

SIGNIFICANT INVOLVEMENT OF AGRICULTURAL HOLDINGS IN RURAL TOURISM DEVELOPMENT IN SERBIA¹

Tamara Gajić², Aleksandra Vujko³, Mirjana Penić⁴, Marko D. Petrović⁵, Milutin Mrkša⁶

Summary

There are a large number of farms in Serbia, which survived with a little capital and labor, and today one of the perspectives they see in the integration with the rural tourism. Tourism development is an incentive for the introduction of improvements in agricultural production, processing and supply of food, as well as the introduction of modern standards that are difficult to apply on small farms because of the high costs of their implementation. Rural tourism in Serbia is not at a satisfactory level of development, although there are all preconditions for its intensive development. Due to unfavorable political and economic position of Serbia, rural tourism has not encountered the support of its favorable development among its competitors. The authors have tried to point out a study for the attitude of the hosts as a service providers on the current status and problems faced in providing services in rural tourism. Investigated in 15 municipalities in Vojvodina (Northern Serbia), Southwestern Serbia and Southeastern Serbia, and in a total of 46 owners of small farms. Using the tests methods questionnaires and processing in SPSS, version 19.0, and analysis of the data, authors led to the confirmation of certain hypotheses of which started in the investigation.

Key words: rural tourism, farms, Serbia, integration.

JEL: Q15, R11

-
- 1 The research was supported by Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development, Republic of Serbia (Grant III 47007).
 - 2 Tamara Gajić Ph.D., Professor of professional studies, Novi Sad Business School, Vladimira Perića Valtera Street no. 4, Novi Sad, Serbia, Phone: +381 63 565 544, E-mail: tamara.gajic.1977@gmail.com.
 - 3 Aleksandra Vujko Ph.D., Lecturer, Novi Sad Business School, Vladimira Perića Valtera Street no. 4, Novi Sad, Serbia, Phone: +381 64 914 26 45, E-mail: aleksandravujko@yahoo.com.
 - 4 Mirjana Penić Ph.D., Lecturer, Faculty of Natural Sciences, Dositeja Obradovica Square no. 3, Novi Sad, Serbia, E-mail: penicns@yahoo.com.
 - 5 Marko D. Petrović Ph.D., Research Associate, Geographical Institute "Jovan Cvijić", Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts (SASA), Djure Jakšića Street no. 9, 11000 Belgrade, Serbia, E-mail: m.petrovic@gi.sanu.ac.rs.
 - 6 Milutin Mrkša Ph.D., Lecturer, Novi Sad Business School, Vladimira Perića Valtera Street no. 4, Novi Sad, Serbia, E-mail: mmrksa@yahoo.com.

Introduction

Serbia has a good basis for the development of rural tourism (pronounced natural and social values, rich cultural and historical heritage and favorable geographic and traffic position). Hitherto unfavorable political and economic situation slowed down the development of tourist activities. Rural tourism in Serbia should contribute to the development of the middle, but also that economic motivate the local population to remain in the country (Gajić, 2009). Small agricultural farms, in Serbia, although often unprofitable from the perspective of space, survived the times, and usually have little capital, land and labor. They are often characterized by a high share of net non-farm income, and a somewhat higher level of formal education than we have in the rest strictly oriented farming households (Lankford et al., 1994; Choi et al., 2006; Andereck et al., 2005). Today's wide range of agricultural products produced mainly dedicated to meeting family needs for food, but the selection of products often does not correspond exactly to the terms of the environment, so that this production is not always economically and environmentally justified (Iorio et al., 2010; Aguilo et al., 2005; Chen et al., 2010). These farms are usually very closed and trying to maintain their way of life and traditions and are reluctant to introduce any changes in the system that allowed its owners to persist for years. With their current economic difficulties, there is a risk that the development of the agri-food chain will be continue to marginalize, and to see a chance only in association with tourism development and marketing in the tourism market (Gajić, 2009).

The introduction of tourism in the rural economy provides more opportunities for the consistent application of environmental farm practices, as well as the actualization of the role of agriculture as an ecological service, which provides conditions for the rural areas retain and recruit younger workforce (Augustin et al., 2007; Sharpley, 2014; Rivera et al., 2015). For tourism as an economic activity, agriculture and farming are not only essential food source, but also a source of attractive activities and creator attractive environment, landscape and biodiversity, which help in increasing the diversity of tourist attractions (Akis et al., 1996; Jaafari, 1986). Tourism, on the other hand, reviving rural environment, because the local community has a specific financial benefit from maintaining its attractive traditional appearance. The focus of this research is to determine the conditions of rural tourism development and integration with farms, the existing problems of development, and then to determine the services and products offered in rural tourism, determining the attitudes of their owners on the inclusion in the tourist offer, looking at tourism activities of each household and determine the most common forms of promotion. Authors used the method of personal interviews and analyzed data in SPSS software, version 19.0. The survey was conducted in 15 municipalities in Serbia (Vojvodina Province – Northern Serbia, Southwestern Serbia and Southeastern Serbia), in a total of 46 of respondents. The sample included a relatively equal number of households, from the three large regions of Serbia.

Theoretical framework and hypotheses development

The importance of rural tourism in economy development

Development of rural tourism and its importance is acute topic of the 21st century, both in developed and undeveloped regions. The importance of the development of rural tourism is reflected in stimulating local economic development because it creates services and job opportunities, and establishes foreign sources of revenue (Gurung et al., 2000). Many rural communities in the world enjoy the complementary support of the local government in terms of general economic assistance policies and targeted housing support (Jeong et al., 2017). Rural areas outside urban areas are also considered to be repositories of older ways of life and cultures that respond to the postmodern tourists' quest for authenticity (Urry, 2002). The encouragement for the development of this form of tourism has become a common policy both in developed countries (Canoves et al., 2004; Hall et al., 1998; Long et al., 2000; MacDonald et al., 2003) and also in developing ones (Briedenhann et al., 2004; Hall, 2004; Carrilat et al., 2007). There are many investigations concerning confirmation of the fact that rural tourism provided economic and social benefits in various rural areas in Europe and elsewhere. Cerezo (2005) pointed out that rural tourism enterprises provided new sources of income for families living in a remote rural area of Chile.

According to Komppulas' research (2007), rural tourism, in general, refers to small family enterprises and lifestyle entrepreneurship. Rural tourism benefits local communities in terms of economic growth, sociocultural development, the provision of essential and nonessential services, and rising standards of living (Sharpley et al., 2011; Nunkoo et al., 2012). Development of rural tourism is the ideal solution for the growth of small and medium-sized enterprises, rural tourism also offers the ideal market for small businesses directly and indirectly bringing economic benefits to local businesses, and encouraging the development of related small businesses (Wild et al., 1994; Vargas et al., 2011; Sinclair et al., 2014). Theorists argue that rural tourism which contributes to small businesses have several specific characteristics. In many cases, these businesses have non-economic goals (Ko et al., 2002; Ladhari et al., 2009, Perez et al., 2010; Kim et al., 2013; Ko et al., 2002). Very often, the development of rural tourism is the wish of the host only to meet their needs and aspirations, such as the way of life, the business might have started in response to the owner's needs or desire for a particular lifestyle (Vujko et al., 2014).

In some rural areas, small businesses often lack even basic governmental supports, including welfare and financial services, training and education programs, and other incentives for local community support for tourism activities (Ateljević, 2009). In Croatia, rural tourism contributes toward sustaining the regional agriculture industry (Petrić, 2003). Rural tourism is a growing sector of the overall tourism market, representing a significant source of income and employment for rural economies (Gajić, 2009), contributing to the sustainability of local communities (Vujko et al., 2014), and revitalizing flagging rural economies (Petrović et al., 2017). A very specific conclusion about rural tourism development is provided by Hall

(2004). He points out that profit from the development of rural tourism contributes to the positive effects and in other spheres: the development of local agriculture, handicrafts, trade, presentation of traditional quality of domestic products, and the opportunity to reevaluate a region's heritage, symbols, environment, and identity.

The needs and abilities of integration of agriculture and tourism

Tourism in the world presents a theory of modernization, where the problems of agriculture and rural areas are considered serious. The policy of integration of agriculture and tourism in the world has long been a hot topic of research (Rasoolimanesh et al., 2017). In most countries agriculture represents the main source of income and employment, which is not the case in rural areas of Serbia. Young people are increasingly leaving rural areas and go to the cities in search of better conditions (Allen et al., 1993, Dyer et al., 2007; Jaafar et al., 2015, Petrović et al., 2017). Rural areas have economic potential which is largely untapped and can be better utilized for the benefit of the rural population and overall national development. Rural areas in Serbia are facing decline through attrition and an aging population, a low skills base and low average productivity (Vujko et al., 2014). The focus is not only to overcome regional disparities and differences between urban and rural development, but also coordinates the development of agriculture and other activities and services in rural areas, to ensure a better quality of life and improve the standard of living rational use of resources and their preservation for future generations (Petrović et al., 2017; Rebeca et al., 2004). Hence the need for the development of tourism activities in rural areas, in order to stabilize the situation and overcome problems (Sharpley, 2011). Agriculture is still the largest user of rural resources and the decisive factor that affects the appearance of the rural area of Serbia.

Evaluation of rural category in the EU and Serbia - the state of rural tourist facilities in Serbia

In the European Union lives 57% of the rural population, wherein the average density of 38 people per square kilometer in predominantly rural regions (except Finland: 2 inhabitants per square kilometer). More developed economies of Europe's rural areas it is often low-income and high unemployment rates, particularly in the new member countries, but also in some old EU-15 countries (Portugal, Spain, Italy, Greece, Finland) (Rasoolimanesh et al., 2017). Romania and Bulgaria, with a total of 7.5 million households with less than 5 ha of land, and most cannot make a sufficient income for their farm household. In the new member states in Central and Eastern Europe, privatization of agricultural land has led to the almost complete disappearance of cooperatives. Cooperatives and commercial farms are located on a large percentage of arable land in Slovakia (76%), Bulgaria (74%), Czech Republic (72%) and Hungary (50%). Small, individual farms cover most of the cultivated land in Slovenia (94%), Latvia (90%) and Poland (86%).

According to the 2002 census at present there are about 778,900 private households, the average size of 2.5 hectares of arable land (total of privately owned 83.7% of the total number of cultivable land, 5.4 million acres). In Vojvodina, there are fewer villages than in other regions and relatively low population density - 94 people per square kilometer. The

unemployment rate in rural areas reached 21%, and the GDP per capita, only 74% of the national average. Holdings up to 3 ha has about 328,000, and those make up about 56% of all households in the rural areas. Over 600,000 households have less than 5 ha of land. The average size of family farms in Serbia is about 3.7 ha (Agriculture and Rural Development RS 2014, 2013). Agricultural population includes over 60 years with a lower degree of education and the high percentage of dependents over the age of 15 years. Most small farms have income from employment outside agriculture, sales of agricultural products and of pensions. Demographic trends in Serbia, especially in its rural areas, are increasingly unfavorable from 1991 to 2002, the population in rural areas of Serbia decreased by 3.6% compared with the overall population decline in the country by 1%, while from 2002-2011 there has been a decline in the total population of 4.15%, which was primarily the result of negative natural increase and migration abroad. About 55% of the Serbian population lives in rural areas, producing 41% of the country's GDP (Agriculture and Rural Development RS 2014, 2013).

The rural population in this period decreased by 311,139 inhabitants (10.9%) and now makes 40.6% of the total population of Serbia. In addition to negative demographic trends in rural areas of the fact that in about 1,000 the village population is less than 100, which indicates that practically every fifth settlement before quenching; the largest concentration of such settlements in the south and east of the country (Agriculture and Rural Development RS 2014, 2013). Given that about 85% of Serbian rural, rural tourism can be assumed that a significant part of the overnight stays in mountain and spas.

On the territory of the Republic of Serbia is 6,158 settlements, of which 193 belong to the city (3.1%), and 5,965 were other settlements, which are automatically considered rural. It is currently estimated that more than 32,000 beds in rural areas plays an important role in the sector of rural tourism, and about 300 rural households with 8,000 beds, offers catering services and generate more than 150,000 overnight stays per year (Petrović et al, 2017). It is estimated that there was a total of 10 billion in revenue from rural tourism (5 billion RSD revenue comes from housing and about 5 billion RSD are direct revenues). What is 16% of total 62 billion RSD of total direct tourism GDP that is for Serbia in 2010. It is estimated that every household that are engaged in rural tourism year certainly remains quite up to 5,000 Euros. Those with luxury accommodation and a better offer, the annual salary of up to 12,000 Euros (Master Plan for Sustainable Development of Rural Tourism of Serbia, 2011). In one household received from 750 to 1,500 per night. More than 1,000 overnight stays a year, makes 60 households. Around 240 objects realized 700-1,000, and 150 has 350-700 nights. About 300 households have less than 350 nights a year. The average length of stay of tourists in households was 2.8 days (Petrović et al., 2017).

Based on these data and many studies on the current topic, the authors of the work are set up several hypotheses:

H1: Rural tourism in Serbia is not at adequate level of development.

H2: Provided services are not on satisfactory level of quality.

H2a: Locals (hosts), mainly, through the development of rural tourism, see the financial benefits.

H2b: Locals do not attach great importance to promotional activities, as well as the best methods of advertising and exiting the market.

H3: There is a low level of integration of agricultural holdings and tourism industry.

H4: Owners of farms, that provide tourist services, see the revitalization in the higher level of integration with tourism.

Research Methodology

As the main method of research in this part of the test methods will be used, which is a way to gain access to primary data, information, and its essence is to collect data over the statements of other entities (subjects), a form of verbal communication with them using questionable testimony. In the realization of field research as a means of testing methods was used questionnaire. As used forms of communication between the interviewer and the respondents in the completion of field trials listed: personal and written communication. Issues that are listed in the questionnaire intended to explore the attitudes of the owner of rural households were formed on the basis of a critical analysis of contemporary literature dealing with the same topic (Petrović et al., 2017). The basis for the implementation of test methods are standardized questionnaires with simple or double scale. While in the case of simple scales, as a rule, with the help of Likert scale (1-5) includes observation of the quality keeping in mind certain attributes or the expectation of consumers before using the services and to compare the experiences after the service. Based on double the scale developed one of the most multi-attributes procedures for measuring service quality called Servqual.

Results and discussion

Area and sampling

Total number of survey, owners of rural households that provide tourist services in rural areas of Serbia who have studied in this paper, is 46. The study included 15 municipalities which are grouped in the following regions: Vojvodina, Southwestern and Southeastern Serbia. The objective of this phase of the research is to gain insight into the state of rural tourism and service quality from the perspective of the owners of rural households and the local population. The sample included a relatively equal number of households from the three large regions of Serbia. In Southeastern Serbia has covered 32.6% of households, in Vojvodina the distribution of questionnaires was 32.61%, and in Southwestern Serbia 34.78%. The questionnaire for the hosts contains a total of 23 questions, of which 5 closed nature and related to socio-demographic characteristics of the host, and other issues to focus on the cognitive and experiential characteristics of the host.

Certain data obtained by the analysis will be presented throughout the text, with no tabulation, and also form part of the written part of statistical research. According to the study, the highest percentage of tourists who had been visited households were domestic tourists 89%, while the foreign visitors only 11%. of which domestic tourists, mainly in the largest percentage, were regular guests. The largest percentage of visitors stay 5 days (63%), followed by seven

days, about 26%. Total 2% of tourists stay two weeks, but longer than that percentage remains 4%. Just one day only 55 tourists stay in rural households that have taken in the investigation. Based on the analysis of the structure of respondents it can be seen dominating the number of hosts that are engaged in agriculture (23.9%) and exclusively tourism (43.5%), which means that residents who are engaged in rural tourism, people are opting for it as their primary activity, or farmers who are looking for an additional source of income. Analysis of the age structure shows, that the hosts are mainly people older than 50 years (32.6%). Further analysis shows that respondents are mainly locals persons with secondary education and they make up 54.3% of total respondents. When looking at the height of monthly revenue, nearly a third of respondents (26.7%) answered that their income does not exceed 200 euros, while only 4 (8.7%) of respondents earning more than 600 euros per month, which indicates relatively low earnings host dealing with rural tourism and compared to the average income in Serbia. All data indicates a low level of development of the rural tourist industry and confirm H1 hypothesis.

Table 1. Socio-demographic characteristics of the owners of farms

Gender structure		Frequency	Percent %
Gender	Male	24	52.2%
	Female	21	46.7%
Total		46	100%
Occupation structure		Frequency	Percent %
Primary occupation	Agriculture	11	23.95
	Tourism	20	43.5%
	Crafts	6	13.0%
	Other	6	19.6%
Total		46	100%
Age structure		Frequency	Percent %
Age	21-30	1	2.2%
	31-40	8	17.4%
	41-50	9	19.6%
	51-60	15	32.6%
	> 61	13	29.3%
Total		46	100%
Educational structure		Frequency	Percent %
Education	Unfinished primary school	1	2.2%
	Primary school	8	17.4%
	Secondary school	25	54.3%
	Higher or high school	12	26.1%
Total		46	100%

	Earning structure	Frequency	Percent %
Earning (in Euros)	< 200	12	26.7%
	201-400	23	50.0%
	401-600	6	13.0%
	>601	4	8.7%
Total		46	100%

Source: Prepared by the author based on data analysis in SPSS 19.0.

In households that receive tourists mainly live two members (29%), which is likely, considering the most dominant age structure among the hosts, indicating an older couple whose children have left home and who need additional sources of income. Estates and houses that host tourists mostly located inside the village, 78%, while a smaller portion of households outside the village. When it comes to farm the largest percentage of those 200 square meters of surface. Since it is the tourist facilities of smaller areas, it can be concluded that the majority of households hosts tourists in their private dwellings. Data show that the host home in 73% of cases older than 20 years. Tourist facilities that are available to visitors in rural areas of Serbia, for the most part (44%) are in the second category.

In the rural areas of Southwestern and Southeastern Serbia, mainly dominate objects of the second category, while in Vojvodina dominated the third category. A significant proportion of tourist facilities the first category is recorded only in Southwestern Serbia. Most households (38%) have between 100 and 500 visits per year, while at 16% of households have from 500 to 1,000. From the sample, we can conclude that the Serbian households are choosing to offer full board to visitors of rural landscapes (52%). As for accommodation facilities, just one host has only one room that offers to the tourists, 17% of the home has two bedrooms, the home with three rooms in its offer is presented with 20%, while the largest number of respondents with several rooms of the above (61%). Data analysis showed that 80% of households' issue of accommodation throughout the year, without the expressed seasonality. As the most important parameter of quality and factor of making tourists decisions is price. According to the results of survey research it was found that the price varies widely, ranging from 640 RSD to 3,500 RSD (1 Euro = 124 RSD).

Table 2. Basic data of households

Number of household members	1	2	3	4	5
	7%	29%	24%	27%	13%
Surface of property (square meters)	100	200	300	do 700	700 +
	27%	47%	11%	2%	13%
Categorization of objects (IP= in process)	I	II	III	IV	IP
	18%	44%	28%	4%	6%
Number of visitors per year	50	50-100	100-500	500-1000	1000+
	23%	7%	38%	16%	16%

Type of accommodation <i>(mean: B&B= bed and breakfast)</i>				
Full accommodation	B&B	Overnight	All	Total
52%	26%	11%	11%	100%
Rooms in households	3 rooms	2 rooms	1 room	more
	20%	17%	2%	61%
Prices of services (RSD)	<1.000	<1.500	<2000	< 3.500
	24%	27%	33%	16%

Source: Prepared by the author based on data analysis in SPSS 19.0.

Table 3. Type of provided service in homes on farms engaged in rural tourism

Provided service	Yes	No
Heating in winter	91%	9%
Air conditioners	40%	60%
French bed	63%	37%
Sofa	35%	65%
The bathroom	98%	2%
Homemade food	93%	7%
Sports activities	43%	57%
Field trips	80%	20%
Participation in activities	52%	48%
Creative workshops	37%	63%
Homemade drink	76%	24%

Source: Prepared by authors of the quality on data analysis in SPSS 19.0.

Table 4. The attitude of the owner of the farms about characteristics of services

Assessment of equipment by the host				
Rate	5	4	3	2
Percent	54%	35%	9%	2%
Assessment of cleanliness and hygiene				
Rate	5	4	3	2
Percent	76%	20%	4%	-
Spaciousness and brightness				
Rate	5	4	3	2
Percent	63%	26%	11%	-
Assessment of peace and tranquility				
Rate	5	4	3	2
Percent	87%	11%	2%	-
Method of preparation of food				
Guest Kitchen	Host cooks	Outside the household	They share with the host	All
69%	9%	4%	16%	2%

Type of advertising									
Recommendation		Announcement		Association		Fares		Internet	
Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
78%	22%	24%	76%	33%	67%	49%	51%	89%	11%

Source: Prepared by authors of the quality on data analysis in SPSS 19.0.

According to the research, it was found that 91% of owners has conditions to ensure adequate heating during the winter in their households, but only 40% of the host has the correct air-conditioning that will provide pleasant living conditions during the summer. Comfort is one of the major demands of tourists. The results we obtained show that 63% of the home offers a single bed, while the same number also offers a double bed (suitable for two people). In 35% of households there is a sofa bed. Comfort is provided if guests hosts offer a private bathroom. According to data obtained from the analysis of questionnaires for the hosts, we found that 98% of households who offer tourist services to visitors of rural areas of Serbia have separate bathrooms for guests. According to the results it was found that furnishings and equipment that offer accommodation to tourists only 2% of respondents assessed as “satisfactory”; 9% of assessed accommodation as “good”, more than a third as “very good” and even more than half (54%) as excellent.

Cleanliness and hygiene conditions are also an important indicator of quality units that affect the satisfaction of tourists, where it notes that 76% of respondents assessed as excellent hosts. The spaciousness and brightness of the room, which is on offer to tourists, 5 patients (11%) assessed as “good”, 12 (26%) as “very good” and 29 (63%) as “excellent”. Peace and quiet in the room where they reside as much as 40 (87%) as “excellent”. In our sample, 93% of the host offers visitors home produced food. Also, two-thirds of the home (76.1%) offers its visitors a drink from a private cellar. Regarding the requirements for the preparation of food in households, the largest number of tourists (69%) have the ability to prepare food in the kitchen that is specially set aside. However, according to our study, less than half of the households (43%) offers guests participation in sport and recreational activities, while only 52.2% of the host is able to offer participation in rural jobs, and 37% in the creative workshops. If we consider the fact that 84% of the home has a holding of up to 300 square meters, it is expected that in such a small space cannot build larger farm, which would expand the tourist offer. However, 80% of the host offers visitors the option of going on a trip around the household. All data analyses suggest the hypothesis H2, that service quality in rural tourism has not given the highest marks by the host, as well as direct service providers.

Confirmation hypothesis H2a, a benefit for locals see the development of this form of tourism, mostly provided data from the table. What benefit locals have from tourism show the following data: 51.1% answered “financial”. Given the level of development of Serbia, especially in rural regions in Serbia, it is expected that a larger number of hosts requires a source of additional income by undertaking tourism activities. Even 40% of the hosts say they had some other benefit (Foreign language learning in an interview with the tourists), 6.5% of respondents believe that the next financial benefit (including the opportunity to sell their products) mirrors and an opportunity to meet and socialize with people. More than

half of respondents (56.5%) are a member of an association of rural households. The survey results show that 96% of the host cooperates with them, which is a positive indicator of their interest to increase tourist demand and offer. Ways to promote a means of attracting tourists and providing tourist development of rural regions. However, these funds require financial investments is due to the unstable economic situation and the crisis in Serbia, it is very difficult to provide. According to the research, the hosts among the respondents do not advertise its tourist offer. This is a very disappointing result, which is due to low income and worsened the economic situation in the country. Due to lack of funds for advertising in the media, local Serbian rural areas rely on oral recommendations of relatives, fellow citizens and guests.

According to the survey, 78% of respondents believe that the arrival of new guests comes from the recommendations, while 22% disagree with this statement. Research has shown that the largest number of households advertised via the Internet, since it is currently the cheapest means of promotion and, unfortunately, only way of promotion that some household in Serbia can afford. Even 89% of respondents use the Internet to present its tourist offer and attracting guests. This confirms the hypothesis H2b. When asked if they received incentives or any other form of assistance from the municipality to improve the rural tourism product, 65% of households responded affirmatively. However, about a third of the sample, namely 28%, a negative answer to this question, which is a significant number. Based on statistical research and analyzed research data it is obviously that there is expressed very weak integration between agricultural holdings and tourism industry, which confirms the hypothesis H3. Of the total respondents, 89%, declared that the revitalization of rural areas is also integrated with tourism, thus confirming the hypothesis H4.

Conclusion

According to Bramwell and Lane (1994) rural tourism is a multifaceted activity rather than farm-based tourism only. The role of rural tourism in developing of economy saw many theorists (Sharpley, 2000). Rural small businesses are sustained with an absolute minimum of staff and rely on a high turnover of sales (Hollick et al., 2005; Reijonen, 2008; Brida et al., 2010; Gursoy et al., 2002). Consequently, rural tourism is regarded important economic strategy for improving rural social conditions (Liu, 2006). Farm owners who deal with involvement their farms in tourism sector earners large part of their income and contribute to a large influx of money to the district, the state and the farmers (Brandth et al., 2011). Agricultural tourism has become a sector that is rapidly expanding in European countries (Burton, 2004). This type of tourism allows farmers to gain additional income and improve the economy of rural areas (Kegel et al., 2003). Turning on farms in rural farm tourism includes such branch, which is adapted users and their activities, such as reading squash, fruits and vegetables, mating with the animals, and the like (Brandth et al., 2011).

According to the latest data from the US Department of Agriculture 2012, farms involved in agri-tourism earned \$ 700 million, an increase of 24 % in five years (Huller et al., 2017). Rural communities in Serbia must face many challenges, contributing to weaker economic performance, or the occurrence of poverty. It is believed that, due to the fact that the rural

areas of Serbia and in the future, will be affected by the negative climate change, changed conditions for the development of agriculture can produce even worse consequences for the survival of rural communities, and the larger of the effects of the current economic crisis. Rural tourism is a major potential for the economic development of Serbia. The difficult economic and political situation that befell Serbia at the end of the 20th century and today, has major implications on the entire economic development. Of course, these consequences are sensible and in the tourism sector. The authors carried out the research in Vojvodina, Southwestern and Southeastern Serbia, with a total of 46 respondents. The statistics on the number of households that are engaged in rural tourism, their due, categorization and other parameters point to confirm the starting hypothesis H1 that rural tourism is underdeveloped in the country. Based on the data on the evaluation of the quality of services by the host multiply conclude that the top-rated services such as domestic food (93%), tours (80%), and serving domestic drinks (76%). Rating of other services provided is not satisfactory perceived by the host.

In order to be said about the revitalized rural areas and integration with tourism, every household would have to be able to accommodate 45-50 people, what is the usual standard for tours with bus transport. If this condition is not fulfilled, the tourists in this town will keep no longer active, but not perfect offer food, entertainment and the like. Therefore, the authors confirmed the hypothesis H2, that provided services are not at adequate and expected level. In terms of prescribed standards of quality units, identified numerous problems that the owners of rural households are facing. Households in rural areas of Serbia are generally small and have no room for improvement of tourist offer. If we take into account the limited possibility of investing in the expansion of tourist facilities in Serbia, leads to the conclusion that the tourism facilities in rural tourism is relatively small areas, do not allow hosting a large number of tourists, and are thus able to expand these activities are very limited. Accordingly, categorization is quite inadequate. In the Southwestern and Southeastern Serbia dominated by objects second categories, while in Vojvodina is dominated by objects of the third and then the second category.

A significant proportion of tourist facilities first category is recorded only in Southwestern Serbia. They are mostly older buildings (73%). Locals have also pleaded the biggest percentage of them in the development of rural tourism, sees mostly-financial or material benefit (certificate H2a). In the development of rural tourism play an important role of public and state institutions as well as non-profit organizations by providing resources, whether in the form of finance or some other form, helping to promote and improvement of tourist offer of the region that are less developed. Statistical analysis showed that households Southwestern Serbia, compared to Vojvodina and Southeastern Serbia, largely undertaken marketing and promotional activities for the presentation of its tourist offer. Only half of the owners of rural households (56%) is a member of an association of rural households, while the majority relies on cooperation with travel agencies.

In addition, even 76% of households have a prominent notice on the issuing of stay. Appalling fact, which is determined in this study is that 35% of owners of rural households had no access to financial assistance for the improvement of the tourism product. It was found that among

respondents with no host does not advertise its tourist offer, but rely on oral recommendations of previous guests and internet ads are free. These results point to a weak level of organization in promoting the development of rural regions in Serbia (certificate H2b). Hypothesis H3, which indicate the subject of this study, which is that there is poor integration of agricultural holdings and tourism is confirmed on the basis of results. H4 hypothesis is confirmed, and that is that the owners of properties that provide tourism services see survival in greater integration with the tourism industry.

To facilitate the identification of and information among tourists regarding the level of quality offered, it is necessary homogenization of standards applied in different centres. Therefore, entrepreneurial associations and public authorities should participate actively in establishing common standards, and to promote and coordinate all actions on creating a draft accreditation. The development of entrepreneurial associations and networks lodging defending homogeneous models of quality management can be an element that contributes to the creation of confidence of tourists. Above all, the standards which highlights the difference in quality should take into account the expectations of tourists.

Based on the identified obstacles to the development of rural tourism in Serbia is possible to extract guidelines for future development and in the following way: finding mechanisms to prevent depopulation of rural areas (strengthening infrastructure, raising the attractiveness of the region, the enrichment of the tourist attractions, the diversification of the rural economy), standardization and uniformity within the rural tourism sector (categorization), more and better integration of agriculture and tourism in the planning documents and in practice, greater participation of the owners of rural households, as well as education and awareness of local people about the possibilities of rural tourism (training continuously and not sporadically), preserving the original rural environment, finding better solutions for the protection of monuments of culture in rural areas, find all possible ways to increase the involvement of farms in rural tourism. Staffing, technical and organizational, local governments in Serbia are still not sufficiently trained to be more involved in rural development.

References

1. Andereck, K., Valentine, K., Knopf, R., Vogt, C. (2005): *Residents' perceptions of community tourism impacts*. Annals of Tourism Research, Vol. 32, No. 4, pp. 1056-1076.
2. Aguiló, E., Roselló, J. (2005): *Host community perceptions: A cluster analysis*. Annals of Tourism Research, Vol. 32, No. 4, pp. 925-941.
3. Akis, S., Peristianis, N., Warner, J. (1996): *Residents' attitudes to tourism development: The case of Cyprus*. Tourism Management, Vol. 17, No. 7, pp. 481-494.
4. Albacete-Saez, C. A., Fuentes-Fuentes, M. M., Llorens-Montes, F. J. (2007): *Service quality measurement in rural accommodation*. Annals of Tourism Research, Vol. 34, No. 1, pp. 45-65.

5. Allen, R.L., Hafer, H.R., Long, P.T., & Perdue, R.R. (1993): *Rural residents' attitudes toward recreation and tourism development*. Journal of Travel Research, Vol. 31, No. 4, pp. 27–33.
6. Ateljevic, J. (2009): *Tourism entrepreneurship and regional development: Example from New Zealand*. International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour and Research, Vol.15, No. 3, pp. 282–308.
7. Augustyn, M. M., Seakhwa-King, A. (2004): *Is the SERVQUAL scale an adequate measure of quality in leisure, tourism and hospitality?* Advances in Hospitality and Leisure, Vol. 1, 3-24.
8. Brady, M. K., Cronin, J. (2001): Some new thoughts on conceptualizing perceived service quality: A hierarchical approach. Journal of Marketing, Vol. 65, No. 3, pp. 34-49.
9. Bramwell, B., Lane, B. (1994): *Rural tourism and sustainable rural development*. Proceedings from the second international school of rural development. London: Channel View Books.
10. Brandth, B., Haugen, M.S. (2011): *Farm diversification into tourism e implications for social identity?* J. Rural. Stud. Vol. 27, 35- 44.
11. Brida, J., Osti, L., Barquet, A. (2010): *Segmenting resident perceptions towards tourism: A cluster analysis with a multinomial logit model of a mountain community*. International Journal of Tourism Research, Vol. 12, No. 5, pp. 591-602
12. Briedenhann, J., Wickens, E. (2004): *Tourism routes as a tool for the economic development of rural areas – vibrant hope or impossible dream?* Tourism Management, Vol. 25, pp. 71–79.
13. Burton, R.J.F. (2004): *Seeing through the 'good farmer's' eyes: towards developing an understanding of the social symbolic value of 'productivist' behaviour*. Soc. Rural. Vol. 44, pp. 195-215.
14. Canoves, G., Villarino, M., Priestley, G.K., Blanco, A., (2004): *Rural tourism in Spain: an analysis of recent evolution*. Geoforum, Vol. 35, No. 6, pp. 755–769.
15. Carrillat, F. A., Jaramillo, F., Mulki, J. P. (2007): *The validity of the SERVQUAL and SERVPERF scales. A meta-analytic view of 17 years of research across five continents*. International Journal of Service Industry Management, Vol. 18, No. 5, pp. 472–490.
16. Cerezo, J.M., Lara de Vicente, F. (2005): *El turismo como industria de España y de la Unión Europea*. In G. En López, J.Y. Tomás, & F. Lara de Vicente (Eds.), *Turismo sostenible: un enfoque multidisciplinar e internacional*, pp. 255–287.
17. Chen, C. F., Chen, P. C. (2010): *Resident attitudes toward heritage tourism development*. Tourism Geographies, Vol. 12, No. 4, pp. 525–545.
18. Choi, H., Sirakaya, E. (2006): *Sustainability indicators for managing community tourism*. Tourism Management, Vol. 27, No. 6, pp. 1274-1289.

19. Dyer, P., Gursoy, D., Sharma, B., Carter, J. (2007): *Structural modelling of resident perceptions of tourism and associated development on the Sunshine Coast, Australia*. *Tourism Management*, Vol. 28, No. 2, pp. 409-422.
20. Gursoy, D., Jurowski, C., Uysal, M. (2002): *Resident attitudes: a structural modelling approach*. *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 29, No. 1, pp. 303-317.
21. Gajić, T. (2009): *Karakteristike razvoja i uticaja turizma na ukupnu privredu Vojvodine*. *Ekonomika poljoprivrede*, Vol. 56, No. 2, pp. 139-154.
22. Gurung, C., DeCoursey, M. (2000): *Too much too fast: Lessons from Nepal's lost kingdom of mustang*. *Tourism and development in mountain regions*, Vol. 20, pp. 239-253.
23. Hall, D. (2004): *Rural tourism development in South-Eastern Europe: transition and the search for sustainability*. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, Vol. 6, pp. 165–176.
24. Hall, C., Jenkins, J. (1998): *The Policy Dimensions of rural tourism and recreation*. *Tourism and Recreation in Rural Areas*. Wiley, Chichester, pp. 19–42.
25. Huller, S., Heiny, J., Leonhauser, I. (2017): *Linking Agricultural Food production and Rural Tourism in the Kazbegi District – a qualitative study*. *Annals of agrarian sciences*, in press.
26. Iorio, M., Corsale, A. (2010): *Rural tourism and livelihood strategies in Romania*. *Journal of Rural Studies*. Vol. 26, No. 2, pp. 152-162.
27. Jafari, J. (1986): *A systemic view of sociocultural dimensions of tourism*. In President's commission on American outdoors, pp. 33-50.
28. Jaafar, M., Rasoolimanesh, S., Lonik, K. (2015): *Tourism growth and entrepreneurship: Empirical analysis of development of rural highlands*. *Tourism Management Perspectives*. Vol. 14, pp.17-24.
29. Jeong, J.S. (2017): *Identifying priority areas for rural housing development using the participatory multi-criteria and contingent valuation methods in Alange reservoir area, Central Extremadura (Spain)*. *Journal of Rural Studies*, Vol. 50, pp. 117-128.
30. Kegel, H. (2003): *The Significance of Subsistence Farming in Georgia as an Economic and Social Buffer*. In *Subsistence Agriculture in Central and Eastern Europe: How to Break the Vicious Circle?* Institute of Agricultural Development in Central and Eastern Europe, pp. 147-160.
31. Kim, K., Uysal, M., Sirgy, M. (2013): *How does tourism in a community impact the quality of life of community residents?* *Tourism Management*. Vol. 36, pp. 527-540.
32. Ko, D., Stewart, W. (2002): *A structural equation model of residents' attitudes for tourism development*. *Tourism Management*, 23, No. 5, pp. 521-530.
33. Komppula, R. (2007): *Developing rural tourism in Finland through entrepreneurship*. *Advances in Tourism Research Series*, pp. 123-134.

34. Ladhari, R. (2009): *A review of twenty years of SERVQUAL research*. International Journal of Quality and Service Sciences. Vol. 1, No. 2, pp. 172–198.
35. Lankford, S. V., Howard, D. R. (1994): *Developing a tourism impact attitude scale*. Annals of Tourism Research. Vol. 21, No. 1, pp. 121-139.
36. Liu, A. (2006): *Tourism in rural areas: Kedah, Malaysia*. Tourism Management. Vol. 27, No. 5, pp. 878-889.
37. Long, P., Lane, B. (2000): *Rural tourism development*. 1999. Trends in Outdoor Recreation, Leisure and Tourism. CABI, Wallingford, pp. 299–308.
38. MacDonald, R., Jolliffe, L. (2003): *Cultural rural tourism: evidence from Canada*. Annals of Tourism Research, Vol. 30, pp. 307–322.
39. Nunkoo, R., Gursoy, D. (2012): *Residents' support for tourism: An identity perspective*. Annals of Tourism Research, Vol. 39, No. 1, pp. 243–268.
40. Pérez, S. (2010): *El valor estratégico del turismo rural como alternativa sostenible de desarrollo territorial rural. The strategic value of rural tourism as a sustainable alternative for rural territorial development*. Agronomía Colombiana. Vol. 28, No. 3, pp. 507–513.
41. Petric, L. (2003): *Constraints and possibilities of the rural tourism development with the special stress on the case of Croatia*. Paper presented at the ERSA conference papers.
42. Petrović, M. D., Blešić, I., Vujko, A., Gajić, T. (2017): *The role of agritourism's impact on the local community in a transitional society: A report from Serbia*. Transylvanian Review of Administrative Sciences. Vol. 50, No. 1, pp. 146-163.
43. Rasoolimanesh, S.M. (2017): *Urban vs. rural destinations: Residents' perceptions, community participation and support for tourism development*. Tourism Management. Vol. 60, pp. 147-158.
44. Rebecca Torres, R., Henshall Momsen, J. (2004): *Challenges and potential for linking tourism and agriculture to achieve pro-poor tourism objectives*, Sociol. Rural. Vol. 4, No. 4, pp. 294-318.
45. Reijonen, H. (2008): *Understanding the small business owner: What they really aim at and how this relates to firm performance: A case study in North Karelia, Eastern Finland*. Management Research News, Vol. 31, No. 8, pp. 616–629.
46. Rivera, M., Croes, R., Lee, S. H. (2015): *Tourism development and happiness: A residents' perspective*. Journal of Destination Marketing and Management, Vol. 5, No. 1, pp. 5–15.
47. Sharpley, R. (2000): *Tourism and sustainable development: Exploring the theoretical divide*. Journal of Sustainable Tourism, Vol. 8, No. 1, pp. 1–19.
48. Sharpley, R., Jepson, d. (2011): *Rural tourism a spiritual experience?* Annals of Tourism Research, Vol. 38, pp. 52–71.

49. Sharpley, R. (2014): *Host perceptions of tourism: A review of the research*. Tourism Management, Vol. 42, pp. 37-49.
50. Sinclair, M. G., Gursoy, D., Vieregge, M. (2014): *Residents' perceptions toward tourism development*. Journal of Destination Marketing and Management, Vol. 4, pp. 36-45.
51. Vujko, A., Gajić, T. (2014): *Opportunities for tourism development and cooperation in the region by improving the quality of supply - The Danube Cycle Route, Case Study*. Economic Research, Vol. 27, No. 1, pp. 847-860.
52. Vargas, S.A., Porrás-Bueno, N., Mejía, M. D. L. Á. (2011): *Explaining residents' attitudes to tourism: Is a universal model possible?* Annals of Tourism Research, Vol. 38, No. 2, pp. 460-480.
53. Wild, C., Cooper, C. P., Lockwood, A. (1994): *Issues in ecotourism*. Progress in Tourism, Recreation and Hospitality Management, Vol. 6, pp. 12-21.

ZNAČAJNIJE UKLJUČIVANJE POLJOPRIVREDNIH GAZDINSTAVA U RURALNI TURISTIČKI RAZVOJ SRBIJE⁷

Tamara Gajić⁸, Aleksandra Vujko⁹, Mirjana Penić¹⁰, Marko D. Petrović¹¹, Milutin Mrkša¹²

Rezime

Postoji veliki broj poljoprivrednih gazdinstava u Srbiji, koji su opstali s malo kapitala i radne snage, a danas jednu od perspektiva pronalaze u integraciji s ruralnim turizmom. Razvoj turizma može da podstakne poboljšanje poljoprivredne proizvodnje, preradu i ponudu hrane, kao i uvođenje savremenih standarda koji se teško primenjuju na malim farmama zbog visokih troškova njihove primene. Ruralni turizam u Srbiji nije na zadovoljavajućem nivou razvoja, iako postoje svi preduslovi za intenzivniji razvoj. Zbog nepovoljne političke i ekonomske situacije u Srbiji ranijih godina, ruralni turizam nije naišao na podršku za povoljniji razvoj u odnosu na konkurenciju. Autori su pokušali da istraže stavove domaćina o trenutnom stanju i problemima s kojima se suočavaju u pružanju usluga u ruralnom turizmu. Istraživanje je obuhvatilo 15 opština u Vojvodini, Severozapadnoj i Severoistočnoj Srbiji, odnosno ukupno 46 vlasnika malih farmi. Upotrebom metode testa i upitnika, te obradom u SPSS programu, verzija 19.0, i analizom podataka došli su do potvrde određenih hipoteza od kojih su krenuli u istraživanju.

Ključne reči: ruralni turizam, gazdinstva, Srbija, integracija.

7 Istraživanje je podržalo Ministarstvo prosvete, nauke i tehnološkog razvoja, Republika Srbija (Grant III 47007).

8 Profesor strukovnih studija, dr Tamara Gajić, Visoka poslovna škola strukovnih studija Novi Sad, Ulica Vladimira Perića Valtera br. 4, Novi Sad, Srbija, Telefon: +381 63 565 544, E-mail: gajic_tamara@yahoo.com

9 Dr Aleksandra Vujko, Predavač, Visoka poslovna škola strukovnih studija Novi Sad, Ulica Vladimira Perića Valtera br. 4, Novi Sad, Srbija, Telefon: +381 64 914 26 45, E-mail: aleksandravujko@yahoo.com

10 Dr Mirjana Penić, Predavač, Prirodno-matematički fakultet, Trg Dositeja Obradovica br. 3, Novi Sad, Srbija, E-mail: penicns@yahoo.com.

11 Dr Marko D. Petrović, Naučni saradnik, Geografski institute "Jovan Cvijić", Srpska akademija nauka i umetnosti (SANU), Ulica Đure Jakšića br. 9, 11000 Beograd, Srbija, E-mail: m.petrovic@gi.sanu.ac.rs.

12 Dr Milutin Mrkša, Predavač, Visoka poslovna škola strukovnih studija u Novom Sadu, Ulica Vladimira Perića Valtera br. 4, Novi Sad, Srbija, E-mail: mmrksa@yahoo.com.