functioning hotels and hostels, shops and restaurants, agricultural cooperatives and estates, factories and warehouses, chateaux and mansions (more e.g. Turečková, 2023), monasteries, residential houses and villas or schools, cinemas, theatres, sanatoriums and health centres, bath houses and hospitals. Less common in the exploration of abandoned properties are vacant building sites, docks, tunnels, sewers and drains, water tanks or chimneys, waterworks, railways, mine buildings or mines, cellars, hangars, parsonages, crematoria, churches or cemeteries, amusement parks, playgrounds or swimming pools, bowling alleys, forgotten gardens and greenhouses, mills, bridge structures, bunkers, barracks[10], shooting ranges etc. (also e.g. Ninjalicious, 2005). Urbex can also apply to objects that are not directly properties but are the result of human activity, such as the inspection of forgotten car wrecks, old disused trains, ships or planes etc.

As such, the exploration can be carried out randomly or purposively. It is not uncommon for a person to be drawn to an abandoned building and enter or peer inside out of curiosity. It is not a planned, ex-ante deliberate act. Until they had seen the building, they had no motive to inspect it. The opposite is true in the case of a purposeful, planned exploration, where you know about the building in advance and deliberately visit it for the purpose of viewing it. It is not uncommon for some urbex sites and their location to be shared only within a closed community, but they may be presented publicly, most often on social media or web portals, or offered for a fee[11]. Conversely, there is the possibility that information about the location of objects is not available, and it is up to the explorers to track down the site ex-ante and find the location themselves.

---

[10] In the context of the object of research, we can be even more specific and go further in the categorization of urbex: we can talk about army/military urbex concerning visits to objects related to the army, chateau urbex focuses on visits to abandoned chateaux and chateau grounds, the term industrial urbex is also used, etc.

[11] For example, a website https://www.urbexmapa.cz/ is available to offer clear maps of the best abandoned places in the Czech Republic and neighbouring countries for a fee.

Figure 1 Bowling alley at the abandoned hotel in Luhačovice, Czech Republic

Source: own (2022)

The exploration of buildings, areas, spaces, structures etc. can take the form of an external (outdoor) exploration, where you do not enter the urban enclosure (if it exists within the building) and only view the object from the outside (see Fig. 1). On the one hand, this type of urbex is safer than internal or complex urbex, but it is logically not as interesting for explorers. The internal urbex alone can be thought of as the exploration of objects with no possibility of viewing the external plan boundaries. Internal urbex refers to tunnels, sewers or shafts, for example. Comprehensive explorations can be considered the most common form of urbex, where the object is viewed from the outside as well as from the inside (see Fig. 2). The urbexer moves in the interior of the building, in corridors, rooms, halls, basements or, conversely, in the attic etc.

In many cases, urbex activities are on the edge of the law or consciously or unconsciously violate laws and legislative norms, especially in relation to the property rights to the real estate that is the object of urbex (for more see e.g. Duda et al., 2024; Gądzik, 2022). The most common are unauthorized trespassing of someone else's property and search of someone else's premises.

In this case, the urbex can be described as unauthorized according to the legitimacy of the exploration carried out. Conversely, an urbex can be carried out with the consent of the owner, who gives the urbexer permission to inspect the abandoned building. A specific case is an urbex on an object where the owner is unknown or cannot be clearly identified at a given time. This urbex can be referred to as 'vacant'. The exploration of abandoned objects can be carried out by the urbexer alone, individually or as part of a larger group of people, i.e. collectively. An urbex enthusiast can engage in regular and relatively frequent or, on the contrary, exceptional (sporadic and haphazard).

Figure 2 Sanatorium Helios in Štrbské Pleso, Slovakia (exterior and interior view)

Source: own (2021)

The research can be personal – private, when the urbexer does not provide information about the visited object, he/she usually carries it out only for his/her own intimate pleasure and has

no need (does not want) to openly identify with his/her experiences and the place of the urbex. The second option is shared urbex, where the wider public is informed about the activity in various forms. This division is indirectly related to the last category of urbex, which divides it according to the reasons for the research itself. A common one is altruistic urbex, the essence of which is to freely experience feelings of adventure and knowledge. The second type is commercial urbex, which has 'emerged' in recent years and is linked to the increasing popularity of this activity. These are activities related to urbex (searching and offering sites, organised tours etc.) which are purely commercial and they don't make it anything but 'business'.

Apart from the above typology (Tab. 1), there is also a breakdown according to the motive for urbex, which can be curiosity, adventure, danger, the intention to experience non-conformity or to follow another person, fashion in the sense of current popularity (trend among people), etc. This classification is problematic from the point of view of the determination of motives, because repeated, recurrent urbex is the result of a combination of many of them. In the case of urbex, one could consider this categorization in the context of the question of what was the original, primary motive that led a person to undertake the first exploration. At the same time, we could argue about the classification of the urbex in terms of the location of the object that is the target of the exploration, namely whether it is located in the intravillan or extravillan, whether in a fully urbanized (populated) area or on its edge, or in rural areas (so-called rurex, rural exploration12). With regard to the concept of the urbex, there is so far a general consensus that the degree of development in the area is not relevant and that the urbex refers to objects located in the area as such.

Authentic urbex vs. pseudourbex

Pseudourbex is a new term coined to distinguish between the two main groups of explorers in the context of urbex activities. The word pseudourbex in the sense in which it is presented here has not yet been traced by my own search of sources elsewhere in the public domain (journals, books, popularization articles, web texts etc.). Pseudourbex is a exploration of urbex objects in a form that does not meet the conditions for authentic – genuine urbex, and which is "passed off" as such for various reasons and causes.

Urbex in the true sense of the word is based on complete and unconditional compliance with rules in various parallels of codes of ethics, but with the same factual content (see the previous chapter), supplemented by such manifestations, approaches and characteristics as the

---

12 Author's own term.

purposefulness of the research (non-randomness, systematicity) and disinterestedness. Urbex can be implemented in a group (rather small), but on the condition that it consists of equally motivated and behaving explorers - i.e. urbexers. Other forms of exploration and their types can be considered irrelevant to the fact whether or not it is authentic urbex. However, a complex/internal form of site exploration is more common than just an external exploration, the exploration is more likely to be unauthorised or free and relates to properties i.e. brownfield sites. The frequency of the exploration and the need to provide information about the property (within the confines of adherence to the ethical code) fully reflects the personality of the urbexer who refers to urbex in their exploration activities and their passion for urbex exploration.

Anyone who does not conduct research within the boundaries outlined above, but refers to urbex (confronts their behaviour with urbex or refers to it) is considered a pseudo-urbex in our case. It does not always have to be a person who knowingly or unknowingly devalues a place. It may be subjects who accidentally discover an abandoned object and view it purely out of curiosity, without disturbing the original condition of the object or endangering the health or rights of themselves or others. In this case, even pseudourbex can be an appropriate and socially acceptable leisure activity. More often, however, it is the explorers who create entrances, damage the interior, behave in a deliberately irresponsible and inconsiderate manner towards others and the site itself, 'brag' about their exploration on social media, blogs, YouTube channels etc., where they share the location and/or benefit financially from this activity.

If we take into account all of the above, then we can synthesize the findings to create a more precise and comprehensive definition of urban exploration. In the true sense of the word, urban exploration is the purposeful and disinterested exploration of the material results of human activity that are found in the inhabited landscape, which is carried out solely for one's own pleasure and under the condition of unquestioning compliance with the rules set out in the so-called code of ethics of urban exploration. Unlike the pseudo-urbexer, the urbexer does not normally publish the locations of objects and does not "brag" to a wider audience about his or her urbex activities, behaves responsibly and prudently, does not take unnecessary risks and does not damage the object he or she visits. Pseudourbex represents (according to the author) a deliberate and more detailed exploration of no longer used objects created by human effort, which is, however, conducted recklessly, in contradiction to the ethical code of urbex, an exploration that devalues the object being explored and contributes to a deeper devaluation of its value; it is also an exploration that is excessively publicized, may have a commercial character, or the explorer's main motivation is not to experience the inner experience of the exploration itself "with his own eyes".

CONCLUSION

Urban exploration is an emerging leisure phenomenon and an alternative form of unconventional tourism. Given the trends in society, it is to be expected that the popularity of urbex will increase, not only in the form of the original – authentic urbex, but also the inauthentic, pseudo-urbex. It is the attempt to distinguish and appropriately name the two forms of research related to urbex activities that was the aim of this paper. Three groups of subjects are now named in the context of urbex activities, i.e., those who do not do urbex at all; those who conduct it in the form in which urbex is supposed to be conducted; and those who adapt the research to their (often unethical) needs and behave irresponsibly. The author's attempt at a neologism and the introduction of a new term is not definitive, as already mentioned above, but it is now up to the scientific community to decide how to work with it further. In order to fulfil the stated purpose in the relations of a scientific text, a synthesis of knowledge based on the general definition of urbex, concretized in the framework of the typology of exploration and the rules of conduct presented in the so-called code of ethics of urbex, was used. The elaborated typology of research is the author's own invention; the rules are the result of the content and substantive unification of several forms of ethical codes and the stated rules. The modified – more specified definition of urbex and its confrontation with pseudo-urbex is the result of an inductive combination of these three approaches. The introduction of the term pseudourbex and the definition of its content, or rather the outlining of its manifestation, may in the future refine the studies and research carried out regarding urban exploration.

As already mentioned, the author has not yet found an expert text that would try to distinguish between urban exploration (the "true" activity that urban exploration is supposed to be) and alternative forms of exploration of abandoned and unused results of human activity. It is therefore also a scientific and methodological problem, which is solved by the introduction of the term pseudourbex, while its use can also be on a general and popularizing level. The scientific and methodological contribution of the article to the urbex problem can also be perceived within the framework of the presented typology of research. The author believes that due to the growing popularity of urbex activities in society and their promotion in the form of a variety of media, there is a significant space for addressing this issue also from the scientific, academic and professional perspective.

Another potential direction of research may be aimed at refining or supplementing the typology of urbex activities. The author himself is currently conducting the aforementioned research (now intended for urbexers from the Czech Republic), where respondents sign up for various types of surveys listed in the typology. Primary research in this area is quite difficult to

implement (specific group of respondents and their approach to participating in research of this type), therefore it will be very interesting to find out the specific structure and form of practiced urbex and the attitudes of the urbexers themselves.

With regard to a possible discussion on the presented content of the submitted article, it should be stated that such is not possible.

REFERENCES

Borseková, K., Cole, D., Petríková, K., & Vaňová, A. (2015). Nostalgic Sentiment And Cultural And Creative Industries In Regional Development: A Slovak Case Study. *Quaestiones Geographicae*, 34(2), 53–63. https://doi.org/10.1515/quageo-2015-0015

Cameron, E. (2008). Cultural Geographies Essay: Indigenous Spectrality and the Politics of Postcolonial Ghost Stories. *Cultural Geographies,* 15(3), 383-393. https://doi.org/10.1177/1474474008091334

Chválová, B. (2021). *Nebezpečný koníček na hraně zákona. Urbex má své vyznavače i v Čechách*. Retrieved from https://budejovice.rozhlas.cz/nebezpecny-konicek-na-hrane-zakona-urbex-ma-sve-vyznavace-i-v-cechach-8474856

Craggs, R., Geoghegan, H., & Neate, H. (2013). Architectural Enthusiasm: Visiting Buildings with the Twentieth Century Society, *Environment and Planning D Society and Space,* 31(5), 879-896. https://doi.org/10.1068/d14512

Cuba, J. (2023). *Tajemný urbex: Odnes si pouze fotografie, zanechej jen stopy bot*. Retrieved from https://www.fotolab.cz/blog/tajemny-urbex-odnes-si-pouze-fotografie-zanechej-jen-stopy-bot/

Duda, D., K. Turečková & Márton, M. (2025). Rights and Obligations of Urbexers in the Context of the Legislation of the Czech Republic. *DANUBE*, 16(1), 49–60. https://dx.doi.org/10.2478/danb-2025-0004

Duda, D., M. Márton & Turečková, K. (2024). Legal aspects of URBEX from the perspective of the property owner in the context of Czech law. *Acta Universitatis Carolinae Iuridica,* 70(1), 199-211. https://doi.org/10.14712/23366478.2024.13

Faiglová, B., & Havlíková, K. (2014). *URBEX: Opuštěná místa v Čechách*. Praha: Grada.

Fraser, E. (2012). Urban exploration as adventure tourism: Journeying beyond the everyday. In H. Andrews and L. Roberts (eds), *Liminal Landscapes: Travel, Experience, and Spaces In-between*, 136–151. New York: Routledge.

Fulton, C. (2017). Urban exploration: Secrecy and information creation and sharing in a hobby context. *Library & Information Science Research*, 39(3), 189–198. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lisr.2017.07.003

Fulton, C. (2021). Urban exploration: Traces of the secretly documented, decayed, and disused. *Library Trends*, 69(3), 556–572. https://doi.org/10.1353/lib.2021.0003

Gądzik, Z. 2022. Criminal assessment of urban exploration. *Studia Prawnicze kul*, 3(91). https://doi.org/10.31743/sp.13200

Garrett, B. L. (2010). Urban explorers: Quests for myth, mystery and meaning. *Geography Compass*, 4(10), 1448-1461. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-8198.2010.00389.x

Garrett, B. L. (2012). *Place Hacking: Tales of Urban Exploration*. University of London.

Garrett, B. L. (2014). Undertaking Recreational Trespass: Urban Exploration and Infiltration. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers,* 39(1): 1-13. https://doi.org/10.1111/tran.12001

Garrett, B. L. (2016). Urban Exploration as Heritage Placemaking. In H. Orange (Ed), *Reanimating Industrial Spaces: Conducting Memory Work in Post-industrial Societies*. Routlege, 72–91.

George, J. (2011). Gazing through the sepia lens: Critical considerations of tourism's nostalgic construction of the small town. *Social Alternatives*, 30(2), 30-34.

Gonzalez, M. G. (2022). Imagining experiences through the urbex. A kind of suburban post-industrial prototourism. *PASOS Revista de Turismo y Patrimonio Cultural,* 20(2), 359-370. https://doi.org/10.25145/j.pasos.2022.20.026

Hála, M., MacGregor Pelikánová, R., & Rubáček, F. (2023). Negative Determinants of CSR Support by Generation Z in Central Europe – Infodemic´s Gender-Sensitive Impacts in a 'COVID-19' Era. *Central European Business Review*, 13(2), 1-26. https://doi.org/10.18267/j.cebr.344 MUP.

Israel, M. (2022). Research and the Ethics of Urban Exploration and Criminal Trespass. In: O'Mathúna D, Iphofen R, editors. Ethics, Integrity and Policymaking: *The Value of the Case Study*. Cham (CH): Springer.

Kindynis T. (2017). Urban Exploration: From Subterranea to Spectacle. *The British Journal of Criminology*, 57(4), 982–1001. https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/azw045

Kovacs, K. (2023). „The Hidden Beauty in Destruction" – Urban Exploration des Six Flags Freizeitparks in New Orleans – Wahrnehmung und Wiedergabe. *RaumFragen: Stadt – Region – Landschaft*, 429–455. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-39085-3_22

Kuźma, K. (2015). Urbexersi — eksploratorzy opuszczonego miasta. *Studia Etnologiczne i Antropologiczne*, 15, 223-239.

Lang, P. (2008). Stalker Unbounded: Urban Activism and the Terrain Vague. In M. Dehaene and L. De Cauter (eds), *Heterotopia and the City: Public Space in a Postcivil Society*, 215–224. London: Routledge.

Lavrenova, O. (2024). Desolation as a Plot: Urban Exploration on YouTube. *Nauka Televideniâ*, 20(3), 129–152. https://doi.org/10.30628/1994-9529-2024-20.3-129-152

Le Gallou, A. (2018). De l'urbex au tourisme de ruines. Enjeux touristiques et patrimoniaux des espaces urbains abandonnés. *Espaces*, 340, 26–31.

Lebreton, F., & Gibout, C. (2017). Les nouveaux usages ludiques du patrimoine militaire: Opportunités pour le développement récréatif des territoires?. *Riséo*, 2017(1), 53–75.

Lennon, J., & Foley, M. (2000). *Dark Tourism— the Attraction of Death and Disaster*. London: Continuum.

Lesné, R. (2022). „Urbex and Urban Space": A Systematic Literature Review and Bibliometric Analysis. *International Journal of the Sociology of Leisure*, 5(4), 425-443. https://doi.org/10.1007/s41978-022-00120-y.

Lyden, J. (2013). *New York underground: Exploring city caves and catacombs*. NPR.

Merrill, S. (2014). Keeping it Real? Subcultural Graffiti, Street Art, Heritage and Authenticity. *International Journal of Heritage Studies,* 21(4), 369–389. https://doi.org/10.1080/13527258.2014.934902

Mott, C., & Roberts, S. M. (2014). Not everyone has (the) balls: Urban exploration and the persistence of masculinist geography. *Antipode*, 46(1), 229–245. https://doi.org/10.1111/anti.12033

Nieszczerzewska, M. (2018). Urban Exploration as an "Interior Tourism". In S. Owsianowska, & M. Banaszkiewicz (Eds), *Anthropology of Tourism in Central and Eastern Europe: Bridging Worlds,* 255–270. Lexington Books.

Ninjalicious. (2005). *Access All Areas: A User's Guide to the Art of Urban Exploration*. Ontario: Infilpress.

Paiva, T. (2008). *Night Visions: The Art of Urban Exploration*. San Francisco: Chronicle Books.

Pinder, D. (2005). Arts of urban exploration. *Cultural Geographies,* 12(4), 383–411. https://doi.org/10.1191/1474474005eu347oa

Prescott, H. (2011). Reclaiming ruins: Childbirth, ruination and urban exploration photography of the ruined maternity ward. *Women's Studies Quarterly*, 39(3/4), 113-132. https://doi.org/10.1353/wsq.2011.0040

Půlpán, M. (2020). *Urbex. Adrenalinový koníček na hraně zákona*. Retrieved from https://pardubice.rozhlas.cz/urbex-adrenalinovy-konicek-na-hrane-zakona-8269836

Radford, R. (2020). Psychogeography: An (Old) New Method for Viewing the Religious in the Urban and the Sacred. *Fieldwork in Religion*, 14(2). https://doi.org/10.1558/firn.40567

Robinson, P. (2015). Conceptualizing urban exploration as beyond tourism and as anti-tourism. *An International Journal of Akdeniz University Tourism Faculty,* 3(2), 141-164.

Rosa, H. (2013). *Social Acceleration: A New Theory of Modernity*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Roult, R., White, B., Adjizian, J.-M., Morel-Michaud, L., & Auger, D. (2019). Loisir et intégration des immigrants: revue systématique des écrits sur le domaine et analyses autour des paradigmes de multiculturalisme et d'interculturalisme dans le contexte canadien. *Loisir et Société*, 49(2), 279–302. https://doi.org/10.1080/07053436.2019.1626035

Steiner, C., & Reisinger, Y. (2006). Understanding existential authenticity. *Annals of Tourism Research,* 33(2), 299–318. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2005.08.002

Stones, S. (2016). The value of heritage: urban exploration and the historic environment. The *Historic Environment Policy & Practice,* 7(4), 1-20. https://doi.org/10.1080/17567505.2016.1252490

Stonington, J. (2014). *Berlin's Urban Explorers Don't Want You to Know their Secret Spots*. Retrieved from http://www.vocativ.com/world/germany-world/urban-explorers-dont-want-you-in-their-secret-spots/

Sucháček, J. (2019). The Benefit of Failure: On the Development of Ostrava's Culture. *Sustainability*, 11(9), 2592. https://doi.org/10.3390/su11092592

Turečková, K., Nevima, J., Duda, D., & Tuleja, P. (2021). Latent Structures of Brownfield Regeneration: A Case Study of Regions of the Czech Republic. Journal of Cleaner Production, 311(127478). ISSN 0959-6526. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2021.127478

Turečková, K. (2022). Categorizing the Causes of Occurrence of Chateau Brownfields: A Case Study on the Czech Republic. *Geographia Technica*, 17(2), 220-227. ISSN 2065-4421. https://doi.org/10.21163/GT_2022.172.18

Turečková K. (2023). The Causes of the Occurrence and Spheres of Restoration of Chateau Brownfields: A Search for Causality on the Example of Properties in the Moravian-Silesian Region, Czech Republic. *Land*, 12(1), 251. https://doi.org/10.3390/land12010251

Turečková, K., & Dolák, R. (2025). Urbex in the V4 countries: analysis of popularity trends. *Geographia Cassoviensis*, 19(1), 59-74. https://doi.org/10.33542/GC2025-1-04

Waitt, G., & Cook, L. (2007). Leaving nothing but ripples on the water: Performing ecotourism natures. *Social and Cultural Geography,* 8(4), 535-550. https://doi.org/10.1080/14649360701529782

Vaňová, A. (2015). Nostalgic Sentiment And Cultural And Creative Industries In Regional Development: A Slovak Case Study. *Quaestiones Geographicae*, 34(2), 53–63. https://doi.org/10.1515/quageo-2015-0015