Pro-growth and Limit Parameters of Regional Development of Sustainable Entrepreneurship Tourism in the Region of South Bohemia

Petra Pártlová

Institute of Technology and Business in České Budějovice, Czech Republic

Abstract

The issue discussed in the paper is a response to the requirements of the business entities operating in the field of sustainable tourism in the current crisis period, period of existence for a number of the enterprises. Data collection took place in 603 municipalities in 17 LAGs in the region of South Bohemia. In total, 29 indicators are used to evaluate and find potential in the region of South Bohemia. The stepwise backward analysis method in the ANOVA program is used for the analysis. The existence of strong links between the indicators is proved; the results further show the effect of all the tested parameters on the potential of tourism. The positive influence of tourism potential is proved for the following variables: Unemployment trend; Accessibility of the area by the public transport on weekdays; Accessibility of the area by A and major roads; Primary school facilities; Accessibility of senior care homes; and Share of water areas. The negative influence is proved for The natives; Availability of hospitals and outpatient facilities; Production capacity of the land resources; Trend of arable land; and Landscape fragmentation. The results, their form and content indicate the possibility of their use in spatial and strategic planning and financing of rural areas and the settlements operating in them. The validity and relevance of the results indicates the suitability of the analysis and prediction of the economic regional potential for the development of tourism in the rural areas.

Keywords: tourism, rural area, business potential, business indicators, index of sustainable recreation and tourism, stepwise backward analysis, entrepreneurship

Introduction

Sustainable tourism is a sector significantly affected by the ongoing pandemic crisis. The estimates of the experts discussing the issue speak of a 40 to 70% percentage drop in sales in 2020 alone. It is natural that ways are being sought to stabilize and further strengthen this significant financial source of the state budget. One of the possible ways is related to finding

an appropriate analytical tool for determining the natural potential for tourism with a specification of the direction of development, intensity, including specific location.

Various methods and tools are sought to help the stabilization and sustainable development of tourism; however, in all cases the starting point is considered to be the rural area, which in the Czech Republic occupies more than 70% of the territory. In general, there are several basic functions of the rural area, such as residential, production, environmental, recreational, historical, and social, etc. The basic precondition for their fulfilment is their corresponding degree of development of rural settlements with the appropriate population density. The current reality and the development trend go the opposite direction of gradual degradation of the rural areas, which is in fundamental conflict with the interest of society as a whole.

The depopulation of rural areas, the settlements located in it, is beginning to appear as a significant limit on the development of the national economy and one of the ways to stop this negative trend is to ensure tourism in these areas, mainly with higher scientific value. Tourism might become decisive factors in the revitalization of the countryside, the stabilization of municipalities in terms of their longevity and ensure a gradual transition from the predominant agricultural and forestry activities to the activities of traditional crafts, services and especially tourism. In order to fulfil the goal, it proves necessary to know the potential of the relevant area for the relevant form of tourism. The paper focuses on determining such natural potential.

Literature Review

As the categories of rural region and area are not yet enshrined in legislation clearly, tourism is not defined similarly (Hoggart, 1990; Robinson, 1990; Scharf, 2001, Perlín, Kučerová & Kučera, 2010). There are definitions, defining tourism simply as rural activities (Lane, 1994; Lane, Kastenholz, 2018), together with definitions relate to the economic view of tourism, such as Cloke (1992) speaking of it as the consumption of the means of production, i.e., the rural space. Also, there is the view that it is not appropriate to define tourism as a separate sector (Wilson et al., 2001), as it is only the performance of activities based on the specifics of different rural regions and specific localities, or a municipality, such as in Bramwell (2009). Goeldner, Ritchie (2012), Pike, Rodríguez-Pose & Tomaney (2016) define tourism as a complex social phenomenon, as a summary of activities of tourism participants, a summary of processes of building and operating facilities with services for tourism participants, including a summary of activities of those who offer and ensure activities related to the use, development, and protection of resources for tourism, a set of political and public activities and the response of the local community and ecosystems to such activities.

A number of foreign authors Morley (1992), Olsen, Tse & West (1998), Sharpley, Telfer (2002), Sharpley (2009) define tourism as part of hospitality services, with the hospitality industry being characterized as a combination of accommodation, catering and other services related to travel. The inconsistency in the definition of this category also lies in its importance and role in the national economy.

Diamond (1977), Heng, Low (1990), Batta (2000), Buhalis, Darcy (2011), Goeldner, Ritchie (2012), Mason (2015), noticing the irreplaceable role of tourism in the national, and global economy, define it as a cross-sectional sector with a link to other related areas of the national economy, especially the financial balance of the state.

Many authors point to the fact that in the field of tourism there is an identical and at the same time different effect of market forces, when the laws of supply and demand apply (Horner, Swarbrooke, 2001; Morley, 1992; Middleton et al., 2009), draw attention to the specifics of tourism in terms of market environment, as there are demonstrably psychological and sociological aspects, including the value orientation of the population (Neal, Yusal & Sirgy, 2007; Middleton et al., 2009; Nickson, 2007). There is also a dissenting opinion on the very definition of the enterprises operating in the field of tourism. Some authors classify travel enterprises into a group of commercial services, which are mainly influenced by capital and labour. The decisive factor is the human resource, its quality, assertiveness, and flexibility (Boella, 2003; Horner, Swarbrooke, 2001; Swarbrooke, 2007; Southwick, Bergstrom & Wall, 2009; Nickson, 2007).

In the Rural Development Programme developed in the EU countries, the rural areas are differentiated into suburban, intermediate, and remote. "Suburban area" is defined as the rural municipalities within urban agglomerations, where there is a transfer of housing and economic activities from the towns to rural communities. "Remote area" includes mainly peripheral areas, such as the areas with unfavourable economic and social characteristics, the remaining rural the area is referred to as "Intermediate" (Ministry of Agriculture of the Czech Republic, 2007).

The issue of recreational activities and tourism is currently a very frequent issue, both worldwide, and at the level of national economies. It is both due to the coronavirus pandemic, significantly affecting the area economically, and due to its untapped production potential (Gowreesunkar et al., 2021). In terms of historical development, the tourism industry is a relatively young business area. The beginnings can be anchored in Europe at the interface of 18-19. (Shaw, Williams, 2002; Page, Connell, 2014), intensive development is discussed in the 20th century, both due to the development of the transport sector, especially the automotive industry, and related commodities such as housing, catering, etc. (Page, 2006). There are also different views on the very contribution of tourism to the development of rural areas (Piga, 2003). They range from the unequivocally positive views on the benefits of tourism in terms of both social, economic, and environmental, to the critical evaluation (Robinson, 1990; Bramwell, 2009; Lane, 1994; Hall, Page, 2006; Wall, Mathieson, 2006). The most significant negatives of tourism are the increasing traffic load (Collins, Patmore, 1981), investment construction, disruption of the environmental components (Page, Connell, 2014). Social conflicts between the tourists and the residents also increase (Wall, Mathieson, 2006).

On the contrary, the opinion of most authors working in the field of tourism is found in the mission, importance, and role of tourism in the national, European and world economy. This can be summarized in the following: irreplaceableness and uniqueness. The national authors strongly support the idea, together with the foreign authors such as Heng, Low (1990),

Diamond (1977), Gunn (1997), Horner, Swarbrooke (2001), Neal, Yusal & Sirgy (2007), Middleton et al. (2009), Goeldner, Ritchie (2012), Mason (2015) and Hanson et al. (2017). In this context, some authors point out the differences in the development of tourism in different parts of the world and the need for its balanced development, Glover, Prideaux (2009), Nickson (2007). In this context, the increasing pressure on quality and complexity in the provision of services in the field of tourism is mentioned, with the fact that this trend will be further strengthened (Yeoman, 2012; Mason, 2015).

The specifics of the tourism and its huge development potential are the result of the significant differentiation of the rural areas (Friedmann, 1972; Amin, Thrift, 1995). Rural development potential depends on the occurrence of different development indicators (Frechtling, Horvath, 1998; Frechtling, Smeral, 2010; Bernini, Guizzardi, 2010, Wu, Li & Song, 2012).

When setting the right dimension and intensity of travel activities, it is useful to respect the key development and limit factors of the relevant locality or area, and this article focuses on this issue.

As a part of the solution, two hypotheses are established:

Hypothesis 1 (H1): The resulting linear model expressed by the Recreation and Tourism Index does not show any strong correlations between the factors of all the tested pillars.

Hypothesis 2 (H2): In determining the Index of Recreation and Tourism, the importance and influence of all tested explanatory variables (a total of 11 variables) on the potential of tourism in the analyzed region is proved.

Methods and Data

The analysis and assessment of the recreational potential of tourism within the defined territorial unit are based on the general framework of the methodological procedure for determining the economic potential of the rural areas, classified as the "Summary Economic Model - SEM". It consists of four “Sub-models (indices): Index of Progressivity of Economic Structure (INXPES), Trend Index of Economic Structure (TIES), Business Activity Rate (BAR) and Sustainable Recreation and Tourism Index (INXSRCR). The paper is focused on determining the latter index.

The main data sources are the secondary data of the LAGs of the region of South Bohemia region; divided into four pillars - economic, social, infrastructural-institutional, and environmental. Data collection took place in 2016-2019 in 602 municipalities in 17 LAGs, without the towns with more than 25,000 inhabitants, i.e., in all the municipalities that are allowed to be a part of a regional LAG group.

In total, 29 indicators are used for the analysis and evaluation of the potential in region of the South Bohemian, further consulted with Czech Invest, reducing their number. The following factors are proposed for the Recreation and Tourism Index (INXRCR): The natives; Unemployment trend; Accessibility of the area by the public transport on weekdays; Accessibility of the area by A and major roads; Primary school facilities; Accessibility of senior

care homes; and Share of water areas. The negative influence is proved for The natives; Availability of hospitals and outpatient facilities; Production capacity of the land resources; Share of water areas; Trend of arable land; and Landscape fragmentation.

For the analysis, stepwise backward regression and the ANOVA programme is uses. Such method enables finding the dependence of the test factors. The stepwise regression method is a method of finding the "best" model (the smallest possible number of the independent variables, the best possible prediction). The subject of the analysis is not to determine the order of variables (predictors) from the point of view of their entry into the model; this is part of the algorithm of the program itself. The principle of the regression consists in the fact that the regression model is built step by step so that in each step we examine all predictors and find out which of them best describes the variability of the dependent variable.

The inclusion of the predictor in the model or its exclusion is done using sequential F-tests. The sequential F-test is based on the F statistic, which is the ratio of the increment of the regression sum of squares when the given predictor is included in the model and the residual sum of squares. If this statistic is greater than the value called "F to enter", the predictor is included. If the F statistic is less than the value called "F to remove", the previously included predictor is excluded from the model. After determining the variables in the model, the parameters of the linear regression function are estimated, and the quality of the regression is assessed by the determination index. Additional variables are gradually added to the model as the proportion of explained variability in the values of the quantity increases (Hocking, 1976; Christensen, 2002).

The following procedure is used to analyse the outputs, for all the indices:

1. Assessment of the value of signification (from the results reported in the summary analytical table, the significance value is classified, the values below 0.05 indicate strong relation between the variables tested).

2. Intensity of the multiple dependence in the tested model (the aim is to determine the variability of the analysed set of variables for the tested index. The intensity of the multiple dependence is characterized by a multiple correlation coefficient, which is the square root of the R-squared adjusted).

$$r\_B=\sqrt{(\text{R-squared adjusted})} \quad (1)$$

3. Determination of the directions of action of the tested factors (positive-sign + and negative -sign - effect on the test index), Beta column.

4. Practical (preferably point and financial) expression of the advantage and the disadvantages for the tested factors (Using the data in Tab. 2 - column Model, Beta and Signification - it is possible to perform a point and financial calculation (assuming the determination of the value of one point, the methodology for the issue is in preparation within the proposed method).

5. Characteristics of the analysed factors in relation to the outputs.

Results

Description of the pillars

Similar to the previous models, 29 indicators are used to calculate the Sustainable Recreation and Tourism Index (INXSRCR), of which four indicators in the economic pillar, seven indicators in the social pillar, eleven indicators in the infrastructural pillar and seven indicators in the environmental pillar.

Tab. 1: Description of the pillars

KOD	**Economic pillar**
K101	Progressivity Index of the Economic Structure
K102	Trend of Progressivity Index of the Economic Structure
K103	Rate of Business Activity
K104	Natural Presumptions of Recreation
KOD	**Social pillar**
K201	Population Density
K202	Aging of Population (increase of the number of senior citizens) – Aging index trend
K203	Economic load index trend
K204	Natives
K205	Trend in the growth of the population with higher education
K206	Unemployment trend
K207	Czech citizenship
KOD	**Infrastructure–institutional pillar**
K301	Accessibility of the area by the public transport on weekdays
K302	Accessibility of the area by the public transport on Saturday
K303	Accessibility of the area by A and major roads
K304	Accessibility of railway stations
K305	Residents living in permanently occupied dwellings connected to water supply, gas and public sewerage
K306	Nursery school facilities
K307	Primary school facilities
K308	Accessibility of secondary schools with Maturita
K309	Accessibility of senior care homes
K310	Accessibility of a general practitioner
K311	Accessibility of hospitals and outpatient facilities
KOD	**Environmental pillar**
K401	Production capacity of land resources
K402	Landscape fragmentation
K403	Share of water areas
K404	Chemical status of surface water
K405	Trend of arable land
K406	Forest hazard zones
K407	Trend of specific territorial emissions from stationary source

Source: Author.

Calculation of the Index of recreation and tourism (INXSRCR)

Natural condition of the area are the most important localization preconditions for recreation and tourism. Localization assumptions mainly represent protected areas, water areas, potential recreational areas. The region of South Bohemian is a rather geographically closed unit, the core of which is the South Bohemian basin. It is surrounded by the Šumava Mountains in the southwest, parts of the Brdy in the northwest, the Central Bohemian Granite Highlands in the north, the Bohemian-Moravian Highlands in the east and the Novohradské Mountains in the southeast. There are two parts of the South Bohemian basin, Českobudějovická and Třeboňská. The basic classification of the index of natural conditions for recreation (INR) consists of the partial coefficients and their weights: 30% - Ecological stability coefficient 20% - Terrain elevation 20% - Air quality - PM10 dust particles concentration 10% - Watercourse density 10% - Special species protection 10% - Population density. A six-point evaluation of the municipalities is used for the analysis. The resulting value determines the extent to which such conditions affect the localization assumptions of recreation. The South Bohemian Region ranked 6th in the whole of the Czech Republic, i.e., it got rather a good result.

Using the stepwise regression method, it was found that the resulting model Index of Natural Assumptions of Recreation is significantly affected by eleven explanatory variables; see the following formula:

$$〖Mp=\hat{y}=β〗_0+β_1 X_1+β_2 X_2+β_3 X_3+β_4 X_4+β_5 X_5+β_6 X_6+β_7 X_7+β_8 X_8+β_9 X_9+β_{10} X_{10}+β_{11} X_{11} \quad (2)$$

$Mp=\hat{y}$ - selective (empirical) regression function - complete model.

Coefficients β are marked as Estimates Beta for each indicator in the table.

$$\hat{y}=\_129{,}890 - 0{,}188\ X\_1 + 0{,}513\ X\_2 + 0{,}040\ X\_3 + 0{,}240\ X\_4 + 0{,}522\ X\_5 + 0{,}279\ X\_6 - 0{,}173\ X\_7 - 1{,}642\ X\_8 + 0{,}184\ X\_9 - 0{,}484\ X\_10 - 11{,}655\ X\_11 \quad (3)$$

Explanatory notes:

X_1 = K204 The Natives.
X_2 = K 206 Unemployment trend.
X_3 = K 301 Accessibility of the area by the public transport on weekdays.
X_4 = K 303 Accessibility of the area by A and major roads.
X_5 = K 307 Primary school facilities.
X_6 = K 309 Accessibility of senior care homes.
X_7 = K 311 Accessibility of hospitals and outpatient facilities.
X_8 = K 401 Production capacity of land resources.
X_9 = K 403 Share of water areas.
X_10 = K 405 Trend of arable land.
X_11 = K 406 Landscape fragmentation.

Using the regression equation, the input data for the input factors X_1 to X_11 are analysed and the outputs from the analysis are reported by Table 2.

Tab. 2: Index of sustainable recreation and tourism (INXSRCR)

Model Summary							
	0,638	Root Mean Square Error (RMSE)		10,191			
R-Squared	0,407	Coef. Var		18,542			
Adj. R-Squared	0,396	Mean Square Error (MSE)		103,847			
Pred R-Squared	0,383	Mean Absolute Error (MAE)		8,07			
ANOVA							
	Sum of Squares	DF		Mean Square	F	Sig.	
Regression	41979,417	11		3816,311	36,75	0	
Residual	61165,625	589		103,847			
Total	103145,042	600					
Parameter Estimates							
model	Beta	Std. Error	Std. Beta	t	Sig	lower	upper
(Intercept)	129,89	6,277	-	20,693	0	117,562	142,219
K204	-0,188	0,052	-0,118	-3,618	0	-0,29	-0,086
K206	0,513	0,171	0,096	2,993	0,003	0,177	0,85
K301	0,04	0,011	0,134	3,663	0	0,019	0,062
K303	0,24	0,087	0,095	2,765	0,006	0,07	0,411
K307	0,522	0,146	0,125	3,578	0	0,236	0,809
K309	0,279	0,09	0,11	3,108	0,002	0,103	0,456
K311	-0,173	0,082	-0,077	-2,117	0,035	-0,333	-0,012
K401	-1,642	0,601	-0,093	-2,733	0,006	-2,823	-0,462
K403	0,184	0,074	0,082	2,488	0,013	0,039	0,329
K405	-0,484	0,091	-0,17	-5,317	0	-0,662	-0,305
K402	-11,655	0,852	-0,497	-13,686	0	-13,328	-9,983

Source: Author.

As revealed by Table 2, the value of significance is 0.000, i.e., the value is below 0.05 within the sample and it can therefore be concluded that there are strong links between the tested variables. The intensity of the multiple dependence is characterized by a multiple correlation coefficient, which is the square root of the R-squared adjusted, see the Table 2.

$$r\_B=\sqrt{0,407}=0,6379655 \quad (4)$$

Based on the value of R-square adjusted (adjusted index of determination), the joint action of all eleven explanatory variables (natives, employment trend, transport service of the area by public transport on weekdays, accessibility of the area from A class roads and major roads, primary school facilities Accessibility of senior care homes, the availability of hospitals and outpatient facilities, the productive capacity of the land resources, the share of water areas, the trend of arable land and Landscape fragmentation) explains 40.7% of the variability of the explained variable, and the sustainable tourism recreation index.

The positive influence of tourism potential is proved for the following variables: Unemployment trend; Accessibility of the area by the public transport on weekdays; Accessibility of the area by A and major roads; Primary school facilities; Accessibility of senior care homes; and Share of water areas. The negative influence is proved for The natives; Availability of hospitals and outpatient facilities; Production capacity of the land

resources; Trend of arable land; and Landscape fragmentation.

Based on the regression model, it is supposed, that increasing Unemployment trend; Accessibility of the area by the public transport on weekdays; Accessibility of the area by A and major roads; Primary school facilities; Accessibility of senior care homes; and Share of water areas by one point (provided that the values of the other variables are unchanged) will increase the Index of sustainable recreation and tourism by 0, 513, 0.040, 0.240, 0.522, 0.279 and 0.184. The greatest advantage of the additional investments is expected in the Unemployment Trend, Primary School Facilities, and the Availability of senior care homes.

On the other hand, increasing the variables of The natives; Availability of hospitals and outpatient facilities; Production capacity of the land resources; Trend of arable land; and Landscape fragmentation by one point will decrease the Index of sustainable recreation and tourism by 0.188, 0.173, 1.642, 0.484 and 11.655. The results revealed that the greatest negative financial impact would be achieved in landscape fragmentation, and production capacity of land resources, meaning its artificial increase with mineral fertilizers and in the trend of arable land.

Conclusions

The strong relations of the variables are proved. The final linear model of the sustainable recreation and tourism index shows multiple correlations on many factors, both from the social, infrastructural, and environmental pillars. Regarding hypothesis 1 as defined in the paper, its rejection is stated with regard to the existence of strong correlation links between the factors of all the tested pillars.

The results show the effect of all eleven explanatory variables on the potential of tourism in the region of South Bohemia (natives, employment trend, transport service of the area by public transport on weekdays, accessibility of the area from A class roads and major roads, primary school facilities Accessibility of senior care homes, the availability of hospitals and outpatient facilities, the productive capacity of the land resources, the share of water areas, the trend of arable land and landscape fragmentation). They explain 40.7% of the variability of the explained variable, and the sustainable tourism recreation index. Such conclusions allow to confirm Hypothesis 2, as the significance and impact of all the tested explanatory variables (a total of 11 variables) are proved.

The positive influence of tourism potential is proved for the following variables: Unemployment trend; Accessibility of the area by the public transport on weekdays; Accessibility of the area by A and major roads; Primary school facilities; Accessibility of senior care homes; and Share of water areas. Such activities should be supported by the development activities of administrative and self-governing, including investment incentives and subsidy programmes.

The factors influencing the development of tourism are identified in The natives; Availability of hospitals and outpatient facilities; Production capacity of the land

resources; Trend of arable land; and Landscape fragmentation. Such factors must also be given increased attention in developing the tourism activities, especially in terms of eliminating their negative impact on the development of tourism.

The result, their form and their content indicate the possibility of their use in spatial and strategic planning and financing of the rural areas and municipalities operating in them, with the help of mathematical modelling to predict the required amount of investment, their location in relevant activities and prediction of the financial benefits.

With regard to the nature of the results, as it is possible to determine the direction of action (either positive or negative) of the variables in terms of the tested index, it is expressed that after their completion they might become an important, and objective, tool in many managements and administrative areas. An example is the issue of regional development at all administrative levels; its usage is expected in municipalities, in the field of spatial planning, in the allocation of funds from the structural funds, including the Rural Development programme.

The results, as presented in the paper are not considered final. They are presented with the aim of opening a scientific discussion on such socially and internationally important issue. Based on the achieved results and assessment of their validity, it is possible to state their relevance and suitability of the chosen procedure in the field of analysis and prediction of the economic regional potential for the development of tourism in rural areas.

The presentation of the paper is also a response to the requirements of the enterprises operating in the field of tourism to ensure accelerated transfer of knowledge from the research base, when their need has grown strongly due to the crisis pandemic, vitally important for tourism in many cases.

Acknowledgement

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, methodology, validation, formal analysis, resources, writing—original draft preparation, writing—review and editing, supervision: P.P.

Funding: This research was funded by Technology Agency of the Czech Republic, programme of ETA, project reg. no. TL01000349 – Stabilization and development of SME in rural areas.

Informed Consent Statement: Informed consent was obtained from all subjects involved in the study.

Data Availability Statement: The data presented in this study are available on request from the corresponding author.

Conflicts of Interest: The author declares no conflict of interest.

References

Amin A., Thrift N., 1995. *Globalization, institutions, and regional development in Europe.* Oxford: Oxford University Press. ISBN 9780198289166.

Batta R. N., 2000. *Tourism and the environment: A quest for sustainability: with special reference to developing countries, and policy analysis on Himachal Pradesh*. New Delhi: Indus Publishing, pp 106–78. ISBN 8173871108.

Bernini C., Guizzardi A., 2010. Internal and locational factors affecting hotel industry efficiency: Evidence from Italian business corporations. *Tourism Economics*, **16**(4), 883-913. doi: https://doi.org/10.5367/te.2010.0008

Boella M. J., 2003. *Human resource management in the hospitality industry*. Chentenham: Nelson Thornes, pp. 135–126. ISBN 0748754660.

Bramwell B., 2009. Rural tourism and sustainable rural tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 1–6. doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/09669589409510679

Buhalis D., Darcy S., 2011. *Accessible tourism: Concepts and issues (Aspects of tourism)*. Bristol: Channel View Publications, pp. 122–98. ISBN 1845412087.

Christensen R. 2002. *Plane answers to complex questions: The theory of linear models*. Springer-Verlag, New York, pp. 386-381. ISBN 0387953612.

Cloke P., 1992. The countryside. In *Policy and Change in Thatcher´s Britain*. Edited by P. Cloke. Oxford: Pergamon, pp. 269–296. ISBN 0080406483.

Collins M. F., Patmore A. J., 1981. Recreation and leisure. *Progress in human Geography*, **5**(1), 87-92. doi: https://doi.org/10.1177/030913258100500106

Diamond J., 1977. Tourism's role in economic development: The case reexamined. *Economic development and cultural change*, **25**(3), 539-553. doi: https://doi.org/10.1086/450969

Frechtling D. C., Smeral E., 2010. Measuring and interpreting the economic impact of tourism: 20-20 hindsight and foresight. In *Tourism Research: A 20-20 vision*. 1st ed. D. G. Pearce and R. W. Butler. Oxford, England: Goodfellow Publishing, pp. 67-79. ISBN 9781906884109.

Frechtling D. C., Horvath E., 1998. Estimating the multiplier effects of tourism expenditures on a local economy through a regional input-output model. *Journal of Travel Research*, **37**(4), 324-332. doi: https://doi.org/10.1177/004728759903700402

Friedmann, J. 1972. *A general theory of polarized development*. In: Growth Centres in Regional Economic Development, N. M. Hansen. Free Press: New York, pp. 107–82. ISBN 0029137306.

Glover P., Prideaux B., 2009. Implications of population ageing for the development of tourism products and destinations. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, **15**(1), 25–37. doi: https://doi.org/10.1177/1356766708098169

Goeldner C. R., Brent Ritchie J. R., 2012. Tourism: Principles, practices, philosophies, 12th ed.; Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, 2012. ISBN 1118071778.

Gowreesunkar V. G. B., Maingi S. W., Roy H., Micera R., 2021. *Tourism destination management in a post-pandemic context: Global issues and destination management solutions*. Bingley: Emerald Group Publishing. ISBN 1800715129.

Gunn C. A., 1997. *Vacationscape: Developing tourist areas*. Washington: Taylor and Francis, pp. 37–

58. ISBN 9781560325208.

Hall M. C., Page. S. J., 2014. *The geography of tourism and recreation*. New York and London: Routledge, pp. 226–206. ISBN 9780415833998.

Hanson D., Hitt M. A., Duane Ireland R., Hoskisson, R. E., 2017. *Strategic management: Competitivess and globalization*. Duane: Asia Pacific edition, pp 50-43. ISBN 1305502205.

Heng T. M., Low L., 1990. Economic impact of tourism in Singapore. *Annals of Tourism Research*, **17**(2), 246–269. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383(90)90086-7

Hocking., 1976. A Biometrics invited paper. The analysis and selection of variables in linear regression. *Biometrics*, **32**(1), 1-49. doi: https://doi.org/10.2307/2529336

Hoggart K, 1990. Let's do away with rural. *Journal of rural studies*, **6**(3), 245-257. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/0743-0167(90)90079-N

Neal J. D., Uysal M., Sirgy M. J., 2007. The effect of tourism services on Travelers' quality of life. *Journal of Travel Research*, **46**(2), 154–163. doi: https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287507303977

Lane B., Kastenholz E., 2018. *Rural tourism, new concepts, new research, new practice*. New York: Routledge, pp. 1156-1133. ISBN 9781138084285.

Lane B., 1994. What is rural tourism? *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, **2**(-), 7-21. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09669589409510680

Mason P., 2015. *Tourism impacts, planning and management*. 3rd ed.; Routledge, pp 125–117. ISBN 9781138016293.

Olsen M. D., Tse E. C. Y, West J. J., 2008. *Strategic management in the hospitality industry*. Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Pearson Prentice Hall, pp. 384-290. ISBN 9781292027418.

Middleton V., Fyall A., Morgan M., Ranchhod A., 2009. *Marketing in travel and tourism*. Oxford: Routledge, pp. 220–159. ISBN 9780750686938.

Ministry of Agriculture of the Czech Republic. 2007. *Rural development programme for 2007-2013*. Praha: MZe, VÚZE Praha, pp. 132-131.

Morley C., 1992. Microeconomic theory of international tourism demand. *Annals of Tourism Research,* **19**(2), 250–267. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383(92)90080-9

Nickson D., 2007. *Human resource management for the hospitality and tourism industries*. Oxford: Elsevier, pp. 137–133. ISBN 9780080966496.

Page S. J., Connel J., 2014. *Tourism: A Modern synthesis*. New York: Routledge, pp 405–355. ISBN 9781408088432.

Perlín R., Kučerová S., Kučera Z., 2010. A Typology of rural space in Czechia according to its potential for development. *Geografie-Sbornik CGS*, 115, 161-187. doi: https://doi.org/10.37040/geografie2010115020161

Piga A. G. C., 2003. Territorial planning and tourism development tax. *Annals of Tourism Research*, **30**(4), 886–905. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383(03)00061-6

Pike A., Rodríguez-Pose A., Tomaney J., 2016. *Local and regional development*. London: Routledge. ISBN 9781315767673.

Robinson G. M., 1990. Conflict and change in the countryside: Rural society, economy and planning

in the developed world. ISBN 1852930446.

Scharf T., 2001. Ageing and intergenerational relationships in rural Germany. *Ageing and Society,* **21**(5), 547–566. doi: https://doi.org/10.1017/S0144686X01008388

Sharpley R., 2009. *Tourism development and the environment: Beyond sustainability? (Tourism, environment and development series).* Oxford: Routledge. ISBN 9781844077335.

Sharpley R., Telfer D. J., 2002. *Tourism and development: Concepts and issues (Aspects of tourism)*. Bristol: Channel View Publications, pp. 281-231. ISBN 1-873150-35-0.

Shaw G., Williams A. M., 2002. *Critical issues in tourism: A Geographical perspective*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing, pp. 289–273. ISBN 978-0-631-22414-3.

Southwick R., Bergstrom J. C., Wall C., 2009. The economic contributions of human-powered outdoor recreation to the US economy. *Tourism Economics*, **15**(4), 709–733. doi: https://doi.org/10.5367/000000009789955198

Horner S., Swarbrooke J., 2001. *Business travel and tourism*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann, pp. 54-23. ISBN 0750643927.

Swarbrooke J., Horner S., 2007. *Consumer behaviour in tourism*. Burlington: Butterworth-Heinemann, pp. 144–103. ISBN 0750667354.

Wall G., Mathieson A., 2006. *Tourism: Change, impacts and opportunities*. Dorchester: Dorset, pp. 150–68. ISBN 0130994006.

Wilson S., Fesenmaier D. R., Fesenmaier J., Van Es J. C., 2001. Factors for success in rural tourism development. *Journal of Travel Research*, **40**(2), 132-138. doi: https://doi.org/10.1177/004728750104000203

Wu D. C., Li G., Song H., 2012. Economic analysis of tourism consumption dynamics: A time-varying parameter demand system approach. *Annals of Tourism Research*, **39**(2), 667–685. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2011.09.003

Yeoman I., 2012. *2050: Tomorrow's tourism*. Bristol: Channel View Publication, pp. 34–17. ISBN 1845413016.

Contact address of the author(s):

Ing. Petra Pártlová, Ph.D., Department of tourism and marketing, Faculty of Corporate Strategy, Institute of Technology and Business in České Budějovice, Okružní 517/10, České Budějovice, 370 01, Czech Republic, e-mail: partloval@mail.vstecb.cz