

TRANSPORT SERVICES: DESTINATION MANAGEMENT PERSPECTIVE

Helena Becková – Božena Nováková

Abstract

Transport belongs to essential services provided in tourism. Visitors need a whole range of services, but first of all transport services that enable them to reach the respective destination and to get back as well as to move about the destination. Transport represents one of the important factors that can influence visitors' decision-making concerning the choice of the destination. However, transport doesn't serve only for transfer of visitors. Transport itself can be an important tourist attraction. Transport issues solving is thus an important task for destination management.

The paper deals with the problems of transport just from the destination management perspective. It examines theoretical background of the relation between transport and tourism and aims to map the role of transport in present destination management. The attention is paid to the situation in the Czech Republic, in its particular regions, by means of a survey via questionnaire among existing destination management organizations. The results can be used for the improvement of destination management in the Czech Republic.

Key words: destination management, tourism, transport

JEL Code: L83, R11, Z 32

Introduction

Transport is one of the most important services provided under the framework of tourism. Key importance of transport issues directly from tourism definition. Tourism foundation is to transport persons to places that are located outside of such persons' regular living environment. Based on this it is possible to state that tourism itself could not be executed without transport at all.

Significant importance of transport is mentioned already in publications dating to the second half of the 20th century. Lickorish (1958) for instance states that development of transport is the momentous and the key factor of tourism development. Kaspar (1967)

reminds us about recommendations formulated already in 1965 by International Union of Official Travel Organisations, predecessor of United Nations World Tourism Organization. These recommendations had issued from the recognition that transport, both public and private, represents an important element in continuous development of tourism.

Similar views are represented in contemporary professional literature. For instance Goeldner and Richie (2014) stress the importance of transport for tourism. It is their opinion that tourism and transport are inseparably interconnected. They even state that the importance of transport for tourism can be never overrated. Prideax (2000) also mentions a number of publications supporting the link between tourism and transport, however in his view professional literature does not mention any casual relation.

Maseiro and Zoltán (2013) stress the importance of transport services provision to target destinations. Also Zurynek, Zelený and Mervart (2008) see transport as one of the fundamental requirements for tourism development. They, at the same time, bring attention to the fact that the relation between transport and tourism is a reciprocal relation since the development of individual forms and types of tourism brings about demand for transport services.

Transport in its relation to tourism can be seen also from another point of view. Most authors see transport as the means for transfer of visitors to target destinations and their movement within these destinations, however transport itself can, under certain conditions, be a tourist attraction by itself. Transport in this sense can be seen as a certain attraction that attracts visitors by itself. Despite the fact that Zurynek, Zelený and Mervart (2008) state that transport services themselves are not the target but the means for reaching tourist targets they admit exceptions. On the contrary Lumsdon and Page (2004) distinguish between transport for tourism and transport as tourism, however they agree that the concept of seeing transport as a tourist attraction is overshadowed by regular understanding of transport as a means of transfer.

1 Relation between transport and destination management

Professional literature, as already stated above, has been for already some time dealing with relations between transport and tourism. The relation between transport and destination management is not, however, in the centre of research attention.

Already Lickorish (1958) stressed the need for closer cooperation and coordination between transport and other elements of tourism. This should be reflected in the official

tourism policy. Also Kaspar (1967) indicated that cooperation between transport companies and tourism companies is essential. It is clear that already in those times when destination management was still at its outset, and this applies also for foreign countries, it is possible to track in professionals' ideas the fundamental principles of destination management.

Prideaux (2000) saw transport from the point of view of regions and he pointed out that transport is very often ignored despite the fact that within regions it generates tourism and it contributes to regions development. He believes that transport infrastructure is the essential precondition for tourism development.

Batabyal and Beladi (2015) dealt with optimum provision of transport infrastructure in tourist destinations and they emphasized the key role of transport infrastructure in the overall infrastructure. They gave evidence to the fact that any attractive tourism destination does not reach its potential when it is difficult to reach. Also Khadaroo and Seetanah (2008) studied the importance of transport infrastructure in relation with destinations' tourist attractiveness and they confirmed that transport infrastructure is one of the decision factors influencing inflow of tourists into a destination.

Lew and McKercher (2006) recommended monitoring movement of tourists within a destination. This monitoring can be then utilized in destination management, for instance for product development and for marketing of individual attractions.

Lohmann and Duval (2014) reminded us that there is not sufficient understanding of the relation between transport and tourism to be able to do modelling of mutual influences and thus it is essential to focus our attention to the mutual relation between tourist destinations and transport. Despite past contributions explaining this relation in the past this relation remains for decades quite an unexplored topic.

As summarized by Landré and Peeters (2011) comprehensive knowledge of transport and tourism is the foundation for further development of destinations, tourism companies and of effective tourism policies and it is also important for dealing with arising local and global issues and conflicts.

2 Czech Republic destination management view of transport

In the following text results from a survey executed in the form of a questionnaire are presented. Destination management organizations listed on the official Czech Tourism web page were addressed in this survey.

This questionnaire survey focused on destination management organizations' opinions and it included three sections. One of the sections focused directly on transport aspects. 55% of addressed destination management organizations returned the questionnaire (40 organizations were addressed, 22 organizations returned the questionnaire). Results were summarized for individual self-administration units, that is by regions.

The results of this questionnaire survey showed that individual car transport is the majority mode of transport for visits to destinations - 64% share, public line transport and railway transport have the same share - 18% share. None of the addressed organizations stated that tourists' buses have the majority share. The stated data proved the fact that visitors in most cases like to use their cars for transport to destinations. The reason for this choice is the comfort of such transport, door-to-door connection. The question to be asked here is whether properly organized public transport would attract a certain share of tourists to public transport utilization, which would be beneficial to the environment and to road infrastructure.

Tab. 1: The most frequent modes of transport used for transport of visitors to destinations in the Czech Republic

| Region | The most frequent modes of transport used for transport to destinations | | | |
|---------------------|---|-------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| | Public line transport | Railway transport | Individual car transport | Tourist buses/coaches |
| Hlavní město Praha* | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Středočeský | | 1x | 1x | |
| Jihočeský | 1x | 1x | 1x | |
| Karlovarský* | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Ústecký | 1x | 1x | 1x | |
| Liberecký | | | 1x | |
| Královéhradecký | 2x | 2x | 4x | |
| Pardubický | | | 1x | |
| Kraj Vysočina* | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Moravskoslezský | 1x, 1x** | 1x** | 4x, 1x** | 1x** |
| Olomoucký | | | 2x | |
| Jihomoravský | | | 1x | |
| Zlínský | | | 1x | |
| Plzeňský | | | 1x | |

*Did not participate in the questionnaire survey, **did not answer the question

Source: the authors

Table 1 shows more detailed results for the most frequent modes of transport used by visitors of the Czech Republic destinations. Destination management organizations' responses

are summarized according to the individual Czech Republic regions. Some destination management organizations stated more types of transport with the provision that according to their opinions these modes of transport are used most and they have the same rate of utilization.

The fact that visitors most often come to destinations by cars brings up the issue of parking places provisioning. Parking places were also included as a subject of the questionnaire survey. The questionnaire included the following question: Is there enough parking places for cars in the Czech Republic destinations? 55% respondents responded „near to yes“ and 45 % „near to no“ to this question. Not a single destination management organization responded with clear yes or clear no. Regarding parking places for tourist buses/coaches it issued from the questionnaire survey that 5% respondents had parking places for buses, 59% respondents responded with „near to yes“, 27% responded „near to no“ and 9% stated they had no parking places for buses. Table 2 summarizes the above-stated results, by individual regions.

Tab. 2: Parking places in the Czech Republic destinations

| Region | Sufficient capacity of parking places in destinations for cars | | | | Sufficient capacity of parking places in destinations for tourist buses/coaches | | | |
|---------------------|--|-------------|------------|-----|---|-------------|------------|-----|
| | Yes | Near to yes | Near to no | No | Yes | Near to yes | Near to no | No |
| Hlavní město Praha* | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Středočeský | | | 1x | | | | 1x | |
| Jihočeský | | 1x | 1x | | | | 1x | 1x |
| Karlovarský* | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Ústecký | | 2x | | | | 2x | | |
| Liberecký | | | 1x | | | | 1x | |
| Královéhradecký | | 2x | 3x | | 1x | 3x | 1x | |
| Pardubický | | | 1x | | | | | 1x |
| Kraj Vysočina* | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Moravskoslezský | | 4x | 1x | | | 4x | 1x | |
| Olomoucký | | 1x | 1x | | | 1x | 1x | |
| Jihomoravský | | 1x | | | | 1x | | |
| Zlínský | | | 1x | | | 1x | | |
| Plzeňský | | 1x | | | | 1x | | |

*Did not participate in the questionnaire survey

Source: the authors

Based on these results we can expect that there are parking capacities in destinations, however not in sufficient numbers which can cause problems especially during tourist seasons, problems for cars in particular. In case of tourist buses it has to be taken into consideration that tourist coaches are used mainly for outgoing tourism and much less for incoming tourism and very little for domestic tourism.

With regard to the fact that the most used means of transport into destinations is travel by car it is very important to deal also with the issue of road transport infrastructure in destinations, both with regard to comfort and to safety. Table 3 shows the results of the survey for this question.

Tab. 3: Quality of road transport infrastructure in the Czech Republic destinations

| Region | Road transport infrastructure quality in destination | | | |
|---------------------|--|------|------------|--------------|
| | Very good | Good | Sufficient | Insufficient |
| Hlavní město Praha* | - | - | - | - |
| Středočeský | | | 1x | |
| Jihočeský | | 1x | 1x | |
| Karlovarský* | - | - | - | - |
| Ústecký | | 2x | | |
| Liberecký | | | 1x | |
| Královéhradecký | | 1x | 3x | 1x |
| Pardubický | | | 1x | |
| Kraj Vysočina* | - | - | - | - |
| Moravskoslezský | | 3x | 2x | |
| Olomoucký | | | 2x | |
| Jihomoravský | | 1x | | |
| Zlínský | | | 1x | |
| Plzeňský | | 1x | | |

* Did not participate in the questionnaire survey

Source: the authors

The following issues from the questionnaire survey: according to the opinion of destination management organizations high quality of road infrastructure is nowhere. Good quality of road infrastructure is in 41% destinations, sufficient quality in 55% destinations and insufficient quality in 4% destinations. With regard to the fact that visitors travel to destinations in most cases by cars but quality of road infrastructure is regarded as insufficient predominantly it is essential to give some heavy thoughts to the situation of this type of

infrastructure. Destination management should include solving of this issue among its activities.

The questionnaire survey dealt also with accessibility of tourist attractions. Important but also less important attractions can be interesting for visitors. Very important attractions are visited more frequently thereby their accessibility by cars gets more attention. Less important attractions may get less attention regarding their accessibility and transport to such areas may be more complicated. Thereby it is important to focus attention also on accessibility of less important attractions because their visit rates could improve with improved accessibility. Transport accessibility of tourist attractions was another section of the questionnaire survey. Table 4 shows results and findings for the area of transport accessibility of important and less important attractions.

Tab. 4: Accessibility of tourist attractions in the Czech Republic destinations

| Region | Accessibility of important attractions | | | | Accessibility of less important attractions | | | |
|---------------------|--|------|------------|--------------|---|------|------------|--------------|
| | Very Good | Good | Sufficient | Insufficient | Very Good | Good | Sufficient | Insufficient |
| Hlavní město Praha* | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Středočeský | | | 1x | | | | 1x | |
| Jihočeský | | | | 2x | | | 1x | 1x |
| Karlovarský* | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Ústecký | | 1x | 2x | | | | 1x | 1x |
| Liberecký | | 1x | | | | | | 1x |
| Královéhradecký | | 3x | 1x | | 1x | 1x | 2x | 1x |
| Pardubický | 1x | | | | | | 1x | |
| Kraj Vysočina* | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Moravskoslezský | 3x | 1x | 1x | | 1x | 2x | 1x | 1x |
| Olomoucký | | 2x | | | | 1x | 1x | |
| Jihomoravský | 1x | | | | | 1x | | |
| Zlínský | | | 1x | | | | | 1x |
| Plzeňský | | | | 1x | | | | 1x |

* Did not participate in the survey

Source: the authors

The results of the survey show that 23% respondents marked transport accessibility of important attractions as very good, 36% respondents as good, 27% respondents as sufficient and 14% respondents stated that transport accessibility of important attractions is insufficient.

The results of the survey show that concerning less important attractions 9% of respondents responded that transport accessibility of less important attractions is very good, 23% see the accessibility as good, 36% as sufficient and 32% as insufficient.

A question focusing on transport issues often solved in destinations was also included in the questionnaire survey. Two destination management organizations did not respond to this question at all (that represents 9%). 23% organizations responded that they did not experience any problems with transport, 68% organizations responded that they did experience problems with transport. These destination management organizations would welcome the possibility to have a say in solving transport issues. Destination management organizations gave examples of transport issues encountered in destinations in connection with tourism. These issues are for instance: bad accessibility of the destination by all transport means, insufficient parking capacities, non-existent bike bus lines, bad marking of closures during summer seasons which has negative impacts on tourist stays or it even discourages tourists from stays, bad connections to highways and insufficient transport infrastructure.

Conclusion

Transport is inseparably connected to tourism. There exist very important mutual relations in this sector, which is evidenced also by professional literature. However mutual relations between transport and destination management have not been researched in more detailed yet. It is clear that destination management should also include the area of transport since transport is obviously very important for tourism. However, the importance of transport is often underrated in this sector.

We have received information, from the questionnaire survey executed among destination management organizations, which have contributed to better understanding of the situation in the Czech Republic. In this article we present a part of the results of the survey, the part that represents the most important issues of transport of visitors in individual destinations. The results have revealed a number of issues to be dealt with by destination management in the future. Unfortunately not all of the issues can be solved in the framework of destination management. This is due to limited competencies of destination management organizations to intervene in transport issues. It is thus important to start cooperation with relevant organizations from the transport area and to involve these subjects as much as possible in remedy of the identified shortcomings. In other words even in this area it is

important to apply the basic principles of destination management - cooperation, coordination and communication.

References

- Batabyal, A. A., & Beladi, H. (2015). Optimal transport provision to a tourist destination: A contract theory perspective. *Economic Modelling*, 47, 180-184.
doi:10.1016/j.econmod.2015.02.003
- Goeldner, C. R., & Ritchie, J. R. (2014). *Cestovní ruch: Principy, příklady, trendy*. Brno: BizBooks.
- Kaspar, C. (1967). The interdependence of tourism and transport and its repercussions. *The Tourist Review*, 22(4), 150-156. doi:10.1108/eb057589
- Khadaroo, J., & Seetanah, B. (2008). The role of transport infrastructure in international tourism development: A gravity model approach. *Tourism Management*, 29(5), 831-840.
doi:10.1016/j.tourman.2007.09.005
- Landré, M., & Peeters, P. (2011). Editorial: Transport and Tourism: a Weak Symbiosis. An Introduction to the Special Issue. *European Journal of Transport and Infrastructure Research*, 11(3), 276-280.
- Lickorish, L. (1958). Transport and tourist policy. *The Tourist Review*, 13(3), 93-94.
doi:10.1108/eb059810
- Lew, A., & Mckercher, B. (2006). Modeling Tourist Movements. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 33(2), 403-423. doi:10.1016/j.annals.2005.12.002
- Lohmann, G., & Duval, D. T. (2014). Destination morphology: A new framework to understand tourism–transport issues? *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*, 3(3), 133-136. doi:10.1016/j.jdmm.2014.07.002
- Lumsdon, L., & Page, S. (2004). Progress in transport and tourism research: Reformulating the transport-tourism interface and future research agendas. In *Tourism and transport: Issues and agenda for the new millennium* (pp. 1-27). Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Masiero, L., & Zoltan, J. (2013). Tourists Intra-Destination Visits And Transport Mode: A Bivariate Probit Model. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 43, 529-546.
doi:10.1016/j.annals.2013.05.014
- Prideaux, B. (2000). The resort development spectrum — a new approach to modeling resort development. *Tourism Management*, 21(3), 225-240. doi:10.1016/s0261-5177(99)00055-2

Zurynek, J., Zelený, L., & Mervart, M. (2008). *Dopravní procesy v cestovním ruchu*. Praha: ASPI.

Contact

Helena Becková

Faculty of Transport Engineering, University of Pardubice

Studentská 95, 532 10 Pardubice

helena.beckova@upce.cz

Božena Nováková

Faculty of Transport Engineering, University of Pardubice

Studentská 95, 532 10 Pardubice

bozena.novakova@upce.cz