



XXI. MEZINÁRODNÍ KOLOKVIUM O REGIONÁLNÍCH VĚDÁCH. SBORNÍK PŘÍSPĚVKŮ.

21ST INTERNATIONAL COLLOQUIUM ON REGIONAL SCIENCES. CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS.

Place: Kurdějov (Czech Republic)
June 13-15, 2018

Publisher: Masarykova univerzita, Brno

Edited by:

Viktorie KLÍMOVÁ

Vladimír ŽÍTEK

(Masarykova univerzita / Masaryk University, Czech Republic)

Vzor citace / Citation example:

AUTOR, A. Název článku. In Klímová, V., Žítek, V. (eds.) *XXI. mezinárodní kolokvium o regionálních vědách. Sborník příspěvků*. Brno: Masarykova univerzita, 2018. s. 1–5. ISBN 978-80-210-8969-3.

AUTHOR, A. Title of paper. In Klímová, V., Žítek, V. (eds.) *21st International Colloquium on Regional Sciences. Conference Proceedings*. Brno: Masarykova univerzita, 2018. pp. 1–5. ISBN 978-80-210-8969-3.

Publikace neprošla jazykovou úpravou. / Publication is not a subject of language check.

Za správnost obsahu a originalitu výzkumu zodpovídají autoři. / Authors are fully responsible for the content and originality of the articles.

© 2018 Masarykova univerzita

ISBN 978-80-210-8969-3

ISBN 978-80-210-8970-9 (online : pdf)

URBAN TOURISM AND REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT**Městský cestovní ruch a regionální rozvoj****ALŽBETA KIRÁLOVÁ¹****IVETA HAMARNEH²**¹Katedra marketinug, managementu a spol. věd ¹Dep. of Marketing, Management and Social Sciences²Katedra cestovního ruchu ²Department of Tourism

Vysoká škola obchodní v Praze, o. p. s. University College of Business in Prague

✉ Spálená 14, 110 00 Prague, Czech Republic

E-mail: kiralova@vso-praha.eu, hamarneh@vso-praha.eu

Annotation

Combining a rich tourist potential, an essential material basis of accommodation, food, entertainment and transportation, numerous facilities for business and services of good quality, the city offers optimal conditions for developing tourism, which is true nodes on the convergence of national and international tourist flows. Urban areas that are committed to developing a tourism destination for visitors and residents alike can ensure sustainability and economic benefits for the community and region. This paper aims to discuss how urban tourism can influence regional development in the Czech Republic by comparing the urban tourism of the Capital City of Prague and the Statutory City of Ostrava in the Moravian-Silesian Region. To measure tourism intensity in Prague City and Ostrava City the indicators as Tourist Intensity Ratio, Tourist Density Ratio, Tourism Penetration Ratio, Augmented Tourism Density Ratio, Impact of Tourism Activities on the Locality, Relative Beds per Establishment, and Defert's tourist function index were calculated. At the same time, the selected elements of urban tourism in both Cities were presented. Literature Review, content analysis of documents been also conducted to answer the research question: Can urban tourism influence the regional development?

Key words

Ostrava City, Prague City, regional development, urban tourism

Anotace

Město nabízí optimální podmínky pro rozvoj cestovního ruchu prostřednictvím bohatého potenciálu cestovního ruchu a kvalitního zázemí pro jeho rozvoj – ubytovací a stravovací kapacity, zařízení pro zábavní průmysl, dopravní zařízení i zařízení pro podnikání. Městské oblasti, které jsou odhodlány rozvíjet cestovní ruch v destinaci, jak pro návštěvníky, tak i pro rezidenty, mohou zajistit udržitelnost a hospodářské výhody pro komunitu i region. Cílem studie je zjistit, jak městský cestovní ruch může ovlivnit regionální rozvoj v České republice, a to porovnáním městského cestovního ruchu hlavního města Prahy a Statutárního města Ostravy v Moravskoslezském kraji. Za účelem měření intenzity cestovního ruchu v Praze a městě Ostravě byly vypočteny následující ukazatele: míra turistické intenzity, hustota cestovního ruchu, míra turistické penetrace, hustota výskytu turistů, index turistického zatížení území, relativní počet lůžek na ubytovací zařízení, Defertova funkce. Také byly prezentovány vybrané prvky městského cestovního ruchu v obou městech. Součástí příspěvku je i literární rešerše a obsahová analýza dokumentů, které byly využity k odpovědi na výzkumnou otázku: Může městský cestovní ruch ovlivnit regionální rozvoj?

Klíčová slova

Ostrava, Praha, regionální rozvoj, městský cestovní ruch

JEL classification: R11, Z32**1. Introduction**

Tourism has emerged as a significant factor of regional development with economic and socio-cultural impact in the last decades. Beside traditional tourism regions, new regions with their tourism offers are appearing on the market and want to benefit from the tourism growth. In the last twenty years, significant regional differences in

the quality of life have emerged within many transition economies. The Czech Republic is affected by regional disparities that have been intensified after 1990 when some regions went through an industry restructuring. Significant differences can be seen between the Prague City Region and the rest of the Czech Republic. This paper aims to discuss how urban tourism can influence regional development in the Czech Republic. The paper compares the urban tourism of the Capital City of Prague and the Statutory City of Ostrava in the Moravian-Silesian Region to achieve this goal. Although the positive influence of tourism can be seen among other things on regional employment and income, the impact of the regional multiplier will vary. As tourism and regional development are closely linked, regions and local authorities play a vital role in the tourism policy enforcement (Constantin, 2000) and thus in the reduction of the regional disparities.

Urban areas that are committed to developing a tourism destination for visitors and residents alike can ensure sustainability and economic benefits for the community and region. Pearce and Butler (2002) examine the reasons for tourism development as a strategy for urban revitalization, and Sharma (2004) is focusing on the integration of tourism in regional development strategies.

According to the data of the European Commission (EC, 2016), 72% of the today's population, which achieves over 85% of the EU's gross domestic product (GDP), lives in cities, suburban and other urban areas of the European Union. At the same time, European cities consume 80% of energy and are also the source of modern economic, environmental, social and security challenges.

2. Urban Tourism

Urban areas are usually places with a dense population, a major transport hub and a gateway for further travel in the region, commercial, financial and industrial centers. They offer a variety of recreational and cultural experiences (Ashworth & Tunbridge, 1990; Page, 1995). As tourism became an essential part of cities' economy, they are investing in the development of tourism offer.

Based on his studies on the relationship between tourism and urban areas Law (2002) defined three elements of city resources. Primary elements provide the main reasons why tourists visit cities and consist of facilities for activities such as cultural sport and leisure facilities, and factors of recreation and relaxation such as physical characteristics and socio-cultural characteristics. Secondary elements are related to accommodation services, restaurants, shops, and other services. The additional items are designed to facilitate access to primary and secondary elements through accessibility e. g. transportation, parking places, tourist information offices, leaflets, and maps and are not the primary attractor of visitors.

It is hard to identify urban areas as tourism destinations as these areas are not exclusively used by visitors only but also by residents and people working there (Page 1995; Law 1996; Maitland & Ritchie, 2009). Smith, Macleod and Hart Robertson (2010) state that urban tourism is one of the most complex forms of tourism to manage.

Tourism is "one of many economic activities within a city, and it must compete with some other industries for resources such as labor and land. Also, within urban areas, there is a complex mix of constraints on development, with natural environmental factors being less significant and cultural heritage and residential factors greater than in other forms of tourism (Edwards, Griffin & Hayllar, 2008, p.1033)."

A wide variety of existing tourism resources in the urban area is a precondition of a city to attract tourists with various goals and motivations. If the city offers a greater variety of attractions and complementary capabilities, it can become more competitive in the tourism market. Warren and Taylor (2003) describe cities' attractions as dining out and shopping facilities, performances, events and nightlife together with wide range of accommodation capacities (often in a different design or thematic ones). Inner-city leisure spaces, waterfront developments, festival marketplaces, casinos, museums, conference centers and sports stadiums are the physical manifestations of a wave of new local economic development initiatives for urban tourism and economic regeneration (Rogerson, 2002). Jansen-Verbeke (1986) states that it is necessary to improve the cities' accessibility create parking facilities and support tourism infrastructure. Page (1995) includes that many European cities improved their centers by creating pedestrian zones, establishing parks and cycling routes, by investing in modern shopping centers, and developing the city's marketing around a specific theme.

People have always been attracted to urban areas for different reasons (e.g., visiting friends and relatives, transit, business, culture). Cities "cater to seniors, who undertake more sightseeing and are more likely to appreciate cultural and historical heritage; young people, who are attracted by the excitement of the urban environment along

with entertainment, nightlife and sporting events; business travelers; and the meetings, incentives, conventions and exhibition market (Edwards, Griffin and Hayllar, 2008, p. 1033)."

Urban tourism is a concept that emerged after 1970 and is developing especially after 1990; however, Christaller (1933) already called cities as "central places" back in 1930. Renewed interest in urban tourism since the beginning of the 1980s has brought about a sharp upturn in this kind of tourism. The fact that people are taking more, but shorter, holidays, the advent of the single market and the general increase in mobility have also helped to build up urban tourism in Europe (EC, 2000, p. 4). Since the 90's several studies on urban tourism have been published (Ashworth, 1992; Jansen-Verbeke, 1986; Cazes & Portier, 1996; Van Den Berg, 1995; Page, 1995; Judd & Fainstein, 1999; Pearce, 2001; Shaw & Williams, 1994; Schnell & Landgrebe, 2005).

According to the European Commission, „urban tourism is complex, difficult to pin down and define, and depends on many factors such as the size of the town, its history and heritage, its morphology and its environment, its location, its image” (EC 2000, p. 21). Law (2002) characterizes urban tourism very merely as tourism in urban areas. Ashworth (1992) noted that urban tourism is a specific part of the urban life; Howie (2003) add that it is not only about the number of tourist activities in cities, but it is a part of the specific urban life. Page (1995) considers the experience of urban tourism as closely related to visitors' satisfaction and the standard of services based on visitors' demand. Judd and Fainstein (1999) identified public tourism places regardless of the cities' size as follows: (1) holiday resorts, (2) towns of historical interest, and (3) created towns.

Urban tourism is an important and one of the most dynamic forms of tourism; it is one of the leading factors of economic increase of European cities (Delitheou, Vinieratou & Touri, 2010). The European Cities Marketing (ECM, 2017) reported in its European Cities Benchmarking Report that European cities continued their growth with a 3.6% increase in 2016 in total overnights compared to 2015. Domestic overnights (6.0%) grew more than international ones (2.3%). Prague is the seventh place on the list while to the first five places belong London, Paris, Berlin, Rome, and Barcelona.

Without a doubt, urban tourism can generate income and employment in the urban area. Schofield (2001) states that urban tourism can create jobs and revenues for a government that is often higher than the income from another type of destinations. The global options for travel destinations are extensive, so cities compete alongside all others, for visits longer than short break or single visits (Dwyer et al., 2009).

Based on Ashworth and Tunbridge (1990), Jansen-Verbeke (1986), and Shaw and Williams (1994) the following motives enhance urban tourism: (1) Visiting friends and relatives; (2) Business; (3) Conference and exhibition; (4) Education; (5) Culture and heritage; (6) Religion and pilgrimage; (7) Leisure shopping. These motives can be further extended with, e.g., sport, food and drinks, specific topics (myths), dark tourism, cruise. The presented motives point out the comprehensiveness of the urban tourism and the complementarity of the different cities' tourism offer (Law, 1996; Page 1995).

3. Urban Tourism and Regional Development

Since the increase of tourism in the global economy from the 1980s, the popularity of tourism as a vehicle for promoting regional economic development is reflected in the experience of some countries (Pearce, 1988; Oppermann, 1992; Müller and Jansson, 2007; Huijbens et al., 2014). Brouder (2013) notes that an increase in demand met by general growth in business activities has seen many regions develop the tourism economy, usually as part of the broader regional development strategies. Kang et al. (2014) state that regional development of tourism requires both the raised demand and ability to participate in tourism activities, and an increased supply of tourism infrastructure, including accommodation and transport access to and within tourism regions.

Urban areas of all types act as tourism destinations and attract domestic and international visitors, including holidaymakers, as well as those on business and conference trips. Towns and cities offer a wide range of attractions, which tend to be highly spatially concentrated. Moreover, tourism in these environments is exceptionally diverse phenomena in at least three different ways: (1) in heterogeneous nature of urban areas that are distinguished by size, location, function, and age; (2) in the sheer variety of facilities offered, i. e., its multifunctional nature; (3) such facilities are very rarely solely produced for or consumed by tourists but by a whole range of users (Ashworth & Tunbridge, 1990).

Urban tourism often exists within distinctive spatial networks at two different levels: urban area level regardless of its regional and national contexts, with particular cities forming parts of essential tourism circuits, and spatial level, where the tourism activities of cities, especially from the viewpoint of domestic tourists and local visitors,

exist within an active regional framework. In this context, cities act as crucial focal point for a region's tourism industry (Sharma, 2004).

Thinking about visitors' satisfaction cities cannot ignore the local community, the city-region residents and the people working within the city (Page & Hall, 2002) as they also use the infrastructure and share these services and spaces with tourists (Pearce, 2001). As Warren and Taylor (2003) point out, there is a correlation between the ability of the city to meet the needs of its citizens and its ability to attract visitors. The city must be attractive for residents and for the visitors at the same time.

Impacts of tourism on regional development have also been an essential field of tourism studies (Pearce, 1988; Shackleford and Verdugo, 1999; Pak, 1996). Authors such as Shaw and Williams (1994), Sharma (2004), Keskin and Cansiz (2010) were concerned with presenting the positive aspects of tourism in regional development. Sharma (2004) stated that tourism had been used as a strategy for promoting regional development both in urban areas and in rural areas (Oppermann, 1993; Beauregard, 1998). Shaw and Williams (1994) highlight the potential that tourism has in bringing development in neglected regions of European countries.

UN-Habitat (UNWTO, 2016) forecasts that by 2030, five billion people – nearly two-thirds of the world's population – will live in cities. By 2050, 70% of the world's population will be urbanized. This continual increase in urbanization will progressively reflect the already considerable impact of city tourism in the development of the city and its economy. Indeed, tourism brings new patterns and changes to the urban landscape, such as globalization and so urban tourism development should maintain a positive living space for locals.

4. Methodology

The analysis and data presented in this paper are based on secondary research. For detection of the current state of the influence of urban tourism on regional development, the research question was defined as follows: Can urban tourism influence the regional development? According to the research question, different indicators were examined as showed in Table 1.

Tab. 1: Tourism indicators

Indicator	Description
Tourist arrivals	The absolute value of the number of tourist for each region and period
Tourist Intensity Ratio (TIR)	The percentage of tourists to the resident population
Tourist Density Ratio (TDR)	Percentage of tourists to land area = tourist arrivals/km ²
Tourism Penetration Ratio (TPR)	Number of tourists multiplied by the average length of stay and divided by number of population multiplied by 365 multiplied by 1000
Augmented Tourism Density Ratio (ATDR)	Number of tourists multiplied by the average length of stay and divided by area multiplied by 365
Impact of Tourism Activities on the Locality (TL)	The number of beds per square kilometer
Relative Beds per Establishment (RBE)	The number of tourist beds (RBE) in the region j relative to the total number of beds in the whole country divided by the total number of establishments (E) in the region j relative to the total number of establishments in the whole country multiplied by 100
Defert's tourist function index (DTF)	The number of total beds available in the selected area divided by the number of inhabitants multiplied by 100

Source: De Albuquerque and McElroy, 1998; Jansen-Verbeke, 1995; McElroy, 2003; Smith and Krannich, 1998

Differences in scale between the regions could make difficult sensible comparisons. For this reason, the Tourist Intensity Ratio (TIR) was applied. This ratio has advantages in balancing the number of incoming tourists against the number of inhabitants. It is accurate to define the real capacity of the primary regional market. McElroy (2003) indicated that TIR is the most common measure of tourism's socio-cultural impact. The Tourist Density Ratio (TDR) is in line with the anterior index, given that the specialization of each region is different according to the size of the region. Also, this measure should be better to approximate environment impacts, not only social effects. Above mentioned basic indicators can be improved by more vigorous indicators like the Tourism Penetration Ratio (TPR) and Augmented Tourism Density Ratio proposed by De Albuquerque and McElroy (1992). Impact of Tourism Activities on the Locality (TL) is a proxy of environmental penetration (De Albuquerque & McElroy, 1998). To have a more precise idea of the regional accommodation capacity the Relative Beds per Establishment (RBE) were applied. If the RBE is higher than 100 than the region has a higher accommodation capacity compared to the country average. Defert's tourist function index (DTF) measures the impact of tourist supply on a socio-

economic substrate of the territory. The higher the index is, the more the tourist-receptive field is present in the regional economy. It is one of the most frequently used indexes when determining the relative magnitude of tourism in a local economy (Lasanta et al. 2007; Smith 1995; Smith 2010).

The data processed in the study was obtained from the following sources: Prague City Tourism, Statutární město Ostrava, Czech Statistical Office, Ministry of Regional Development, CzechTourism, <http://www.atlasck.cz/>, and ATIC (Association of Tourist Information Centres of the Czech Republic).

5. Results and Discussion

The Czech Republic is for the performance of the administration divided into fourteen regions, including the Capitol City of Prague. The tourism sector plays an essential role in regional development, contributing to the economic growth and job creation. However, the regional distribution of tourism flows in the Czech Republic is problematic. The most visited region is the Prague City Region (7 652 865 visitors and 18 056 204 overnights in 2017), the Moravian-Silesian Region, which County Seat is the Statutory City of Ostrava, is far behind with 898 042 visitors and 2 556 263 overnights in 2017 (CSO, 2017). Although it is necessary to add that in the last five years a positive tourism development in the region was recognized (Moravskoslezský kraj, 2018).

According to the research of the agency CzechTourism (2016), Prague as a tourist destination is a stronger brand than the brand of the Czech Republic and has a stronger image than the country's total. AT Kearny's 2017 in-depth analysis of global cities ranks Prague as a leader city by metric in GINI index. In the Global City Outlook is Prague ranked on the twenty-seventh places, and it is an increase of eleven places when compared to 2016. The report examines the top performing cities today and those with the highest potential for the future (Hales, Peterson, Mendoza Pena, Dessibourg-Freer & Chen, 2017).

The area of the City of Prague is for the performance of the state administration is divided into 22 administrative districts, and 57 autonomous municipal districts with elected bodies (Table 2). These districts are significantly different. There are districts with the distinct character of the city center, districts with predominantly residential character, districts with the favorite industrial character, housing estate districts, and districts with rural character. Many of these districts are originated by plugging the surrounding villages into the city. They differ in the degree of urbanization, population density, quality of technical infrastructure and socio-economic living conditions.

Tab. 2: Basic characteristics of Prague and Ostrava Cities

Indicator	Prague City	Ostrava City
Size of area	496 km ²	214 km ²
Number of inhabitants	1, 273 million	299 483
Population density	2 580,6 /km ²	1 404/km ²
Administrative districts	22	23

Source: Authors' processing based on data from Prague City Tourism (2016) and Statutory City Ostrava (SCO, 2017)

In 2016, seven million one hundred twenty-seven thousand and five hundred fifty-eight visitors arrived in Prague; by 7.9 percent more than a year ago. While the number of visitors was continuously increasing, the average length of stay is continuously decreasing; in 2011 the average length of stay was 2.7 nights, in 2016 it dropped to 2.36 nights (Table 3).

Tab. 3: Indicators of visitation for Prague and Ostrava Cities (2016)

Indicator	Prague City	Ostrava City
Number of visitors (total)	7 127 558	222 507
• residents	1 016 796	131 060
• non-residents	6 110 762	91 447
Number of overnights (total)	16 796 384	592 177
• residents	1 778 681	380 482
• non-residents	15 017 703	211 695
Average lengths of stay	2.36	2.66
• residents	1.75	2.90
• non-residents	2.46	2.31

Source: Authors' processing based on data from Prague City Tourism (2017); Czech Statistical Office (CSO, 2017); Ministry of Regional Development (MRD, 2017); Statutory City Ostrava (SCO, 2017)

Prague's historical center belongs since 1992 to the UNESCO World Heritage Sites. There are 1 330 protected objects in this area (including 28 national cultural monuments), 1 322 protected buildings, a large number of small architectural objects, technical monuments, and historic gardens and parks.

The most visited monument in 2016 was the Prague Castle, followed by Petřín Funicular, the Zoological Garden, the AquaPalace and the Old Town Hall (Table 4).

Tab. 4: The most visited monuments in Prague City and Ostrava City (2016)

Prague City		Ostrava City	
Monuments	Number of visits	Monuments	Number of visits
Prague Castle	2 100 700	Lower Vítkovice Area and Landek Park	1 301 600
Petřín Funicular	1 753 000	Zoological Garden	509 300
Zoological garden	1 448 400	Černá Louka Center	457 100
AquaPalace	1 022 800	Observation Tower New Town Hall	40 000
Old Town Hall	867 800	Mine Michal	12 645

Source: Authors' processing based on data from CzechTourism (2017), Statutory City Ostrava (SCO, 2017)

Ostrava is a Statutory City and is the second largest settlement and industrial agglomeration in the Czech Republic. For the performance of the state administration, Ostrava is divided into 23 administrative districts (Table 2). At the same time, the city serves as a municipality with extended competence.

In 2016, two hundred twenty-two thousand and five hundred seven visitors arrived in Ostrava; by 6.0 percent more than a year ago. While the number of visitors was continuously increasing, the average length of stay is continuously decreasing; in 2011, the average length of stay was 2.76 nights, in 2016 it dropped to 2.66 nights (Table 3) but is higher than the average duration of stay in Prague.

Tab. 5: Selected elements of urban tourism in Prague City and Ostrava City (2016)

Selected elements of urban tourism	Prague City	Ostrava City
Primary elements		
Number of galleries, museums and other monuments	34	12
Number of organized exhibitions	390	64
Number of castles, palaces and other monuments for the admission	17	11
Number of cultural events	1 030	56
Number of conferences in accommodation establishments	4 437	614
Secondary elements		
Number of accommodation facilities	795	67
Number of beds in accommodation facilities	91 887	5 264
Number of gastronomy facilities	5 758	295
Additional elements		
Number of Travel agencies and tour operators	65	35
Number of Tourism information agencies	9	6
Number of Airports	2	1
Number of Train stations	3	2

Source: Authors' processing based on data from Czech Statistical Office (CSO, 2017); Statutory City Ostrava (SMO, 2017), ATIC (2018), <http://www.atlasck.cz/> (CKA, 2018)

Mining and heavy industry strongly influenced the economy of the Moravian-Silesian Region. Among the most important industrial monument not only in the Moravian-Silesian Region but also in the Czech Republic is the Lower Vítkovice Area, the project of converting the industrial brownfield to the multifunctional, visitor and congress center. The industrial complexes are unique also in the international context. The Lower Vítkovice Area is one of the most visited monuments in the Czech Republic (1 301 600 visitors). The next most visited places in Ostrava are the Zoological Garden, the Černá Louka Center, followed by Observation Tower New Town Hall, and the Mine Michal (Table 4). Four National Cultural Monuments and four Urban Conservation Areas can be

found in Ostrava together with two castles and forty-four cultural monuments. The selected elements of urban tourism in both Cities are presented in Table 5.

For detection of the current state of the intensity of visitors flow in the two Cities, different tourism indicators were calculated. Table 6 shows the value of indicators for Prague and Ostrava Cities.

Tab. 6: Indicators for Prague and Ostrava Cities (2016)

Indicator	Prague City	Ostrava City
Tourist Intensity Ratio (TIR)	560	74
Tourist Density Ratio (TDR)	14 370/km ²	1 040/km ²
Tourism Penetration Ratio (TPR)	36	5,4
Augmented Tourism Density Ratio (ATDR)	92,91	7,58
Impact of Tourism Activities on the Locality (TL)	185	24,60
Relative Beds per Establishment (RBE)	198	135
Defert's tourist function index (DTF)	7,22	1,76

Source: Authors' processing based on data from Prague City Tourism (2017); Czech Statistical Office (CSO, 2017); Ministry of Regional Development (MRD, 2017); Statutory City Ostrava (SCO, 2017)

The estimated economic impact of tourism in Prague City Region (Table 7) is over 52.25 billion Czech crowns. The estimated impact of tourism in Moravian-Silesian Region is over 3 billion Czech crowns. With the added estimation of spending of one-day and multi-day foreign visitors accommodated in individual facilities, based on the results of the survey conducted by STENMARK (2017), this amount can be doubled and reach around 7 billion Czech crowns. The total income from tourism in the Czech Republic was at the same time 228 billion Czech crowns.

Tab. 7: Estimated economic impact of tourism in Prague City Region and Moravian-Silesian Region in 2016

	Number of visitors	Number of Overnights	Average length of stay	Total spending
Prague City Region				
Residents	6 110 762	15 017 703	2.46	44 799 155 498 CZK
Non-Residents	1 016 796	1 778 681	1.75	7 454 324 372 CZK
Total	7 127 558	16 796 384	2.36	52 253 479 871 CZK
Moravian-Silesian Region				
Residents	637 612	1 917 977	3.00	1 917 977 360 CZK
Non-Residents	179 041	444 457	2.48	1 094 875 251 CZK
Total	816 653	2 362 434	2.89	3 012 852 611 CZK

Source: Authors' processing based on data from Prague City Tourism (2017); Czech Statistical Office (CSO, 2017); ATIC (MK, 2017)

Conclusion

Based on the analysis given, the following results can be stated. Tourist intensity Ratio shows that Prague City (560) has the higher volume of tourism than Ostrava City (74). The Tourist Density Rate indicates that Prague welcomes nearly fourteen times more tourists per day per 1 km² than Ostrava. Prague City's Tourist Penetration Rate indicates more than six times higher amount of tourists per day per 1000 inhabitants than Ostrava City in the long term. Augmented Tourism Density Ratio confirms that the daily tourists relative to the area are in Prague City higher than in Ostrava City. The Impact of Tourism Activities on the Locality shows one hundred ninety-five beds per 1 km² for Prague and one hundred thirty-five beds per 1 km² and Ostrava City, while the Relative Beds per Establishment shows for both, Prague City as well as for Ostrava City, higher accommodation capacity compared to the country's average. The Defert's tourist function index for Prague City (7.22) indicates a little tourist activity and that the tourism function of the City is submerged in other urban function. It must be added that this result will be different if only the Prague City Center area would be measured. The Defert's index value for Ostrava (1.76) indicates basically no tourist activity.

The analysis carried out in this study demonstrates disproportions in the range of the indicators, especially in the relative magnitude of tourism in a local economy of both Cities. The low value of the Defert's index for Ostrava City is in line with the estimated share of the Prague City Region of the threshold for the income from tourism in the Czech Republic with its value of 22, 92%, and at the same time the estimated threshold for the income from tourism in the Moravian-Silesian Region that is only 3, 01%. Nevertheless, activities for supporting tourism development in Ostrava City can be seen in the last decades.

Based on the results obtained in this study, the research question stated for this study can be answered that urban tourism if developed sustainably, can be seen as a tool of regional development.

The opportunities for future research can be seen in widening the research and calculate the indicators for time series data.

Literature

- [1] ATIC, (2018). *Hlavní město Praha*. [online]. [cit. 2018-03-24]. Available on: <http://www.aticcr.cz/praha/os-1001/p1=2309>.
- [2] ASHWORTH, G. J., (1992). Is There an Urban Tourism? *Tourism Recreation Research*, vol.17, no. 2, pp. 2-8. ISSN 2320-0308. DOI: 10.1080/02508281.1992.11014645.
- [3] ASHWORTH, G. J., TURNBRIDGE J. E., (1990). *The Tourist-historic City*. London: Belhaven Press. ISBN 0080436757.
- [4] BEAUREGARD, R. A., (1998). Tourism and economic development policy in U.S. urban areas. In D. Ioannides & K. G. Debbage (eds.), *The economic Geography of the tourist industry: A supply-side analysis*. London: Routledge, pp. 220–234.
- [5] BROUDER, P. (2013). *Tourism development in peripheral areas: Processes of local innovation and change in Northern Sweden*. PhD thesis, Department of Tourism Studies and Geography, Mid-Sweden University, Ostersund. ISBN -0-415-164125.
- [6] CAZES, G., PORTIER, F., (1996). *Le Tourism et la Ville: Experiences Européenes*. Paris: L'Harmattan.
- [7] CKA, (2018). *Atlas CK. Katalog cestovních kanceláří a agentur*. [online]. [cit. 2018-03-24]. Available on: <http://www.atlasck.cz/>.
- [8] CONSTANTIN, D., (2000). Tourism and Environmentally Sustainable Regional Development: The Case of Romania. *Proceedings of the 40th Congress of the European Regional Science Association*. Vienna, 29 August-1 September 2000, Volume 29.
- [9] CSO, (2017). *Regionální časové řady*. [online]. [cit. 2018-02-02]. Available on: https://www.czso.cz/csu/czso/regionalni_casove_rady.
- [10] CZECHTOURISM, (2016). *Výzkum zaměřený na motivaci potenciálních zahraničních turistů (Evropa)*. [online]. [cit. 2018-03-21].
- [11] CZECHTOURISM, (2017). *Návštěvnost turistických cílů v roce 2016* [online]. [cit. 2018-03-21]. Available on: <http://www.czechtourism.cz/pro-media/tiskove-zpravy/navstevnost-turistickych-cilu-vloni-rostla/>.
- [12] De ALBUQUERQUE, K., McElroy, J. L., (1992). Caribbean small-island tourism styles and sustainable strategies. *Environmental Management*, vol. 16, no. 5, pp. 619-632. ISSN 1432-1009. DOI: 10.1007/BF02589017.
- [13] De ALBUQUERQUE, K., McELROY, J. L., (1998). Tourism penetration index in small Caribbean islands. *Annals of Tourism Research*, vol. 25, no. 1, pp. 145-168. ISSN 0160-7383. DOI: 10.1016/S0160-7383(97)00068-6.
- [14] DELITHEOU, V., VINIERATOU M., TOURI, M., (2010). The contribution of public and private investments to the growth of conference tourism in Greece. *Management Research and Practice*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 165-178. ISSN 2067- 2462.
- [15] EC, (2000). *Towards Quality Urban Tourism: Integrated Quality Management (IQM) of Urban Tourist Destinations*. Brussels: European Commission.
- [16] EC, (2016). *Urban Development*. [online]. [cit. 2018-03-24]. Available on: http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/en/policy/themes/urban-development/
- [17] ECM, (2017). *Benchmarking Report*. 13th Official Edition. 2016-2017. Dijon: ECM.
- [18] EDWARDS, D., GRIFFIN, T., HAYLLAR, B., (2008). Urban Tourism Research: Developing an Agenda. *Annals of Tourism Research*, vol. 35, no. 4, pp. 1032-1052. DOI: 10.1016/j.annals.2008.09.002.
- [19] HALES, M., PETERSON, E., MENDOZA PENA, A., DESSIBOURG-FREER, N., CHEN, K., (2017). *Global Cities 2017: Leaders in a World of Disruptive Innovation*. Atlanta: ATKearney.
- [20] HUIJBENS, E. H., JOHANNESSON, H., JOHANNESSON, G. T., (2014). Clusters without content? Icelandic national and regional tourism policy. *Scandinavian Journal of Public Administration*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 63–85. ISSN 1402-8700.
- [21] CHRISTALLER, W., (1933). *Die zentralen Orten in Süddeutschland*. Jena: Gustav Fischer.
- [22] JANSEN-VERBEKE, M., (1986). Inter-city Tourism: Resources, Tourists and Promoters. *Annals of Tourism Research*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 79-100. DOI: 10.1177/004728758602500162.
- [23] JANSEN-VERBEKE, M., SPEE, R., (1995). A regional analysis of tourist flows within Europe. *Tourism Management*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 73-80. ISSN 0261-5177.
- [24] JUDD, D. R., FAINSTEIN, S. S. (eds.), (1999). *The Tourist City*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

- [25] KANG, S, KIM, J., NICHOLLS, S., (2014). National tourism policy and spatial patterns of domestic tourism in South Korea. *Journal of Travel Research*, vol. 53, no. 6, pp. 791–804. DOI: 10.1177/0047287514522875.
- [26] KESKIN, A., CANSIZ, H., (2010). *Tourism, Turkey and economic development*. [online]. [cit. 2018-03-24]. Available on: <http://e-dergi.atauni.edu.tr/index.php/IIBD/article/viewFile/6531/6109>.
- [27] LASANTA, T., LAGUNA, M., VICENTE-SERRANO, S. M., (2007). Do tourism-based ski resorts contribute to the homogeneous development of the Mediterranean mountains? A case study in the Central Spanish Pyrenees. *Tourism management*, vol. 28, no. 5, pp. 1326-1339. ISSN 0261-5177.
- [28] LAW, C., (1996). *Tourism in Major Cities*. London: International Thomson Business Press.
- [29] LAW, C., (2002). *Urban Tourism: The Visitor Economy and the Growth of Large Cities*. London: Continuum.
- [30] LINDNEROVÁ, V., ŠÍLOVÁ, H., (2017). *Základní statistické údaje o kultuře v České republice*. Praha: NIPOS - Národní informační a poradenské středisko pro kulturu, Centrum informací a statistik kultury. ISBN 978-80-7068-319-4.
- [31] MAITLAND, R., RITCHIE, B., (2009). *City Tourism: National Capital Perspectives*. Australia: University of Queensland.
- [32] McELROY, J., (2003). Tourism Development in Small Islands across the World. *Geografiska Annaler*, vol. 85 B, no 4, pp. 231-242. DOI: 10.1111/j.0435-3684.2003.00145.x.
- [33] MORAVSKOSLEZSKÝ KRAJ, (2018). *Cestovní ruch v Moravskoslezském kraji*. [online]. [cit. 2018-03-24]. Available on: https://www.msk.cz/cz/rozvoj_kraje/cestovni-ruch-v-moravskoslezskem-kraji-97076/.
- [34] MRD, (2017). *Statistiky a analýzy*. [online]. [cit. 28-03-24]. Available on: <http://www.mmr.cz/cs/Regionalni-politika-a-cestovni-ruch/Cestovni-ruch/Statistiky-Analyzy>.
- [35] MÜLLER, D. K., JANSSON, B., (2007). The difficult business of making pleasure peripheries prosperous: Perspectives on space, place and environment. In Müller, D. K. & Jansson, B. (eds.) *Tourism in peripheries: perspectives from the Far North and South*. CABI, Wallingford, pp. 3–18. ISBN 9781845931773. DOI: 10.1079/9781845931773.0000.
- [36] OPPERMAN, M., (1992). International tourism and regional development in Malaysia. *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*, vol. 83, no. 3, pp. 226–33. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-9663.1992.tb00782.x.
- [37] PAGE, S., (1995). *Urban Tourism*. London: Routledge. ISBN-13: 978-0415112185.
- [38] PAGE, S., HALL, M., (2002). *Managing Urban Tourism*. Harlow: Prentice Hall. ISBN-13: 978-0130272867.
- [39] PAK, M., (1996). Geografski elementi regionalnega razvoja Spodnjega Podravja s Prlekijo. *Geografski vestnik*, vol. 68, no. 5, pp.161–174. ISSN 0350-3895.
- [40] PEARCE, D. G., (1988). Tourism and regional development in the European community. *Tourism Management*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 13–22. ISSN 0261-5177.
- [41] PEARCE, D., (2001). Integrative Framework for Urban Tourism Research. *Annals of Tourism Research*, vol. 28, no. 4, pp. 926-946. ISSN : 0160-7383. DOI: 10.1016/S0160-7383(00)00082-7.
- [42] PEARCE, D., BUTLER, R. (eds.), (2002). *Contemporary Issues in Tourism Development*. New York: Routledge. ISBN 0-203-38030-4.
- [43] PRAGUE CITY TOURISM, (2017). *Statistiky a analýzy*. [online]. [cit. 2018-03-24]. Available on: <https://www.praguecitytourism.cz/cs/nase-cinnost/statistiky>.
- [44] ROGERSON, C. M. (2002). Urban Tourism in the Developing World: The Case of Johannesburg. *Development Southern Africa*, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 169-190. DOI: 10.1080/03768350220123927.
- [45] SAARINEN, J., (2014). Critical sustainability: Setting the limits to growth and responsibility in tourism. *Sustainability*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp.1–17. DOI: 10.3390/su6010001.
- [46] SHACKLEFORD, P., VERDUGO, A. M. (eds.), (1999). Measurement of the Economic Impact of Tourism. *Tourism Economics*, vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 313-314. ISSN 1354-8166.
- [47] SHARMA, K. K., (2004). *Tourism and Regional Development*. New Delhi: Sarup & Sons. ISBN 8176255297.
- [48] SHAW, G., WILLIAMS, A. M., (1994). *Critical Issues in Tourism: a Geographical Perspective*. Oxford: Blackwell. ISBN 0 631 17676 4.
- [49] SCHNELL, P., LANDGREBE, S. (eds.), (2005). *Städtetourismus*. München, Wien: Oldenburg Verlag.
- [50] SCHOFIELD, P., (2001). Urban Tourism and Small Businesses. In N. Douglas, N. Douglas, & R. Derret (eds.) *Special Interest Tourism: Context and Cases* (pp. 432-450). Brisbane: John Wiley and Sons. ISBN 0471421715.
- [51] SMITH, S. L. J., (1995). *Tourism analysis. A handbook*. Abingdon: Taylor Francis. ISBN 978-0-582-25160-1.
- [52] SMITH, S. L. J., (2010). *Practical tourism research*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. ISBN 9781845936327.
- [53] SMITH, M., MACLEOD, N., HART ROBERTSON, M., (2010). *Key Concepts in Tourist Studies*. London: Sage Publications. DOI: 10.4135/9781446251027.
- [54] SMITH, M. D., KRANNICH, R. S., (1998). Tourism Dependence and Resident Attitudes. *Annals of Tourism Research*, vol 25, no 4, 15 October, pp.783–802. ISSN 0160-7383.

- [55] SMO, (2017). *Faktografické listy Ostrava 2017, Město Ostrava ve faktech a číslech*, Statutární město Ostrava.
- [56] STENMARK, (2017). *Příjezdový cestovní ruch. Border Crossing Survey*. Praha: Stenmark.
- [57] TELFER, D. J., (2002). Tourism and regional development issues. In R. Sharpley, D. Telfer (eds.) *Tourism and development: Concepts and issues*, pp. 112–48, Clevedon: Channel View. ISBN 1-873150-35-0.
- [58] UNWTO, (2016). *UNWTO City Tourism Network*. Madrid: UNWTO.
- [59] VAN DEN BERG, L., VAN DER BORG J., VAN DER MEER (eds.), (1995). *Urban Tourism: Performance and Strategies in Eight European Cities*. Aldershot: Avebury. ISBN 1859721524.
- [60] WARREN, J. A. N., TAYLOR, C. N., (2003). *Developing Urban Tourism in New Zealand*. Wellington: Centre for Research, Evaluation and Social Assessment.

This paper is based on research project “Evaluation of City Tourism Competitiveness: A Comparative Study of Selected Czech Cities” GA/6/2018.