



TOURISM IN TERMS OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF SERBIAN RURAL AREAS

Invited paper

Drago Cvijanović, Ph.D;

Faculty of Hotel Management and Tourism – Vrnjci Spa, University of Kragujevac, Vojvodjanska 5A Street, Vrnjacka Banja, SERBIA,

E-mail: drago.cvijanovic@kg.ac.rs; dvcmmv@gmail.com

Vojin Cvijanović, Msc;

Em Teh MMV, d.o.o. Banjička 14 Street, Zemun-Belgrade, SERBIA,

E-mail: cvija91@yahoo.com;

Zoran Simonović, Ph.D.

Institute of Agricultural Economics, Volgina 15 Street, Belgrade, SERBIA

E-mail: zoki@medianis.net

***Abstract:** The territory of the Republic of Serbia is 85% a rural area, with around 55% of the total population. Rural areas have: hospitable population, natural resources, rich eco-system and biodiversity, natural rarities, intact natural beauties, cultural and historical heritage, local and autochthonous dishes and drinks, etc. At the same time, the rural population in regard to the urban population have lower incomes and life standard, a chronic lack of employment in other activities besides agriculture; they don't have basic conditions for cultural and sports life on one hand, but they dispose with the significant resources, which can be in terms of the improvement of everything previously said, on the other hand.*

There was applied the combination of qualitative and quantitative research methods in this paper, where there was used a structural questionnaire, as a research instrument, which had enclosed a list of questions, mostly those open type. In-depth interviews were organized with hosts who were engaged or wanted to be engaged in tourism.

The expected result is to impose the tourism, as the services industry, as the driver of overall development of the rural areas, along with the respect of comparative advantages every area has, and to put all the resources in terms of higher and more balanced employment, higher incomes and better life standards of population in these areas, and also a smaller gap between rural and urban areas, which have been now very expressed in Serbia.

Key words: *tourism, rural areas, Serbia, employment, standard.*

JEL classification: Q18, P25; R58; Z32

1. INTRODUCTION

There are different definitions of rural development (RD); one of the contemporary definitions implies, under a term “rural development”, an integral and multi-sector and sustainable development of rural space. The overall (integral) development of rural areas (RA) is important primarily due to the rural economy diversification, which has significantly fallen behind the urban areas (UA). Migrations of work-active population from rural to urban



settlements, population growing old, depending only on the primary agricultural production, destroying the horizontal and vertical reproduction chains in agro-food production (plundering privatization), insufficient investments in infrastructure have made this area lagging behind, impossible for normal life and work, and therefore impossible to start a family.

Depopulation appears, first of all, owing to economic factors, i.e. unemployment of work-capable population. Diversification of rural economy is a basic reason and a basic condition of demographic stabilisation of these areas, and which makes a foundation of all developmental components sustainability (society, economy and environment). An essence of the developmental process is in realizing the current situation (especially to determine all real resources for the development), determine the comparative advantages of the observed RA in regard to the neighbouring areas and accordingly to define a developmental path, which can bring more quality working conditions and quality life of population in that area.

Underdeveloped RA, with bad social and economic characteristics, represents a big problem, not only to a local community, but to the whole country, on one hand, while it disposes with the significant resources (especially natural), on the other hand. There comes to the stoppage of depopulation, employment of work-capable population, increase of income and thereby more balanced development of these areas with UA, by putting into operation those resources.

In order to decrease the pressure and inflow of population in UA, it is necessary, in a best possible way, to use the strategic advantages of every RA and to integrate these economic activities into a local community economy and the state as a whole. RA, which have determined their comparative strategic advantages, and if there has arose an enterprising, wise, brave man, a man with a vision, can have a serious diversified development of the economy in that area.

Naturally, everybody has to do his work. The state should bring the systematic laws, make economic environment, build infrastructure and adopt the measures of economic and agrarian policy, which would be in function of the development of diversified rural economy. Faculties, institutes, chambers of commerce, cooperatives, local authority, RA, associations, business entities, agricultural holdings etc. should perceive the current situation and determine the strategic directions of development (mission, vision, strategic goals, priority goals and measures) and finally, to determine who and in what way can realize it.

Respecting the facts that the Republic of Serbia disposes with the significant potentials for the development of all forms of rural tourism (RT), the tourism as an important tertiary economic activity, "industry of services", should be, along with agriculture, as a primary economic activity, one of the "locomotives" for the Serbian RA development. It means that all activities of all sectors, from the primary, secondary, tertiary and quaternary should be equally proportioned in the development of some RA, according to its comparative advantages and environment preservation.



2. MATERIAL AND METHODS

In this paper were used data, which have already been published in papers, publications, books, monographs, as well as data of the Statistical Office of the Republic of Serbia, EU, FAO, etc. The research methodology of this paper is a combination of quality and quantity researches. As a research instrument was used a structured questionnaire, which has comprised a list of questions, mostly open type. Conversations with hosts, who are engaged in agricultural production and/or rural tourism, were organized at "ETHNO FAIR" in Belgrade, 26th-27th November 2015, and examinees were from the following municipalities (Vrnjacka Banja, Kraljevo, Aleksandrovac, Cacak, Gornji Milanovac and Mali Zvornik). In-depth interviews were done with some of the hosts, who have seriously "made a step" toward rural tourism.

In the paper was used the comparative-analytical method and SWOT analysis.

3. RURAL AREAS, SITUATION AND PERSPECTIVE FOR THE DEVELOPMENT

In past thirty years, the EU countries has put RA at the centre of their developmental policy on one hand, and create the investment terms in those areas and thereby make real possibilities for employment of jobless people, on the other hand. It implies that RD respects the comparative advantages of the area in regard to surrounding areas and making the real and original models of development (Cvijanović, et.al. 2011).

Of the total 165 municipalities, 130 of them belong to RA (areas which population density is less than 150 inhabitants per km²), i.e. 85% of Serbian territory is rural, and 55% of total population lives there. Besides still significant number of active population, in these areas of our Republic, there are natural resources of our country, like high-quality and preserved land, clean forests and waters. RA have been rich with eco-systems and biodiversity, natural rarities, they have various activities, cultural and historical heritage. The Republic of Serbia still has uncontrolled migrations (rural-urban areas), devastation and impoverishment of village, poor previous and unfinished privatization, destruction of industry and agricultural-food sector, high unemployment, etc.

In recent years, in RA, the employment structure per activities has been dynamically changed. The highest employment was noticed in agriculture, in regard to other activities. In the period from 2004 to 2012, it had ranged from 43% to 50%, which had been much in regard to other European countries. Every fifth inhabitant of RA works in industry, and unfortunately, and they keep significantly decreasing. At the same time, the population in RA has been increasingly employed in a tertiary sector, which could be interpreted in two ways: on one hand, by the greater business stability in this sector's activities, and on the other hand, by growth of a number of employees in public administration activities, education, communal and social services.



An income of holdings in RA speaks in that favour, 35-42% of incomes result from employment (regular and additional) and right after follows a share of retirements with increasing trend (around 30% in 2012). In the same time, the analyses, agricultural income range from 6-9% of the total available resources of households, which were highly dependable of agricultural yield, and they had varied from year to year. The natural consumption value, which has mainly attributed to food consumption, manufactured in an agricultural holding, has been stable at the level of 12-14% (the Strategy of Agriculture and Rural Development of the Republic of Serbia for the period 2014-2024 ("Official Gazette RS" no. 85/2014)).

Tourism, as a very dynamic service activity, in past decades was starting to be an indicator of overall economic development, standards and the development of culture of a country (Štetić et.al. 2014). The significance of tourism, as a generator of economic and social development, and also its multiplied effects, affects the increase of a basic and additional employment, especially in rural areas. With tourism development and by inclusion of other compatible activities, which have their place in the total development of tourism, there the long-term stability is going to be ensured (Dimitrovksi, D., Milutinović, Sonja, 2014).

For countries in transition such as the Republic of Serbia is, all forms of RA mean a chance for a large number of dismissed workers from industry and other activities. Those workers, which left jobless, put pressure on RA and searched for their chance in agricultural production, tourism, trade and craftsman trade and other activities, which have the comparative advantage in this area in regard to other areas, but they must base their activities on modern marketing activities, i.e. to manufacture those products and services required by a market (Cvijanović et.al. 2013). RA as a very important segment of multifunctional agriculture, due to a multiplicative effect of tourism, initiates the faster diversification of rural economy, especially through highlighting of the AFP production in terms of high-quality nutrition of tourists in extraordinary landscapes of the Republic of Serbia (Cvijanović et.al. 2016). Besides, RAs provide the significant incomes to agricultural holdings of RA, not only through tourists' nutrition, but also through the sale of agricultural-food products (AFP) in a holding, as well as a product of home craft (Njegovan et.al. 2015).

Foreign trade exchange of AFP in the Republic of Serbia plays an important role, especially due to a fact that export is higher than import.

If we analyse the AFP import, then we can conclude that Serbia imports less than it exports, in regard that the coverage of import by export is higher 76.8% in 2008, and 94.2% in 2009. While observing the structure of import, we can determine that 62-65% of the primary agricultural products import, around 30% of processed and around 5-8% of fish and fish products. For small and poor country like ours, it is good that import is less, but it is not good to import AFP which the Republic of Serbia can produce. In past eight years, a share of these products in total import has increasing, unfortunately, and it has ranged from the lowest share of 4.6% in 2008 to 8.4% in 2014, when the share in total import was the highest.

In the analysed period (2008-2015), a share of AFP in total export was ranged from the lowest 18% in 2008 to the highest share of 23.2% in 2009. However, the structure of



AFP export is not satisfactory, while most often export the primary agricultural products (fresh or frozen raspberry, blackberry, strawberry, plum, sour cherry, cherry, peach, apple and mercantile maize) up to 75%. At the same time, for the analysed period, there is negligible small export of agricultural products with the higher-processing-stage (except sugar and oil). Causes why Serbia does not export more agricultural and/or food products, although there has come to more favourable conditions for export (increase of prices, opening the specific markets – crisis and sanctions between the EU and Russian Federation, etc.) on the world market, should seek in several facts. First of all, to say the least, the privatization of food industry, agricultural combines and foreign trade enterprises was done heedlessly. Secondly, there is no organized, specialized and interest connected agricultural-food production, processing and sale. Thirdly, the system of cooperative societies was destroyed. Fourthly, domestic banks, big and serious export houses were ruined, and there was neither an organized marketing approach, nor the export of these products.

Fifthly, the reproduction chains have been broken, and especially a large number of manufacturers, who were in a cooperative sector or some other form of cooperation with combines or food industry, have left aside. They could provide significant surpluses of these products, as for domestic, as well as for very demanding foreign market.⁴

Regarding that a large number of small manufacturers (family holdings) were not capable to comply with the requirements of “6K” (“2Q+4C”), many of them were ruined or were forced to do the additional jobs. The serious productions of autochthonous products which are manufactured in small holdings in rural areas of the Republic of Serbia unfortunately do not export. Whether they cannot fulfil “6K” or the standards and various non-tariff barriers are the obstacle for them. However, when tourists from all over the world test the autochthonous products, they usually look for when and where they can buy the specific AFP, or they come again in these rural areas and search for the traditional food and/or beverages. These AFP could be very interesting for so called “invisible export” through the supply of RT products.

A special place in the world has the development of all forms of rural tourism in RA, primarily, due to a very stressful life in UA (Cvijanović et.al. 2009). There are many motives why tourists come to rural areas. It can be: introduction and/or participation in field works, enjoying the healthy nature, getting acquainted with ethno events of a RA, enjoying the traditional food, wild herbs, forest fruits and/or mushrooms, enjoying wines, rakia or other agricultural-food products and/or making them, visiting farms (salas) and enjoying the traditional dishes, participating in manifestations – famous “ijade”, getting to know with RA, especially the cultural-historical heritage, introduction of children to RA, a way of life and work, hunting, fishery in the specific conditions of the RA, etc.

Remarkable natural beauties of Serbia, with an unusual and attractive relief, diverse and rich flora and fauna, favourable climatic and hydrological conditions, rich cultural heritage and national tradition provide numerous developmental possibilities, especially in

⁴ Modern foreign markets require “6K” (2Q+4C): quantity, quality, continuity, control and competitiveness. And to achieve all that, it is necessary to provide a capital.



the field of tourism (Katić et.al. 2011). Unfortunately, still continue the unfavourable migrations, villages are getting older and wither away, the weeds grow all over and arable land turns to forests. Very bad infrastructural and other conditions of rural population are noticeable. The development of RT, along with unavoidable agricultural-food production and other activities which could develop without being disturbed, change of awareness regarding the preservation of environment, could be one of the solutions to reconcile the current opposites, and with wisely thought-out selective economic, agrarian, infrastructural, organizational and educational incentive measures would ensure multiple positive effects (Cvijanović and Vuković, 2011).

4. FAMILY AGRICULTURAL HOLDINGS AS A CARRIER OF THE RURAL TOURISM AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT

The Republic of Serbia, according to Census of Agriculture in 2012⁵, has 631,552 agricultural holdings (AH); of that number of family agricultural holdings (FAH) 628,552 (or 99.5%), and legal entities and entrepreneurs 3,000 (or 0.5%) (Cvijanović et. al. 2014). An average economic size of AH amounts 5,939 euro, and observed in accordance to the organizational-legal form of AH, this indicator amounts: in a sector of family holdings – 4,990 euro, in a sector of legal entities and entrepreneurs – 204,755 euro.

If we observe only FAHs by regions (*Table 1*), the situation is as it follows: the Belgrade Region has 5.3% of total number of FAHs, with an average economic size (AES) of 4,389 euro, which is for 601 euro less than the republic average.

Vojvodina Region participates with 23.3% in total number of FAH of the Republic of Serbia, and it singles out by AES and in a total economic size of FAH in euro. That is to say, the region of Vojvodina has for 3,963 euro higher AES of FAH in euro than the AES of FAH in euro in the republic.

The region of Sumadija and West Serbia is the region which has the highest share in a total number of FAHs of the republic and it makes 41.7%. This region, as well as the Belgrade region, has less AES of FAHs in euro in regard to an average of the republic for 868 euro.

South and East Serbian region participates with 29.8% in a total number of FAHs of the Republic of Serbia and it is on the second place regarding a number of FAHs. Unfortunately, this region has the least AES in euro of FAH, it amounts 3,215 euro and it is less than the republic average for 1,775 euro.

⁵ Census of Agriculture 2012 was conducted by the methodology for agricultural holdings (AH) typology, by all relevant international suggestions, which had ensured a complete comparability of AH typology of the Republic of Serbia with the typology used in the EU countries and surrounding countries.

Table 1 Number and economic size of FAH in the Republic of Serbia and by the regions (source: part of Table 4 was taken over from Family holdings according to an economic size and the production type in the Republic of Serbia, Statistical Office of the Republic of Serbia, 2014).

Family agricultural holdings (FAH)	Republic of Serbia	Belgrade region	Region of Vojvodina	Region of Sumadija and West Serbia	Region of South and East Serbia	Region of Kosovo and Metohija
Number of FAH	628,552	33,177	146,269	261,935	187,231	-
Economic size in euro	3,136.526.046	145,344.061	1,309.594.621	1,079.712.999	601,874.365	-
Average economic size in euro	4,990	4,389	8,953	4,122	3,215	-

All these indicators point out to a fact that, as in many other countries, the situation is better in the north and west and worst in the south and east. It is obvious that a certain number of FAH has differentiated, which can survive as serious commodity manufacturers and those who must search for OPA in order to survive.

Besides the agricultural activities, the FAHs also have other profitable activities (OPA) related to a holding and not related to it. Of a total number of FAHs in the Republic of Serbia, 51.9% of them haven't got OPA, and 48.1% have OPA. Of a total number of FAHs which have any OPA, 25.7% are FAHs with OPA related to a holding, and 74.3% are FAHs with OPA not related to a holding.

The OPA related to a holding include incomes from: sale of agricultural manufactured products (meat, milk, fruits, vegetables and other agricultural products, rural tourism and fishery incomes, sale of wood and/or processed wood, sale of products of folk arts and crafts, etc. These activities can be performed on a holding (for example, tourism, folk arts and crafts, the processing of agricultural products for sale – except grape processing for wine production in case that a quantity of processed grape is exclusively or mostly from own production) or out of a holding (agricultural and non-agricultural contract work, for example, work with own combine). A share of FAH with OPA related to a holding in a total number of FAHs in the Republic of Serbia amounts 12.4% (Cvijanović et.al. 2014).

If we analyse data carefully (Cvijanović et.al. 2014), as well as all data previously described, than we can draw a conclusion that there are the most FAH with lower classes of economic size, which have OPA in their holding. In the Belgrade Region, the Sumadija Region, the West Serbia and the Region of South and East Serbia, the most of FAHs with OPA related to a holding is in the economic size class from 4,000 to 7,999 euro, while the least FAHs with OPA is in the economic size class of 100,000 euro and over. In the Region



of Vojvodina, the most of FAHs with OPA related to a holding is in the economic size class from 0 to 1,999 euro and here is, as in other regions of the Republic of Serbia, the least FAHs with OPA in the economic size class of 100,000 euro and more.

The OPA not related to a holding are the activities where a holding's resources have not been used, except a holding's labour and they can: perform in a holding or outside (in any other economic or off-economic activity). The share of FAHs with OPA not related to a holding in a total number of FAHs in the Republic of Serbia amounts 42.9% (Cvijanović et.al.2014).

At the republic level and a total number of FAH, the most of FAHs with OPA not related to a holding, are in the economic size class 0-1,999 euro or 19.9%, while the least of these holdings are in the economic size class of 100,000 euro and over (only 0.04%). The same situation is if we observe by the regions (Cvijanović et.al. 2014).

In other words, FAHs are, besides the primary agricultural production, forced to do also other profitable activities, as in theirs, as well as outside their FAH. All of these point out to a serious thinking to make serious preconditions in rural areas, even without some strategic documents or serious plans at the republic and the local community level, and an "initial spark" for the development of agricultural products processing in food products of higher-processing-stages and all forms of RT on one hand, and other activities for which are the basic conditions for the development, on the other hand. For example, that FAHs easily turn to holdings which are engaged in the processing of agricultural products, except the primary agricultural production, and the sale of these products, and some FAHs start to deal with other additional profitable activities (tourism, hospitality, transportation and handicrafts).

If the Republic of Serbia had defined RD in 2011 as an economic, social and ecological priority, then it is expected that the diversification of rural economy realizes in socially, economically and ecologically sustainable way, where there must be paid a special attention to the life quality improvement, decrease of poverty level and permanent taking care on a social and ecological degradation.

RT should be recognized as an important activity which can initiate the process of diversification of rural economy (MASTER PLAN OF THE SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT OF RURAL TOURISM IN Serbia, 2011).

There was organized research in several municipalities of Sumadija and West Serbia to try to determine whether and how FAHs and rural tourism (RT) affect the RD of RA. The research was done with FAH which are engaged in agricultural-food production and/or RT. Although the questionnaire had 39 questions, we will cite several questions with answers, which illustrate the best the significance of RT for the development of rural economy in RA of examinees.

When they were asked, *if they were engaged in agricultural-food production and if they have a surplus in agro-food products (AFP), there were offered the following answers: that they are engaged in agricultural food production and that they have surpluses in AFP, that they are engaged in this production, but they don't have surpluses in AFP, and others.* Of a total number of examinees, 91.6% was replied positively, i.e. that they are engaged in



this production and they have surpluses in AFP, 8.2% was replied that they were engaged in this production but without surpluses in AFP, and 0.2% of them were relied with “other”.

When they were asked, *how they sell surpluses of AFP and where, there were offered the following answers: at home, in the market, to processing capacities, to middlemen and others.* Of a total number of examinees, 49.7% was replied “at home”, 12.6% was replied “in the market”, 25.9% was replied “to the processing capacities”, and 1.8% of them were replied with “other”.

When they were asked, *who they sell their surpluses of AFP to, there were offered the following answers: to already familiar buyers, to passer-buyers, tourists (through diet and purchase for ‘to go’) and others.* Of a total number of examinees, 71.7% sell to familiar buyers, 3.6% sell to passer-buyers, 20.6% sell to tourists, and 2.1% of them were replied with “other”.

When they were asked, *what form of AFP surpluses sale is the most profitable, there were offered the following answers: sale to already familiar buyers, sale to passer-buyers, sale to tourists, sale to tourists (purchase of AFP ‘to go’) and others.* Of a total number of examinees, 45.0% think that selling to familiar buyers is the most profitable, 23.1% think that selling to tourists (nutrition) is the most profitable, 28.3% think that selling to tourists (purchase of AFP for ‘to go’), and 0.7% of them were replied with “other”.

When they were asked, *if and in which extent could increase the agricultural-food production and make higher surpluses of AFP for the potential tourists, there were offered the following answers: yes, double; yes, for a half of the current surpluses; there are no capacities for higher production and others.* Of a total number of examinees, 81.9% were replied with “yes, double”, 15.2% were replied with “yes, for a half of the current surpluses”, 2.2% were replied that there is no capacities for higher production, and 0.7% of them were replied with “other”.

When they were asked, *if they would be ready to be engaged comparatively in agricultural-food production and RT in their FAHs, there were offered the following answers: yes, no, I don’t know.* Of a total number of examinees, 95.6% were replied with “yes”, 1.6% was replied with “no”, and 2.8% were replied with “I don’t know”.

When they were asked, *who should start up their FAH to be engaged in RT (this question was asked to FAH, i.e. to their representatives), there were offered the following answers: FAH, FAH with the support of tourist organization (TO) and a municipality, TO, municipality, municipality with the governmental support, I don’t know.* Of a total number of examinees, 12.9% were replied with “FAH”, 46.8% were replied with “FAH, with the support of TO and municipality”, 9.9% were replied with “the local TO”, 17.5% were replied with “the municipality”, 12.6% were replied with “the municipality with the governmental support” and 0.3% were replied with “I don’t know”.

In accordance to this research and done in-depth interviews and discussions with experts, there can be expected that Sumadija and West Serbia, and we are sure the whole Serbia, have big chances for the RT development in all rural areas with the comparative advantages in creating the tourist product supply, by enriching a tourist product through the specific AFP.

The awareness is growing, not only of educated urban population in rich countries, but also of the population in Serbia, that it is very important to relax in peaceful natural

amenities, to eat top-quality food, introduce the production process of AFP, as well as to know not only how much, but also what to eat. At the same time, the Republic of Serbia disposes with a significant number of FAHs, engaged in the agricultural-food production, which they cannot sell in the world markets, but they can do it successfully through the RT. In other words, and the research has shown, that the population of Sumadija and West Serbia (as well as the population in other regions of the Republic of Serbia), who offers rural tourist products, pays special attention to AFP. It is the same with tourists, who come, not only to see natural beauties, cultural and historical heritage Serbia disposes with, but also to enjoy in delicious autochthonous food, great natural juices, rakia, wines, jams, salads, fruit preserves without any artificial additives.

In order to define the RT significance for the development of RA, and also rural economy diversification in some municipalities of Sumadija and West Serbia, and their better positioning in the market, it is necessary to define strengths and weaknesses, as well as chances and threats (*Table 2*).

Table 2: SWOT analysis of healthy-safe food and rural tourism of Central Serbia

<p style="text-align: center;">STRENGTHS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ favourable tourist-geographic position of Sumadija and West Serbia, ➤ a large number of preserved and protected natural resources (especially clear soil, water and air), ➤ a great potential for accommodation of tourists in rural houses, ➤ hospitality of population, ➤ diversity of a tourist product of RT, ➤ good supply of an authentic AFP, i.e. food and beverages, ➤ fair prices in regard to other countries, ➤ educational staff for the production of AFP and for the RT. 	<p style="text-align: center;">WEAKNESSES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Bad tourist infrastructure and signalization in RA; ➤ Inadequate legislation for the facilities categorization, ➤ Unfavourable age structure of population in RA (elderly and devastated village), ➤ Insufficient marketing presentation of the potentials for the production of AFP and RT; ➤ Insufficient measures of economic and agrarian policy for stimulating the AFP i RT development, ➤ Insufficient state support and support of local authorities in funding the AFP and the RT development.
<p style="text-align: center;">CHANCES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ changes in habits and values of tourists who search for AFP and a new natural experience in RT; ➤ connections in interest among a local authority, scientific and economic institutions, and FAH for the faster development of AFP and RT; ➤ activation of a “dead” capital (empty houses, stables, cultural centres, village halls, etc.) in terms of the AFP and RT, i.e. the RA development; 	<p style="text-align: center;">THREATS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ social-economic crisis, wars in the Middle East, refugees and other problems which affect the tourists readiness to travel, ➤ weak or insufficient coordination among institutions in the field of AFP, i.e. agriculture and tourism, ➤ Strong competition in countries which develop similar or the same tourist products, such as Switzerland, Austria, Slovenia, Croatia, etc. ➤ elemental, unplanned and unprofessional approach to the strategic planning and



<p>➤ Solving the state unemployment problem through the employment of especially young people, starting from unskilled workers to top experts in agriculture, i.e. AFP, tourism, traffic, hospitality, trade handicraft trades and other economic and off-economic activities.</p>	<p>the realization of organic production and RT in RA of the central Serbia,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ potential jeopardy of RA if the sustainable development principles are not going to be respected, and if the natural wealth is not going to be preserved,➤ Potential jeopardy of flora and fauna in unplanned utilization of them.
--	--

5. CONCLUSION

The Republic of Serbia disposes with the excellent natural conditions for the agricultural food production; it has a significant number of FAH which are engaged in not only AFP production, but they have a real capacity for the development of RT, too. At the same time, the FAHs manufacture significant surpluses of AFP, which they sell with difficulties, and which they could sell to rural tourists through meals or for “to go”. Besides, RT would activate an unused “dead capital”, such as the significant uncultivated agricultural areas, empty houses, stables, outbuildings, watermills, as well as the other facilities in rural areas.

All of that enriches and differentiates the rural tourist supply of these areas, so it can have also more significant impact, as of FAHS to RT and reversely, and all in order to develop the entire rural economy.

It is desirable to plan strategically the development of RT in RA of the Republic of Serbia, along with the respect of the comparative advantages they have, as regarding their natural beauties, cultural-historical heritage, as well as regarding the cultivation of AFP and collecting wild herbs, forest fruits, etc.

A unique tourist supply of Serbian RT, the strategic planning of agricultural development and RT, would preserve also RA from destroying their original beauties, those areas pollution and the preservation of flora and fauna, by which these areas dispose.

There could also employ a large number of workers and experts, not only in the field of tourism and agriculture, but also all other economic and of-economic activities, because the tourism is a „serviceable industry” which set in motion all economic and off-economic activities. Investing in RT in terms of the RA development would decrease a gap among rural and urban areas, there would stop the migrations of work-active population (rural-urban areas) and there would increase the life standard of rural population.



REFERENCES

- [1] Cvijanović D., Katić B., Kljajić Nataša (2009): *Rural development in Serbia – regional dissimilarities and problems*, Warsaw, Institute of agricultural and food economics national research institute.
- [2] Cvijanović D., Vuković P. (2010): *Agritourism in Serbia as a chance for food export*, International Conference – Food and Rural economy competitiveness under the global crisis, 23-25 September, Bucharest, Romania,
- [3] Cvijanović, D., Simonović, Z., Mihailović, B. (2011): *Težišta i ciljevi novijih reformi agrarne i regionalne politike Evropske unije*, „Economics of Agriculture“, Beograd, broj 3/2011,
- [4] Cvijanović, D., Trandafilović, S., Imamović, N. (2013). *Marketing concept in terms of agricultural enterprises development in transitional countries*, „Economics of Agriculture“, broj 1/2013, Belgrade,
- [5] Cvijanović, D., Subić, J., Paraušić Vesna (2014). *Poljoprivredna gazdinstva prema ekonomskoj veličini i tipu proizvodnje u Republici Srbiji*, Republika Srbija, Republički zavod za statistiku, Beograd, 2014.,
- [6] Cvijanovic, D., Mihailovic, B., Cvijanovic Gorica (2016): „*The significance of healthy-safe food in development of the rural tourism of Serbia*“, „*Policy and Economics for Sustainable Agricultural and Rural Development*“ AAEM 10th International Conference, 12-14 May 2016, Ohrid, Republic of Macedonia,
- [7] Dimitrovski, D., Milutinović Sonja (2014). *Mesto i uloga turizma u privredi Srbije*, HiT menadžment, Univerzitet u Kragujevcu, Fakultet za hotelijerstvo i turizam u Vrnjačkoj Banji, Broj:1/2014.
- [8] Katić B., Cvijanović D., Pejanović R. (2011): *The agriculture as a real assumption of regional and rural development in Serbia*, Rural areas and development – vol. 8, Institute of Agricultural and Food Economics – National Research Institute, Warsaw,
- [9] Master plan održivog razvoja ruralnog turizma u Srbiji, <https://futurehospitalityleaders.files.wordpress.com/2012/11/master-plan-odrzivog-razvoja-ruralnog-turizma-u-srbiji.pdf>
- [10] Njegovan, Z., Demirović Dunja, Radović Gordana (2015). *Upravljanje održivim razvojem ruralnog turizma u Vojvodini*, Škola biznisa, Broj 1/2015,
- [11] *Strategija poljoprivrede i ruralnog razvoja republike srbije za period 2014-2024. godine* ("Sl. glasnik RS", br. 85/2014)
- [12] Štetić S., Cvijanović, D. i Šimičević, D. (2014). *Posebni oblici turizma Dunavskog regiona Srbije*. Institut za ekonomiku poljoprivrede, Beograd.