TRANSFORMATION OF RURAL COMMUNITIES: MOBILITY, TOURISM AND IDENTITY

Hana Horáková

ABSTRACT

Recent major changes in rural development in Europe have brought about new demands made on rural space. As a result of the transformation of rural needs, a type of modern rurality typical of the shift from production to consumption has emerged. The most illustrative example of this shift in rural environment is the emergence of international tourism and second homes. This text focuses the attention on how contemporary forms of mobility and international tourism affect local identities. Emphasis is put on the ways new and old cultural identities are contested, negotiated and constructed. The aim is to analyze one of the contemporary forms of 'voluntary', temporary mobility – the phenomenon of second homes owned by the Dutch in Czech rural countryside. The focus is placed on factors that either facilitate or hinder interaction between the second home owners and other international tourists, and local residents in two Czech rural communities.

KEY WORDS: modern rurality, second homes, temporary mobility, anthropology of tourism, 'hosts' and 'guests'

ANOTACIJA

Esminiai pokyčiai kaimo bendruomenių gyvenime yra lemiami bendrųjų ūkininkavimo sąlygų nuosmukio visos šiuolaikinės Europos mastu. Agrikultūrinę gyvenseną, pagrįstą intensyvia žemės ūkio produkcijos gamyba, vis dažniau keičia kitos kaimo gyvensenos formos. Ryškiausias gamybinės gyvensenos virtimo vartotojiška gyvensena pavyzdys minėtoje kaimo aplinkoje – naujųjų kaimo atvykėlių ir jų „antrųjų namų" fenomenas. Straipsnyje aptariama, kaip aukščiau minėtos šiuolaikinės gyventojų mobilumo ir tarptautinio turizmo formos veikia senojo, kaimiškojo, identiteto esmę. Pagrindinis dėmesys skiriamas naujųjų ir senųjų identiteto socialinių santykių, t. y. tarpusavio supratimo, konkurencijos ir įtakų atvejams apibūdinti. Tyrimų tikslas – išanalizuoti vieną iš laikinos gyvensenos šiuolaikinių formų – olandų „antrųjų namų" (second homes) fenomeno atsiradimą Čekijos kaimuose. Esminis dėmesys straipsnyje skiriamas tokių „antrųjų namų" savininkų, kitų atvykėlių iš užsienio ir senųjų vietinių gyventojų tarpusavio bendravimo veiksniams, palengvinantiems ar komplikuojantiems šio bendravimo procesus dviejų Čekijos kaimo vietovių gyventojams.

PAGRINDINIAI ŽODŽIAI: modernus kaimas, „antrieji namai", laikinasis mobilumas, turizmo antropologija, „šeimininkai" ir „svečiai".

Dr. Hana Horáková
University of Pardubice; Metropolitan University Prague
Dubečská 900/10, 100 31 Praha 10 - Strašnice
E-mail: hana.horakova@upce.cz

Introduction

Recent major changes in rural development in Europe instigated by the decline in farming as a determinant, followed by population loss, lack of public services, economic and ecological degradation have brought about new demands made on rural space. A shift from the agricultural to

the rural known as the 'post-productivist transition'[1] has produced a type of modern rurality characterized by new forms of relationship between urban and rural contexts, and by novel shapes of economic and social organisations. The most illustrative example of this shift from production to consumption in rural environment is the emergence of tourism. To secure a livelihood by diversifying their agricultural activities, rural populations offer their assets – public space and landscape – to both domestic and international forms of tourism. Thus, the frequent outflow of original rural inhabitants is compensated for the influx of other people (usually urbanites) who are moving into rural areas either temporarily or with the intention for permanent residence. These in-movers often have different perspectives and ideas on how local development should be achieved and maintained and what a 'better quality of life' means. Current restructuring processes in rural areas can challenge old identities and provide an opportunity for the construction of new identities, or the strengthening of existing identities utilising existing resources[2].

This text focuses the attention on how contemporary forms of mobility and international tourism affect local identities. Emphasis is put on the ways new and old cultural identities are contested, negotiated and constructed. The aim is to analyze one of the contemporary flexible forms of 'voluntary', temporary mobility – the phenomenon of second homes owned by the Dutch in Czech rural countryside. The focus has been placed on factors that either facilitate or hinder interaction between the second home owners and other international tourists, and the local residents in two Czech rural communities. The text is grounded in empirical evidence derived from the first phase of ethnographic fieldwork carried out in Lipno nad Vltavou and Stárkov between 2008 and 2009. At present, it only yields some preliminary data as the research is still in progress. An underlying aim of the project will be a complex comparative analysis of the interaction between foreign tourists and local hosts from an anthropological perspective which will reveal the differences and similarities between second home owners and local residents, and their impact on the rural development.

These aspects will be explored through four sections. First, a short outline of the concepts of mobility and tourism is provided. In the second section the focus falls on the empirical realities of the two case studies. The third part discusses theoretical conceptualization of the key notions – hosts and guests. The fourth section deals with the factors that facilitate or hinder intercultural communication between the hosts and guests. The conclusion draws the investigation to a close, arguing that the type of second home development and international tourism taking place in these locations holds a number of positive, but also negative implications for the host communities.

1. Mobility and tourism

The nature of mobility has changed. Contemporary flexible forms of human mobility over space and time that overcome the former distinction between tourism and migration are impossible to study without reference to international forms of tourism. The centrality of tourism to the processes of transnational mobilities and migrations has been recognized by many scholars, for

[1] See: ILBERRY, Brian (ed.). *The Geography of Rural Social Change*. Harlow: Longman, 1998.
[2] See: HANNON, Frances & CURTIN, Chris. The Role of Identity in Contemporary Rural Development Processes. In: Árnason, Arnar; Shucksmith, Mark & Jo, Vergunst (eds.). *Comparing Rural Development, Continuity and Change in the Countryside of Western Europe*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2009, p. 125–142.

instance Hall and Tucker[3]. New conceptualisations of tourism as a form of temporary mobility[4] or temporary migration[5] are currently receiving renewed scholarly attention.

One of the most researched interfaces between tourism and migration is the second home, a result of the increasing mobility of ever-larger sections of the industrial and post-industrial world. Second homes as one of the specific forms of tourism-related migration is an important international phenomenon, a linking activity between tourism and migration. Since the 1990s the issue of second home tourism has been revisited due to the emergence of new mobile lifestyles[6].

The second home phenomenon is not new. In Western countries, the scale of second home ownership increased enormously in the last decades. Although second homes have received extensive research attention internationally[7], these issues have only recently emerged as an area of investigation within the post-communist countries, namely the Czech context. There is at the moment no research beside the one that is being presented in this study that would investigate the significance of the second home phenomenon and other forms of international rural tourism in the Czech Republic from the anthropological perspective.

2. Case studies

Our research activities focus on two Czech rural settlements – Lipno nad Vltavou and Stárkov – that have recently embarked upon the project of international tourism which uses public space and rural landscape as one of its principal attractions. Both the rural localities are heavily dependent on international tourism that was initiated by Dutch investors, attracting predominantly Dutch clientele. The Dutch investment includes both the construction of recreational parks and individual ownership of second homes in the Czech rural countryside.

Lipno nad Vltavou is a village in Southern Bohemia lying near the lake of the same name on the left side of the Moldau (Vltava) river, within the southern Sudeten Germany belt. According to the 2005 census, it has 537 inhabitants. The history of the village dates back to 1530. In the past, the village, largely populated by Germans, was a small lumberjack settlement and its population's major subsistence economy was timber floating along the Moldau River. After the Second World War, many Germans were displaced due to the Beneš's decrees and the area was gradually repopulated by ethnic Czechs who decided to settle. The fundamental change in the life of the village took place in the mid-twentieth century. In the 1950s, due to the construction of the dam[8], the village was intentionally flooded. The historical development of the village predetermined to a certain degree its present shape. The construction of the Lipno dam, which appeared disastrous

[3] See: HALL, Michael C. & TUCKER, Hazel (eds.). *Tourism and Postcolonialism. Contested Discourses, Identities and Representations.* London & New York: Routledge, 2004.
[4] See: HALL, Michael C. Reconsidering the Geography of Tourism and Contemporary Mobility. *Geographical Research*, Vol. 43 (2), 2005, p. 125–139.
[5] See: BELL, Margaret & WARD, Graham. Comparing Temporary Mobility with Permanent Migration. *Tourism Geographies*, Vol. 2, 2000, p. 87–107; HALL, Michael C. & WILLIAMS, Allan M. (eds.). *Tourism and Migration: New Relationships between Production and Consumption.* Dordrecht: Kluwer, 2002.
[6] MÜLLER, Dieter K. Mobility, Tourism, and Second Homes. In: Lew, Alan A.; Hall, C. Michael & Allan M., Williams (eds.). *A Companion to Tourism*. Blackwell Publishing, 2004, p. 387–398.
[7] Recent research on second homes includes e.g. Shucksmith1983; Jaakson1986; Barke 1991; Girard and Gartner 1993; Chaplin 1999; Willams and Kaltenborn 1999; Müller 1999; 2002; 2004; Hoogendoorn et al. 2005; Priemus 2005. Their authors admit difficulties in drawing general conclusions regarding the impact of second home tourism on change (Müller 1999). Second home tourism is viewed both as a *consequence* of rural change, a symptom of the declining traditional countryside, and a *cause* for rural decline (Gallent and Tewdwr-Jones 2000).
[8] Lipno became the largest hydroelectric dam (4,650 hectars, 306 mil. square metres) in Czechoslovakia.

for the old settlement, has created certain potential that has allowed for the existence of a new settlement. This potential, however, did not turn out to be utilized because the village was situated in the close vicinity of the so-called Iron Curtain. Thus, stagnation, rather than prosperity was the essential feature for almost the whole second part of the twentieth century. A new epoch was brought by the fall of Iron Curtain, opening up the borderland in the early 1990s.

It became obvious that the former economy focused on timber industry would be playing an ever diminishing role in the future. A gradual loss of competitiveness of the most of the former businesses resulted in the termination of many, or in the restructuring of the rest that survived. The economic transformation was followed by a social and cultural change in the lifestyles of the local people. A gradual increase in unemployment brought about a decline in the service sector, and in general a worsening of the level of local facilities. Negative effects of the transformation of the Czech economy enforced a question whether there is a solution to such a grave problem that would help secure working opportunities for the local people, would be compatible with the local conditions and thus could contribute to a sustainable development of the region. The answer came forward, the logic was simple: the historical development of the past forty years that had made the access to the borderland impossible has 'helped' to save the uniquely preserved countryside. Any type of industry in this region was doomed for ecological reasons. So, the only branch of industry that was naturally taken into consideration was tourism.

The local authorities ostentatiously claim that the village made use of the above-mentioned potential in an exemplary way. The village did not possess any financial assets therefore it concentrated on preparing conditions for the influx of investors. Moreover, as they state, in the early 1990s the local authorities accepted a revolutionary principle of that period in that the village can create conditions for investment, which will be linked to private capital. In the same vein, they speak highly about the perseverance and conviction concerning the right attitudes that have borne fruits in the course of time: in 1997 the village authorities made a deal with a Dutch investor who built (between 1999 and 2005) a tourist resort which has become known as Landal Marina Lipno[9]. As it rose right at the Lipno Lake in the vicinity of the Šumava national reserve, it was promoted as a "place of rural and nature-based attractions". The investment reached more than one billion crowns[10], which brought an unprecedented breakthrough in the life of the village; soon it has become the largest and best equipped tourist resort in Šumava and the whole region of Southern Bohemia. Similar to the nature of any industrial investment, this event has triggered off a chain reaction and further investment continued. The faith in the Dutch investor and the vision of a stable clientele in the form of foreign (especially Dutch) holidaymakers has launched further construction of a winter ski resort Lipno-Kramolín. The locality of Lipno has recently attracted a number of Dutch second home owners who have been buying cottages and houses from the local people, offering them unbeatable prices.

---

[9] Its owner, Landal Green Parks, is part of the American concern Wyndham Worldwide, which is an internationally-oriented company in the field of tourism, recreational management and accommodation, and touristic real estates. The firm is a business associate which has business enterprise in more than 100 countries. Landal occupies the top position in the offer of recreational parks. It has over 60 parks with approx. 10,000 recreational houses. In the Netherlands, there are 43 recreational parks. Outside Holland it has built parks in Germany, Belgium, Switzerland, Austria, and the Czech Republic. *Landal Marina Lipno stretches in* the area of 13 hectars offering over 306 studios and apartments.

[10] Lipno is a village boasting about the highest figure of foreign investment per one inhabitant in Southern Bohemia.

A small town of Stárkov is situated in the Eastern Bohemia region, not far from the Polish border (former Sudeten Germany). Its history dates back to the thirteenth century. In the past it was a place of farmers, coal miners (until 1890 when all the mines were closed), weavers and forestry. In the nineteenth century the first textile factories emerged there. The first half of the twentieth century saw the development of timber industry and agriculture (flax). The population make-up of the settlement differed throughout history. The town was settled predominantly by Germans. For instance, in 1930 there were 892 inhabitants, of which only 102 were ethnic Czechs. After 1938, Stárkov was incorporated into German *Reich* – as part of the Sudetenland. After 1945 the majority of Germans were transferred to Germany and a new wave of immigrants came in – by and large, these people did not have a genuine relationship with the local landscape and many of them came only on promise of a cheap or even free acquisition of housing and land. During the communist era all private companies were nationalized. The situation changed after 1989 when former land owners got their possessions back and could start doing business.

The tourist resort Green Valley Park (GVP) came into being in 1998 as the first 'Dutch village'[11] in the Czech Republic and so far it comprises 22 villas[12]. The GVP was a Dutch initiative, as the present mayor recalls:

> The Dutch – Mr. Hoed – arrived on his own in 1995. When the borders opened after 1989, he firstly went to Poland and Hungary, but Czechoslovakia seemed to him the most appropriate – in terms of both people and prices. When he showed interest in our village we could not tell him "yes, we want it or we do not" as the village did not own the land – it was a private property. But the village had to issue a consent, which it did. At first the private owner – a local guy – had 51 per cent of shares, the village 10 and the rest was the Dutch investment. The Dutch investor had to establish some twenty Ltd. companies in which he put in the land and then he offered the companies to the Dutch in Holland. It was quite confusing, even for the Dutch. They claimed "we bought a house in Stárkov", but I contradicted: "No, you did not buy a house; you bought a company that 'owns' the house".

After the change of legislature in 2004, GVP is a Czech company with Dutch capital. Now, foreigners who are permanent residents of the EU can buy a property here.

3. Interaction between hosts and guests: region, culture and identity

No other industry has the potential to bring consumers and producers and their 'products' into such a close contact. Moreover, few other occasions of human encounter provide so many situations of exchange between people of different backgrounds – people of different class, ethnicity, economic position, religious denomination, and culture. Tourism is extremely 'culturally intimate'[13]. This statement has far-reaching theoretical and methodological implications. Firstly, how to conceptualize 'local' and 'global', 'us' and 'them', 'hosts' and 'guests'? How can we identify

---

[11] At present there are other 'Dutch villages' in the Czech Republic, mainly in the mountainous border regions. They are either adjacent to local villages (e.g. Panské pole near Rokytnice in the Eagle Mountains), or built right into the villages (e.g. Čistá's project Happy Home – 42 bungalows serving as Dutch second homes, Stupná's project Arcadian with the average influx of some 140 – 150 Dutch per year that outnumbers the local population of Stupná – 40).

[12] Stárkov is planning to build another 30 villas in the near future.

[13] See: CHAMBERS, Erve. Native Tours. *The Anthropology of Travel and Tourism*. Long Grove: Waveland Press, 2000, p. 32.

cultural membership? Is it marked by ethnicity, nationality, language, class, age, and/or gender? In other words, how people claim and attribute identities as 'local'?

With a certain degree of simplification, there are two different communities in both the researched areas: a local one, rooted in time, space, and local social relations, and a 'global' one; the boundaries between the two communities can be either impenetrable, allowing little or virtually no interaction, or porous, in which movement is fluid. Secondly, how can we define a region, community or village as a cultural space? As Byron[14] reminds us in relation to small-scale places, it is a common human propensity to see the world in terms of categories. We tend to divide and classify our world into meaningful bits and pieces. As he maintains, there is nothing wrong with this, as all of us do this analogical thinking[15]. There is of course a need to differentiate between emic conceptualisations of identity, ethnicity, and culture that tend to go beyond time and space, and etic conceptualizations based upon empirical evidence. The idea of culture as a bounded unit is confronted with a postmodern approach to region, village, culture, identity – as imagined, unstable, fluid concept. It is, however, difficult to use as an analytical tool for comparison. So, to reconcile these two seemingly oppositional viewpoints is one of the most difficult tasks for any scholar in social sciences. One has to take into account both the idea of a mental demarcation line separating 'us' from 'them', and the fact that cultural boundaries are dependent on multiple scales and dimensions[16]. On the one hand, cultures are usually perceived as rooted in a particular territory, on the other hand, cultures are always in motion, viewed as a process[17]. A living culture is constantly re-worked, re-negotiated and re-defined[18].

Symbolic borders between communities have been the subject of social science research, however, far less attention has been paid to the theoretical and practical issues of locality and globality within small-scale communities – of relations between local and global forces in today's world[19]. Theoretical conceptualization of identity seen as an 'outcome' of an ongoing socio-cultural change initiated by the interaction between local population and foreign visitors/foreign second home owners can be approached by a number of social science disciplines. The one that seems most competent in terms of methodology and epistemology is a relatively young anthropological sub-discipline – the anthropology of tourism. However, until the 1980s, reactions of local population to international tourism were seldom a research subject even within the anthropology of tourism. The situation changed after the publication of a seminal book titled *Hosts and Guests: the Anthropol-*

---

[14] See: BYRON, Reginald. On the Politics of Multiculturalism. In: *Defining Region: Socio-Cultural Anthropology and Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. Acta Historica Universitatis Klaipedensis, Vol. 12; Studia Anthropologica, Part 1. Klaipėda: Institute of Baltic Sea Region History and Archaeology, Klaipėda University, 2006, p. 49–61.

[15] Ibid, p. 55.

[16] See: SCHIPPERS, Thomas K. 2006. Cultures in Space: some Reflections on the Mediterranean and the Baltic in a Comparative Anthropological Perspective. In: *Defining Region: Socio-Cultural Anthropology and Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. Acta Historica Universitatis Klaipedensis, Vol. 12; Studia Anthropologica, Part 1. Klaipėda: Institute of Baltic Sea Region History and Archaeology, Klaipėda University, 2006, p. 9–17.

[17] See: NIC CRAITH, Máiréad. Local Cultures in a Global World. In: Kockel, Ullrich & Nic Craith, Máiréad (eds.). *Communicating Cultures*. LIT, 2004.

[18] See: LIUBINIENĖ, Neringa. Towards the Framing of the '*Region*' from Contemporary Anthropological Perspective. In: *Defining Region: Socio-Cultural Anthropology and Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. Acta Historica Universitatis Klaipedensis, Vol. 12; Studia Anthropologica, Part 1. Klaipėda: Institute of Baltic Sea Region History and Archaeology, Klaipėda University, 2006, p. 39–47.

[19] See e.g.: NOVOTNÁ-HORÁKOVÁ, Hana. The Local and the Global: In Search of European Identity in the Czech Local Community. In: *EASA 06: Europe and the World.* Bristol: University of Bristol, 2006.

ogy of Tourism[20] by the editor, American anthropologist Valene Smith. The book has triggered off an interest into tourism as social practice[21]. Recently, there emerged a whole host of texts that not only attempt to theorize tourism practices and its outcomes, but which are also grounded in long-term, thorough empirical studies[22], dealing with tourism and intercultural exchange. Moreover, as the distinction between tourism and migration is being increasingly blurred, issues revolving around creating and recreating identities (inclusion vs. exclusion, cohesion vs. fragmentation) are increasingly approached by various theories of transnational migration: migration and mobility (both voluntary and temporary) as a typical example of delocalization and deterritorialization ranks among its key notions. Together with anthropologists of tourism, transnational theorists claim that boundaries of a community or a culture are largely impossible to define as they do not overlap with territorial borders of local or national social spaces.

Defining the hosts and guests – who is 'us', and who is 'them' – ranks among the most difficult tasks that every scholar dealing with international tourism (and not only) has to face. Let us have a look at the ways these categories are theorized and how they are constructed in the above-mentioned fieldwork sites.

The categories of guests and hosts are socially constructed, and in reality quite mutable; therefore we should study the processes through which touring and hosting are defined[23]. Tourism is much more of a reciprocal endeavour than we might first imagine – people often exchange the roles of tourist and toured. Moreover, there is considerable variability among the 'guests', as well as among the 'hosts' – neither are homogeneous groups. This relationship is odd in many ways. One member is at play, one is at work; one has usually economic assets and little cultural knowledge, the other has cultural capital but little money. As Crick observes, international tourists are people out of culture: out of place, out of time[24].

It is difficult to determine the line between being a tourist and belonging to a place because tourism is mediated by persons and institutions who are neither hosts nor guests; locals are often wrongly perceived as passive recipients of a touristic dynamic[25]. There are three important sets of actors in the process – the tourists themselves, the local people, and the mediators.

The host community involves different segments that compete among themselves for the power and authority to determine the ways in which their place is to be represented. The most important condition is the degrees of autonomy people have in deciding for themselves – a degree to which a tourist–receiving community has the ability to control its interactions with tourists and tourism mediators. Hence, the key question is whether the locals have managed to incorporate tourism into existing social and political structures.

As has been stated, host is a porous category. Who are the hosts in Lipno? We can discern four different categories of people which constitute the notion of host. Three of them refer to different

---

[20] See: SMITH, Valene L. (ed.) *Hosts and Guests. The Anthropology of Tourism*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1977.

[21] See cf.: BOISSEVAIN, Jeremy (ed.). *Coping With Tourists: European Reactions to Mass Tourism*. Oxford: Berghahn Books, 1996; SMITH, Valene L. & BRENT, Maryann (eds.). *Hosts and Guests Revisited: Tourism Issues of the 21st Century*. New York, Sydney & Tokyo: Cognizant Communication Corporation, 2001.

[22] See e.g.: LEW, Alan A.; HALL, C. Michael & WILLIAMS, Allan M. (eds.). *A Companion to Tourism*. Blackwell Publishing, 2004; or: GAVIN, Jack & PHIPPS, Alison. *Tourism and Intercultural Exchange*. Cleveland, Buffalo & Toronto: Channel View Publications, 2005.

[23] See: CHAMBERS, E. (...) 2000, p. 57.

[24] See: CRICK, Malcolm. Representations of international tourism in the social sciences: Sun, Sex, Sights, Savings, and Servility. *Annual Review Anthropology*, Vol. 18, 1989, p. 307–344.

[25] See: CHAMBERS, E. (...) 2000.

types of residents: 1) local permanent residents, 2) local temporary residents – re-creational lot (cottage/chalet) owners, 3) seasonal owners – usually Czech – who work in tourism-related jobs (cultural brokers). The fourth category is represented by friends and relatives visiting all the three previous categories. As it is clear, such a typology does not correspond with the notion of the local. Thus, there is a need to challenge a common view that 'local' is the original, the natural, the authentic, as opposed to 'global' as new, external, artificially imposed, and inauthentic[26]. In other words, one should not take the local a given, without asking how perceptions of locality and community are constructed.

Who is 'them'? To answer this question, we need to look at both etic and emic categorisations of foreign tourists and second home owners. Let us first deal with the etic conceptualization of Dutch guests, i.e. temporary migrants – second home owners, and regular tourists visiting Czech rural landscape. We shall also look into the reasons for their temporary migration.

There is no commonly acknowledged definition of second homes because of a variety of differences between dwelling types. Yet, there have been many attempts to present different definitions and diverse typologies of second home owners. For the purpose of this paper we can borrow a definition of the second home as 'a property owned, long-leased or rented on a yearly or longer basis as the occasional residence of a household that usually lives elsewhere'[27]. Hence, second home owners are a group of people who appear to have deliberately placed themselves outside their original home country on a temporary basis[28].

Reasons for temporary migration may be quite diverse including the attempts to achieve a lifestyle not available at the primary residence, the escape aiming to provide a balance in life, a turn to the local as a response to globalization (a step 'back to nature', to an idealized simple rustic lifestyle), a form of internationalization[29], expression of elitism, a solution of retirement, or a financially advantageous opportunity for investment.

International residential migration, the use of leisure homes and second homes is particularly associated with the so called Dutch special needs that have been confirmed during interviews with informants and participant observation in the studied areas. At the top is the need for space: around 18 percent of Dutch second homes are situated abroad. The countries in which Netherlanders have their second home include France, Spain and Belgium that are at the top of the list. The Czech Republic announces 974 Dutch second homes, which makes 2.7 per cent of the whole figure[30]. Another need expressed by some of the informants stems from the environmental concern – the threat

---

[26] See: LIUBINIENĖ, N. (...) 2006.

[27] See: Dartington Amenity Research Trust 1977, in: DIJST, Martin; LANZENDORF, Martin; BARENDREGT, Angela & SMIT, Leo. Second Homes in Germany and the Netherlands: Ownership and Travel Impact Explained. *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*, Vol. 96 (2), 2005, p. 139–152.

[28] In Czechoslovakia, the phenomenon of second home ownership was exclusively associated with the most common way of domestic leisure in the communist era – cottageing (*chataření* and *chalupaření*) – which was above all a form of escapism by the locals from the straightjacket of the communist regime into the private.

[29] European integration suggests that owning a property abroad belongs to the major, self-evident rights of the EU Citizen.

[30] See: Dutch Housing Need Survey 2002/2003, quoted in: PRIEMUS, Hugo. Importing and Exporting Spatial Needs: A Dutch Approach. *European Planning Studies*, Vol. 13(3), 2005, p. 371–386. In general, it is very difficult to assess the number of second homes. The new 'residents' who usually spend a long period of time in their second homes are not normally recorded in the Census of Population. There is a lack of information provided by official sources. Moreover, the Dutch are increasingly interested in buying a property in the Czech Republic but not any more within the areas informally called as Dutch villages. As some of the Dutch informants said, it is discouraging; they want to buy houses *outside* the Dutch villages. This trend has also been confirmed by the mayor of Stárkov who said that some villages nearby (Vernařovice, Straškovice, Petrovice) are "*simply bought out by the Dutch*".

of floods. For most of the interviewees, however, the most important motive given for purchasing the Czech property is escape, such that it becomes a theme to which they repeatedly return in the context of talking about their working lives in the Netherlands as well as their general feelings about place and home. Escape *from* leads inevitably to what the escape is *to*: „Escape is the main theme, from pressure of work, everyday routine, from commodification, to a space which is a bolt-hole, a retreat or a genuine break from paramount reality"[31]. My hypothesis was that affluent Dutch migrants would oscillate between their homes and other places called the second home in order to rediscover rural idyll in the places that have not allegedly lost authenticity. I assumed their motivations as largely anti-urban and anti-modern. In other words, the urge of 'getting away from it all', and escaping from the 'nightmare of repetition'[32] which typifies everyday life: the stress, the pressure, the drive to achieve, away from the constraints of rationalized production and commodified consumption. Research outcomes, however, did not validate my hypothesis. Self-conscious rustic minimalism is not all-pervasive as it might appear. The concept of 'voluntary simplicity' defined by Elgin[33] is in sharp contrast to the reality of the Dutch village in Lipno which is both ultra-modern and looks the same (standardized patterns of the houses). Ritzer's[34] 'all-pervasive hell of the same' has not been proved. It equally fails to characterize the Stárkov case. The 'Dutch way of life' in both the villages is to a large extent commodified: an alteration of patterns of consumption towards more natural, simple foods has not occurred. On the contrary, shopping is largely supermarket-based, instead of being taken place in local groceries and small shops. The manner of living which many of the second home owners share largely perpetuate the urban pattern: though staying in smaller scale living environments, their contact with community is non-existent and is limited to the members of their own 'tribe', if any.

Some of the most important factors that influence the decisions of the Dutch to migrate do not deal any more with economic requirements. Instead, what matters are the climate, quality of life, and recreation as well as the population size of the local areas. These preferences are especially important in retirement. As the Dutch informants repeatedly confirm, they visit the place because of the nice hilly landscape they miss at home. The Dutch spend their leisure time as other tourists – going on trips, hiking, skiing in winter time.

Emic categorisation of tourists and second home owners refers to the local identity issues: who or what occupies the role of 'other'? How do local people perceive and understand them and how, or if, they distinguish among types of tourists? Here, the concept of 'stranger'[35] comes to the forefront. The semantics of tourist-local interaction implies that a tourist does not become part of any long-term reciprocity structure. The same applies to second home owners though the length and nature of their stays in the studied areas largely differ from 'ordinary' tourists. The attitudes of the locals to foreign tourists and second home owners, as well as the ambitions and strategies of the 'guests' to 'hosts' affect the formation and development of new social organizations in the researched areas. By conceptualizing tourism and second homes as a site and form of potential intercultural communication[36], we can pose a key question: what facilitates/hinders intercultural

---

[31] CHAPLIN, Davina. Consuming Work / Productive Leisure: the Consumption Patterns of Second Home Environments. *Leisure* Studies, Vol. 18, 1999, p. 41.

[32] See: COHEN, Stanley & TAYLOR, Laurie. *Escape Attempts: the Theory and Practice of Resistance to Everyday Life.* London: Routledge, 1992.

[33] See: ELGIN, Duane. *Voluntary Simplicity. Toward A Way of Life That Is Outwardly Simple, Inwardly Rich.* Morrow, 1981.

[34] See: RITZER, George. *The McDonaldization Thesis: Explorations and Extensions.* London: Sage Publications, 1998.

[35] See: BURNS, Peter M. *Tourism & Anthropology.* London and New York: Routledge, 1999.

[36] GAVIN, J. & PHIPPS, A. (…) 2005.

exchange between tourists and locals? What are the factors that deepen social distance and what are those which, on the contrary, support interaction and thus enable integration?

4. Social distance or interaction?

Modern rurality is frequently considered to be a positive situation because it represents a new vitality for declining social organizations. A tourism development may appear to be socially and economically beneficial to a local community. On the other hand, there may be other factors that tend to affect interaction in a negative way, and thus complicate a path to development. We shall treat them separately as analytical categories, yet, having in mind that in reality they often overlap.

The first group of factors revolves around spatial patterns. Second home tourism and international tourism patterns may affect regional geography and spatial distribution. As has already been stated, the 'Dutch villages' were directly built into the above-mentioned rural settlements. Yet, both physical and symbolic spatial patterns are clearly discernible in both cases. In Lipno, the visual outlook proves the existence of three neatly bounded parts: first, so called 'old Lipno' which consists of the original village centre, and the periphery, intended for elderly residents who were moved there into newly built row houses after they had sold their flats or houses on more lucrative lands either directly to the Dutch, or to developer companies; second, a buffer zone called 'New Lipno' for the *nouveau riche* local residents, and Landal Marina Lipno as an enclave for foreign tourists and second home owners. Restrictive spatial patterns can be observed in the differential access to the local aqua-park. In the peak season, locals can visit it only between 4 – 9 pm. Spatial boundaries are equally visible in Stárkov. The village is divided into two zones, between the 'old' settlement and the Green Valley Park. The physical closure is accompanied by a low opportunity for, even absence of interaction. The Dutch do not go to see the locals, and the locals rarely go to see the Dutch. The situation loosely corresponds with the mayor's opinion he had expressed prior to the construction of the villas:

> I want the Dutch to be on the area of 13 hectars so that they do not bother the locals in the village, so that they stay in their own places.

From time to time, mainly in the peak season, locals do pop into the area for a drink. They commonly call it as 'going for a beer to Holland'. Locals also use an old outdoor swimming pool and children playground built during the communist times that are accidentally situated within the 'Dutch' area. In such atmosphere, a researcher can come across bizarre situations: I asked one of the locals, an elderly woman, about the GVP; at first she did not know what I was speaking about. After I explained, she vaguely recalled it but said it was too far away for her to walk there – she never visited the place nor even considered the GVP to be an integral part of the village. The overall visual outlook of the 'old' parts of both places – Lipno and Stárkov – does not prove the existence of a foreign clientele which would bring prosperity: most local houses are old, inadequately maintained, many of them still waiting for reconstruction and repair. Local roads are in a terrible condition. Public services are declining, a comparable situation to other cross-border villages without revenues from tourism. This external impression was acknowledged in interviews with many of the locals. For instance, daily takings of the local grocery in Stárkov have not increased since the arrival of the Dutch. They do not go shopping there (apparently because of the limited assortment of goods, as the area keeper puts it, and higher prices, as a local seller deems), they prefer to go

shopping to supermarkets in nearby bigger towns. The old rural settlement in both the researched places is in sharp contrast to the newly built-up areas intended for foreign clientele. In Lipno, for instance, the former historical settlement that was mostly flooded by the Lipno dam looks quite different at present. As the local elite put it, there is a new square with "plentiful cosy cafés, decorative greenery, and promenade pavements". Their opinion certifying that tourism is the right road to success and happy future is, however, often contradicted by a whole host of critics (both locals[37] and outsiders) who largely point to excessive concentration of the tourism industry in one place which makes an entirely unnatural impression on the landscape.

The second group of factors deals with a socio-demographic impact on the local structure of population caused by second-home developments and international tourism forms and practices. The relationship between the extent of seasonal home ownership and changes in the local structure of the population has been traced in a number of studies[38]. Differences between the socio-demographic characteristics of local people and temporary migrants / tourists appear to be significant in both the researched places. A phenomenon of depopulation of the Lipno village centre and the dispersal of the population to the peripheral rural sectors has already been mentioned. At the same time a growth in the local population has been observed due to the increasing number of incoming foreign second home dwellers and also thanks to a steady influx of new residents – usually young Czech urbanites who are attracted by the village modernity.

Environmental issues rank among the other factors that may be instrumental in aggravating hosts and guests relationships. Stárkov Green Valley Park was built in the protected nature zone, irrespective of the resistance of the regional environmental authorities. The project aroused sharp protests not only among the nature protectors, but also among some of the locals and other Czech cottage-owners. The recreational objects in Lipno had negative environmental effects by stimulating the use of private cars and by increasing pressure on sensitive areas and traffic congestion. It has also led to the reduction of the amount of space for natural uses.

The barriers sharpening the differences and enhancing social distance between the local population and second home owners and other foreign temporary migrants include probably the most discussed impacts: socio-economic and socio-cultural factors. Differing social, economic and cultural backgrounds of the foreigners (their above average income, their 'otherness', the language difference, etc.), and the locals make way to a deepening social distance between local people and tourists. Economic gain, though an important factor in tourism development, may be accompanied by strikingly disproportionate distributions of the economic benefits associated with tourism.

On the other hand, the growth of second homes and other forms of international tourism could be seen as a positive development from the economic point of view. Scholars have noted down numerous benefits: second homes could have a stimulating influence on the local economy by the demand for services and the creation of job opportunities.

What are the costs and benefits of second homes for the two communities under study? The advocates of tourism as a strategy for development in Lipno put it in no uncertain terms: "tourism is a positive means" (the economist of the local authorities, and the mayor's girl-friend). The intention of local authorities was to avert economic and population decline in this rural area; a rapid drop in young people threatened the continuity of social life. Tourism served to help reverse this trend. It stabilized the population of the village, even increased the population number. It

---

[37] Among those who find the place tasteless, ugly and non-aesthetic are the displaced elderly people.
[38] See e.g.: CASADO–DIAZ, María Angeles. Socio-Demographic Impacts of Residential Tourism: a Case Study of Torrevieja, Spain. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, Vol. 1, 1999, p. 223–237.

infused new wealth into community that was on the verge of extinction. Tourism raised incomes, increased opportunities for wage employment, gave the possibility of additional small-scale entrepreneurial activities associated with tourism, helped to create a new middle-income population. It helped to sustain the rural environment which had experienced economic and population decline. It enhanced chances to modernise rural housing which is implicitly for local residents (New Lipno satellite-town-houses). From this point of view, Lipno may serve as an example of successful adaptation to changing conditions.

However, the ownership of second homes and the existence of the vast recreational resort also have potential to cause problems if left unrestricted. Negative consequences underlying rapid changes were predominantly perceived by those who either have not adapted to or do not benefit from the new situation: the rejection of the old system, workplaces, service and social networks have not yet been fully compensated by the creation of new networks in their place. Moreover, the costs in Lipno include a rise in the prices of food, rents, local houses, and community services. The locals point to the inflated prices for land – the coefficient of real estate tax is five, which is the country's highest possible legal level. Such an exorbitant rate obviously creates problems for local people who live on low incomes. Benefits seem to be distributed disproportionally among the local population. Increased social and economic stratification is taking place, particularly between those who have and those who have not: those who own and operate tourism facilities and those who provide services only; between pensioners who are being offered a place to live in the newly built row houses 'beyond the old' Lipno, 'reserved for the elderly' in order to vacate their houses for recreational tourism (the local librarian).

Conclusion

The underlying aim of the project is a complex comparative analysis of the interaction between foreign tourists and second home owners on the one hand and local hosts on the other. So far, the qualitative studies of the local situations, enabled by the stationary social anthropological fieldwork, have focused on diverse aspects of the hosts and guests interaction. Even though it is too early to present concrete results – as has been mentioned, the research is still in progress – the existing empirical evidence can indicate further development of the relationship between the hosts and guests in these localities.

In public discourse, international tourism is said to have a universal positive function as it can blur boundaries between nations and identities. The experience of social scientists is, however, contradictory: by and large, tourism is an activity by means of which stereotypes and prejudices are perpetuated and even reinforced, rather than broken down. This practice has been acknowledged in both the research sites where the contact of the 'guests' with the local population is limited, and mutual interaction is rare.

Today's travel, far from broadening the mind, is actually contrived to shrink it. Temporary migration in the form of second home owners and other forms of international tourism tend to contribute to strengthening of 'us' and 'them' categories, of collective cultural stereotypes and to increased misunderstandings. This is enhanced by the lack of mutual interaction and subsequent absence of individual perceptions. Foreign guests appear indifferent to the social reality of their hosts and vice versa, which leads to the promotion of mutual ignorance, not understanding. Even though overt expressions of negative or hostile sentiments towards Dutch tourists and vice versa

have been exceptional, one can expect that they will appear on a larger scale unless the interaction intensifies and social distance diminishes.

A tourism development may appear to be economically beneficial to a local community in its initial stages but it can turn out to have nightmarish consequences in the long run[39]. It remains to be seen which scenarios will take place in Lipno and Stárkov in the future.

Literature
ÁRNASON, Arnar; SHUCKSMITH, Mark & VERGUNST, Jo (eds.). *Comparing Rural Development, Continuity and Change in the Countryside of Western Europe*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2009.

BARKE, M. The Growth and Changing Pattern of Second Homes in Spain in the 1970s. *Scottish Geographical Magazine*, Vol. 107, 1991, p. 12–21.

BELL, Margaret & WARD, Graham. Comparing Temporary Mobility with Permanent Migration. *Tourism Geographies*, Vol. 2, 2000, p. 87–107.

BOISSEVAIN, Jeremy (ed.). *Coping With Tourists: European Reactions to Mass Tourism*. Oxford: Berghahn Books, 1996.

BURNS, Peter M. *Tourism & Anthropology*. London and New York: Routledge, 1999.

BYRON, Reginald. On the Politics of Multiculturalism. In: *Defining Region: Socio-Cultural Anthropology and Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. Acta Historica Universitatis Klaipedensis, Vol. 12; Studia Anthropologica, Part 1. Klaipėda: Institute of Baltic Sea Region History and Archaeology, Klaipėda University, 2006, p. 49–61.

CASADO–DIAZ, María Angeles. Socio-Demographic Impacts of Residential Tourism: a Case Study of Torrevieja, Spain. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, Vol. 1, 1999, p. 223–237.

CHAMBERS, Erve. Native Tours. *The Anthropology of Travel and Tourism*. Long Grove: Waveland Press, 2000.

CHAPLIN, Davina. Consuming Work / Productive Leisure: the Consumption Patterns of Second Home Environments. *Leisure* Studies, Vol. 18, 1999, p. 41–55.

COHEN, Stanley & TAYLOR, Laurie. *Escape Attempts: the Theory and Practice of Resistance to Everyday Life.* London: Routledge, 1992.

CRICK, Malcolm. Representations of international tourism in the social sciences: Sun, Sex, Sights, Savings, and Servility. *Annual Review Anthropology*, Vol. 18, 1989, p. 307–344.

DIJST, Martin; LANZENDORF, Martin; BARENDREGT, Angela & SMIT, Leo. Second Homes in Germany and the Netherlands: Ownership and Travel Impact Explained. *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*, Vol. 96 (2), 2005, p. 139–152.

ELGIN, Duane. *Voluntary Simplicity. Toward A Way of Life That Is Outwardly Simple, Inwardly Rich.* Morrow, 1981.

GALLENT, Nick & TEWDWR-JONES, Mark. *Rural Second Homes in Europe*. Brookfield: Ashgate Publishing, 2000.

GAVIN, Jack & PHIPPS, Alison. *Tourism and Intercultural Exchange*. Cleveland, Buffalo & Toronto: Channel View Publications, 2005.

GIRARD, T. C. & GARTNER, William C. Second Home Second View: Host Community Perceptions. *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 20, 1993, p. 685–700.

HALL, Michael C. Reconsidering the Geography of Tourism and Contemporary Mobility. *Geographical Research*, Vol. 43 (2), 2005, p. 125–139.

HALL, Michael C. & TUCKER, Hazel (eds.). *Tourism and Postcolonialism. Contested Discourses, Identities and Representations.* London & New York: Routledge, 2004.

HALL, Michael C. & WILLIAMS, Allan M. (eds.). *Tourism and Migration: New Relationships between Production and Consumption.* Dordrecht: Kluwer, 2002.

HANNON, Frances & CURTIN, Chris. The Role of Identity in Contemporary Rural Development Processes. In: Árnason, Arnar; Shucksmith, Mark & Jo, Vergunst (eds.). *Comparing Rural Development, Continuity and Change in the Countryside of Western Europe*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2009, p. 125–142.

HOOGENDOORN, Gijsbert; MELLETT, Robyn & VISSER, Gustav. Second Homes Tourism in Africa: Reflections on the South African Experience. *Urban Forum*, Vol. 16 (2-3), 2005, p. 112–154.

ILBERRY, Brian (ed.). *The Geography of Rural Social Change*. Harlow: Longman, 1998.

JAAKSON, Reiner. Second-Home Domestic Tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 13, 1986, p. 367–391.

LEW, Alan A.; HALL, C. Michael & WILLIAMS, Allan M. (eds.). *A Companion to Tourism*. Blackwell Publishing, 2004.

---

[39]   See: CHAMBERS, E. (…) 2000, p. IX.

LIUBINIENĖ, Neringa. Towards the Framing of the 'Region' from Contemporary Anthropological Perspective. In: *Defining Region: Socio-Cultural Anthropology and Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. Acta Historica Universitatis Klaipedensis, Vol. 12; Studia Anthropologica, Part 1. Klaipėda: Institute of Baltic Sea Region History and Archaeology, Klaipėda University, 2006, p. 39–47.

MÜLLER, Dieter K. Mobility, Tourism, and Second Homes. In: Lew, Alan A.; Hall, C. Michael & Allan M., Williams (eds.). *A Companion to Tourism*. Blackwell Publishing, 2004, p. 387–398.

MÜLLER, Dieter K. Second Home Ownership and Sustainable Development in Northern Sweden. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, Vol. 3, 2002, p. 343–356.

MÜLLER, Dieter K. *German Second Home Owners in the Swedish Countryside: On the Internalization of the Leisure Space.* Umeå: Department of Social and Economic Geography, 1999.

NIC CRAITH, Máiréad. Local Cultures in a Global World. In: Kockel, Ullrich & Nic Craith, Máiréad (eds.). *Communicating Cultures*. LIT, 2004.

NOVOTNÁ-HORÁKOVÁ, Hana. The Local and the Global: In Search of European Identity in the Czech Local Community. In: *EASA 06: Europe and the World.* Bristol: University of Bristol, 2006.

PRIEMUS, Hugo. Importing and Exporting Spatial Needs: A Dutch Approach. *European Planning Studies*, Vol. 13(3), 2005, p. 371–386.

RITZER, George. *The McDonaldization Thesis: Explorations and Extensions*. London: Sage Publications, 1998.

SCHIPPERS, Thomas K. 2006. Cultures in Space: some Reflections on the Mediterranean and the Baltic in a Comparative Anthropological Perspective. In: *Defining Region: Socio-Cultural Anthropology and Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. Acta Historica Universitatis Klaipedensis, Vol. 12; Studia Anthropologica, Part 1. Klaipėda: Institute of Baltic Sea Region History and Archaeology, Klaipėda University, 2006, p. 9–17.

SHUCKSMITH, Mark D. Second Homes: A Framework for Policy. *Town Planning Review*, Vol. 54, 1983, p. 176–193.

SMITH, Valene L. & BRENT, Maryann (eds.). *Hosts and Guests Revisited: Tourism Issues of the 21st Century*. New York, Sydney & Tokyo: Cognizant Communication Corporation, 2001.

SMITH, Valene L. (ed.) *Hosts and Guests. The Anthropology of Tourism*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1977.

WILLIAMS, Allan M. & HALL, Michael C. Tourism and Migration: New Relationships between Production and Consumption. *Tourism Geographies*, Vol. 2(1), 2000, p. 5–27.

WILLIAMS, Allan M. & KALTENBORN, Bjørn P. Leisure Places and Modernity: The Use and Meaning of Recreational Cottages in Norway and the USA. In: Crouch, David (ed.). *Leisure / Tourism Geographies.* London: Routledge, 1999. p. 214–230.

POKYČIAI KAIMO BENDRUOMENIŲ GYVENIME: MOBILUMAS, TURIZMAS IR TAPATYBĖ

Hana Horáková
Pardubicės universitetas, Prahos Metropolitan universitetas, Čekijos Respublika

S a n t r a u k a

Esminiai pokyčiai kaimo bendruomenių gyvenime yra nulemti bendrųjų ūkininkavimo sąlygų nuosmukio visos šiuolaikinės Europos mastu. Tai lemiamas veiksnys, kurio pasekmės – demografinė krizė, ekonominė ir ekologinė visuomenės degradacija. Tai nauji socialiniai iššūkiai, su kuriais susiduria vis daugiau kaimo gyventojų įvairiuose regionuose. Agrikultūrinę gyvenseną, pagrįstą intensyvia žemės ūkio produkcijos gavyba, vis dažniau keičia kitos kaimo gyvensenos formos, ir tai įvardijama „po-produktyvinės kaitos" (post-productivist transition) procesu (Ilberry 1998). Šis procesas formuoja naujos kokybės modernią kaimo gyvenseną, kuriai būdingos naujos kaimo ir miesto gyventojų tarpusavio santykių ir bendravimo formos ir iki tol neįprastos ekonominio bei socialinio gyvenimo organizacijos. Ryškiausias gamybinės gyvensenos virtimo vartotojiška gyvensena pavyzdys minėtoje kaimo aplinkoje – naujųjų kaimo atvykėlių fenomenas.

Siekdami išsaugoti savo gerovę, kaimo gyventojai turi plėsti ir įvairinti ūkininkavimo formas. Kartu jie neišvengiamai turi naujai įvertinti ir suvokti viešosios erdvės bei kraštovaizdžio svarbą vietinio ar tarptautinio atvykėlių srauto vystymui. Vyksta ir aiški kaimo gyventojų kaita – senieji kaimo gyventojai vyksta gyventi į miestus, o į jų vietą atvyksta miestiečiai, linkę čia gyventi laikinai (vasaros, atostogų metu), arba ir visam laikui. Tokie atvykėliai naujakuriai čia siekia geresnio gyvenimo, bet dažniausiai labai skirtingai suvokia tokios naujos jiems gyvensenos kaime formas ir perspektyvas. Tokių struktūrinių gyvensenos kaime pokyčių procesas iš esmės leidžia paneigti senąsias tapatybės formas ir sudaro prielaidas naujųjų identitetų formavimuisi. Kitu atveju jis senąsias tapatybės formas verčia prisitaikyti prie naujo gyvensenos konteksto ir tik taip leidžia joms išlikti gyvybingoms (Hannon & Curtin, 2009).

Straipsnyje aptariama, kaip aukščiau minėtos šiuolaikinės gyventojų mobilumo ir tarptautinio turizmo formos veikia senojo, kaimiškojo, identiteto esmę. Pagrindinis dėmesys skiriamas naujųjų ir senųjų identiteto socialinių santykių, t. y. tarpusavio supratimo, konkurencijos ir įtakų, atvejams apibūdinti. Tyrimų tikslas – išanalizuoti vieną iš savanoriško laikinos gyvensenos mobilumo šiuolaikinių formų – olandų „antrųjų namų" (second homes) fenomeno atsiradimą Čekijos kaimo regionuose. Esminis dėmesys straipsnyje skiriamas tokių „antrųjų namų" savininkų, kitų atvykėlių iš užsienio ir senųjų vietinių gyventojų tarpusavio bendravimo veiksniams, palengvinantiems ar komplikuojantiems šio bendravimo procesus dviejų Čekijos kaimo vietovių gyventojams. Tyrimai buvo rengiami empiriniu būdu, pirmojo etnografinės ekspedicijos etapo metu Lipno nad Vltavou ir Stárkov vietovėse 2008 ir 2009 metais. Šiuo metu yra aptariami tik preliminarūs tyrimų rezultatai. Tokio tyrimų projekto esmė – kompleksinė lyginamoji naujųjų atvykėlių iš užsienio ir senųjų vietinių gyventojų socialinių tarpusavio santykių analizė sociokultūrinės antropologijos požiūriu. Tai turėtų atskleisti abiejų socialinių grupių atstovų gyvensenos panašumus ir skirtumus bei jų įtaką tolesnei kaimo gyvenimo perspektyvai.

Straipsnio tekstas yra išdėstytas keturiais poskyriais. Visų pirma pateikiama bendroji socialinio mobilumo ir turizmo sampratų apžvalga. Antrajame poskyryje pateikiami dviejų empirinių tyrimų rezultatai ir jų komentarai. Trečiojoje dalyje pateikiama teorinė dviejų esminių sampratų „šeimininkai, vietiniai gyventojai" (hosts) ir „svečiai, atvykėliai" (guests) analizė. Ketvirtajame poskyryje aptariami minėti abiejų socialinių grupių atstovų tarpusavio bendravimo veiksniai, palengvinantys ar komplikuojantys šio tarpkultūrinio bendravimo procesus. Išvadose atkreipiamas dėmesys į aptariamo tarptautinio „antrųjų namų" turizmo fenomeno pozityvių ir negatyvių veiksnių įtaką vietinės kaimo bendruomenės gyvenimui.