Jezkova, Renata

**Conference Paper**

# Town marketing in the Czech and Slovak Republics: Past, present state and future

50th Congress of the European Regional Science Association: "Sustainable Regional Growth and Development in the Creative Knowledge Economy", 19-23 August 2010, Jönköping, Sweden

**Provided in Cooperation with:**

European Regional Science Association (ERSA)

*Suggested Citation:* Jezkova, Renata (2010) : Town marketing in the Czech and Slovak Republics: Past, present state and future, 50th Congress of the European Regional Science Association: "Sustainable Regional Growth and Development in the Creative Knowledge Economy", 19-23 August 2010, Jönköping, Sweden, European Regional Science Association (ERSA), Louvain-la-Neuve

This Version is available at:
https://hdl.handle.net/10419/119132

**50th Anniversary European Congress**
**of the Regional Science Association International**
**"Sustainable Regional Growth and Development in the Creative Knowledge Economy"**
**19 – 23 August 2010 – Jonkoping, Sweden**

# Town marketing in the Czech and Slovak Republics: past, present state and future

**Renáta JEŽKOVÁ**

***Abstract:*** *The paper deals with town marketing in the Czech and Slovak Republics, a relatively new approach to administration and development of municipalities and towns. The first effort to apply it originated in the second half of 90-ies of 20th century. The first more significant scientific works about town marketing began to appear approximately in a half of 90-ties of 20th century. The main topic was the possibility to apply foreign experience in conditions of the Czech and Slovak towns. That was mainly searching possibilities of how to apply the foreign experience (German, English and Netherlands). The most significant problems which are connected with implementation of the marketing approaches in the Czech and Slovak towns have been summarized on the base of the published studies (see the review of references), as well as the author´s own experience acquired within her scientific-research activities and consultancy. The paper is based on the empiric research of town marketing implementation in all the Slovak towns (138) from a year 2003; it shows some starting points also from a similar research from a year 2010. It comments a future possible development of town marketing in the Czech Republic and Slovakia.*

***Key words:*** *town marketing, Czech Republic, Slovak Republic, interpretation, communal practice*

## 1. Beginnings of town marketing in the Czech and Slovak Republics

In the Czech and Slovak Republics town marketing is a relatively new approach to administration and development of municipalities and towns. The first effort to apply it

originated in the second half of 90-ies of 20th century. One of the significant impulses were growing disparities between individual regions and towns as a result of economic and social transformation, which were realized in the first half of 90-ties of 20th century (massive privatization, deregulation and liberalization). Polarization of the municipalities, towns and regions has caused an increasing interest in a topic of local and regional development and in searching effective instruments of its support.

Other important impulse, which inspired implementation of town marketing was the Public Administration Reform; the municipalities and towns in both countries obtained significant self-governing functions within it. Relatively small size and also a system of finance the municipalities and towns (so called budgetary tax rating), which is not motivating enough, are limited factors of the municipalities´ and towns´autonomous behaviour. The municipalities and towns have only limited possibilities how to increase their tax revenues, which they obtain mainly from centrally collected taxes. That is a reason why the municipalities and towns have a big expectation of European Union Structural Funds.

Approximately since 90-ties of 20th century in connection with the Public Administration Reform, the effort to make it of a higher quality and implementation of ideas of New Public Management in both countries, have become more intensive. Some towns (a number of them have been relatively small) have tried to implement innovative approaches, which would lead to their quality and efficiency increase, e.g. ISO, benchmarking, CAF, BSC and others.

Town marketing idea-holders in 90-ties of 20th century were most of all Czech or Slovak branches of international consultancy companies as e.g. Berman Group, DHV and others. For example, the Czech branch Berman Group in years 1995-1998 elaborated strategic marketing plans for 10 Czech towns and also the first similar document in Slovakia for the town Trnava.

The first more significant scientific works about town or regional marketing began to appear approximately in a half of 90-ties of 20th century. The main topic was the possibility to apply foreign experience in conditions of the Czech and Slovak towns and regions. That was mainly searching possibilities of how to apply the foreign experience (German, English and Netherlands). Several works also arised within the international projects solution. The most significant Czech and Slovak works which have been written up to present are: L. Janečková & M. Vaštíková (1999), M. Bernátová & A. Vaňová (1999, 2000), P. Rumpel (2001), Malinovský (2004), R. Pauličková / Ježková (2005, 2006), Váňová (2006) and J.Ježek & R.Ježková (2007).

## 2. Town marketing between a theory and practice

Town marketing has become a "label" for various different concepts and ways of expressions in communal practice. Many municipalities and towns perform marketing activities without realizing this fact or they interpret this term in a different way. Moreover there exist other spheres of public administration competence in communal practice, which are in a narrow relation with town marketing. As some examples we can mention strategic town development, spatial planning or Public Relations. The similar methods, instruments and organizational forms as in a case of town marketing are often used in all the spheres mentioned above (Ježek 2004, Ježek & Ježková 2007).

Although the term marketing in communal policy sphere is often used, the term town marketing has not been suitably and definitely defined, yet. There has not been any uniform definition of town marketing (see e.g. Grabow & Grömig 1998, Pauličková 2003, Konken 2004). On the contrary we are witnesses of a further dispersion of this term. More often we meet various "innovations" in communal practice called town marketing and majority of them are of an experimental character (various intiatives, pilot projects etc.). As they become more and more popular, a disproportion between theoretical reflection and practical applications grows because of no existence of a complex theory of town marketing. Communal practice is full of huge amount of various handbooks, manuals, guides with one common fact: they handle marketing as the instrument very pragmatically, often without any critical reflection. Still new and new approaches have been accepted without verifying the individual concepts by theoretical discussions and further practical use (Ježek 2004).

Current communal (municipal) practice is characterized by a great content heterogenity of the term town marketing. Often we can meet various different concepts, ways of expression and different organizational models of town marketing in communal practice (Ježek & Ježková 2007, Pauličková 2005a, 2005b). Most of the towns agree on their visions. Usually they present service orientation, slim public administration or decentralization of responsibilities for their funds. But they differ in marketing implementation into practice. Every town goes its own individual way according to its traditions, relations between actors etc. The same situation is in understanding the roles of town marketing as well as their organizational forms or tasks of cooperation with citizens and enterpreneurs (Public Private Parntership) etc. (Weber 2000, Pauličková 2003, Ježek & Ježková 2007).

Many authors have tried to define and describe various types of town marketing and their individual elements. Some definitions are included e.g. in the article by R.Pauličková (2003) or in the newest Czech textbook of town marketing (Ježek & Ježková 2007). The general agreement exists only in the idea that an automatic transfer of corporate marketing to communal practice (town marketing) is too simplified, because there are big differences between communal and corporate roles, goals and areas of their influence. Although the economization in connection with the town development grows and also does the orientation to services, it is not possible to understand the town as the corporation. This statement is not in any disagreement with communal practice where it is often used the term "town engaged in business"(see e.g. Hofman 1999). The only question is what all from corporate marketing may be implemented into administration and development of towns.

## 3. Case studies from the Czech and Slovak Republics

### 3.1 Interpretation of town marketing in communal practice. Case Study from the Czech Republic[1]

Representatives of West Bohemia towns consider town marketing mostly as a realization and appraise of concrete marketing projects (90%) and Pulic Relations (82%) (see Chart 1). If we compare results of our research with a similar research done in Bavaria, we will find out that West Bohemia towns understand the term town marketing more pragmatically. On the contrary, Bavarian towns understand twn marketing as a complex with its coordination role (cooperation of actors). The marketing activities of the West Bohemia towns are mostly oriented to the main target groups: citizens (74%), local enterpreneurs (69%) and visitors of the town – tourists (65 %). Again, if we compare our results with those mentioned above from the German research, it is clear that the Czech towns are more oriented into inside of the town (they perform internal marketing) and the Bavarian towns use their marketing instruments most often in the relation with their competitors. That is the reason why Bavarian or German towns proclame the need of creation the cooperation networks of the towns what has not been an accepted task in the Czech Republic, yet (Ježek & Ježková 2007).

[1] The empirical research of implementation of marketing into administration and developmet of towns was executed in 2003 in West Bohemia (Karlove Vary and Plzeň Regions). Totally 135 towns with more than 5 000 citizens were inquiried.

**Chart 1:** Significance of individual elements of town marketing. Comparison of a situation in West Bohemia and Bavaria (Germany). Ratio of answers is in %.

| | West Bohemia | Bavaria |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Cooperation of actors | 72 | 61 |
| 2. Service orientation | 73 | 41 |
| 3. Target groups orientation | 72 | 33 |
| 4. SWOT analysis | 57 | 57 |
| 5. Development visions | 61 | 55 |
| 6. Realization and apraise of projects | 90 | 62 |
| 7.Organization and management | 64 | 21 |
| 8. Promotion | 50 | 50 |
| 9. Public Relations | 82 | 28 |

References: West Bohemia (own findings 2003; n=135), Bavaria (Weber 2000, n=128).

According to the results of interviews with the representatives of West Bohemia towns 58% of them had elaborated the development (marketing) strategy and 37% of interviewee thought about it. Only 5 % of towns stated that they did not have any strategy and they did not need it. Almost 2/3 of municipalities and towns ordered its elaboration through some external subject and the rest (1/3) elaborated it by themselves. It resulted from the structural interviews that the most frequent subjects that took part in elaborating the marketing strategy were members of the Board of Representatives of the Town or Town Council, then experts from the Town Office and citizens. The main difference between Czech and Bavarian or German practice is in the fact that enterpreneurs, business associations (especially among retailers), non-profit organizations and the Church in Germany take part in elaborating the strategy more intensively. Although the situation in the Czech Republic in this sphere keeps improving, engagement the enterpreneurs and non-profit organizations into town marketing is still a secondary task. Town marketing in conditions of the Czech towns is more Town (City) Office marketing.

Implementation of marketing into the town management was mainly the initiative of the elected representatives of towns. This effort was initiated either by the meyor himself (44%), someone from the Board or Council of the town (44%) or other representative of the public administration (30%). The rest of the initiators of town marketing played relatively unimportant role (e.g. external consultants, representatives of economic chambers, enterpreneurs etc.). In German towns, as we have already mentioned, various interest

associations of enterpreneurs and citizens play the most significant role. If we simplify the situation we can claim, that the very first impulse of applying marketing into administration of German towns arised from retailers who ran their business in the centres of the towns (origin of the term City marketing) and tried to find the cooperation strategy to pass the competition with hypermarkets.

According to our research the most marketing activities are performed by the Town (City) Office as a whole (61%), special department of theTown (City) Office (20%) (most often it is the Town Development Department) or any specialized organization established by the town (7%). Only 5% of inquired towns stated that the majority of their marketing activities was performed by other subjects in the townś territory either with a coordination role of the Town Office or without it. The situation in Germany (Bavaria) is quite different, because institutions of town marketing often stay outside the towns´ administration (office). Most often they are associations, societies, corporations or Ltd.

Marketing activities of majority of West Bohemia towns are managed by the meyor (46%), town administration (23%) or secretary (11%). In several towns these activities are managed by a special group (7%), which was created for this reason. There are also some towns where marketing activities are not coordinated a lot (12%).

Implementation of marketing into administration and development of towns is not an easy task. It is the long – term period process accompanied by many problems and barriers. The most frequent ones are: different understanding of town marketing by various actors (71%), lack of interest of the groups of actors (65%) and lack of funds in the starting phase (60%). Next often mentioned problems are: low ability to hold a discussion and cooperation between individual actors (54 %) and too dominant position of individual persons or group interests (49%).

### 3.2 Case Study Slovakia[2]

**Principles of marketing activities of towns and their provision (institutionalization)**

The representatives of individual Slovak towns consider marketing activities of towns: economic development of towns; advertisement; to become more visible; explaining the

[2] The empirical research, executed from February to April 2003, was oriented to identification of a concrete marketing and communicational instruments enforcement in conditions of Slovak Towns. A sample in inquiry examination was created by all the towns in the Slovak Republic, totally 138. A return of questionnaires by mail was 51,45 %. Consequently we widened the data collection also to structured interviews with heads of marketing departments or those departments of town (city) offices, which were in charge of this responsibility.

activities of the towns to their citizens, enterpreneurs, tourists; provision of town competitiveness in comparison with others; raise funds from grants and subsidy schemes of the European Union to solve problems the towns face. All the interviewees agreed with the necessity to enforce marketing activities in conditions of their towns. The most important reasons why to enforce marketing principles in conditions of the towns according to interviewees are: economic development (100%), tourism development (58,3%), investment flows (54,2%), fulfil of citizens needs (41,6%) and finally other reasons (8,33%): increasing of employment (50%), strenghten of communication between a citizen and a municipality and increasing of credibility of municipalities (50%). According to the representatives of the municipalities, initiator of the marketing activities of the municipalities should be citizens themselves who want to improve their lives, then employees of the municipalities who should be motivators to attract certain target groups to the town; they should be creative within their work e.g. in event marketing. They realize increased demand for provision of cultural and leisure time activities for the town cititizens.

There is no institutionalized form of marketing in 2/3 of Slovak towns. The predominant reason of no existence of the institutionalized form of marketing activities (63,8%) is lack of finance, then lack of professionals (29,8%), other reasons (23,4%) and a non-existent need (8,5%). The most often other reasons why marketing activities are not institutionalized are: the organizational structure does not contain a post which would deal with marketing (45,4%); lack of sympathy from responsible people (9%); authorities of a town do not deal with a need of town marketing (9%); in small towns the apparatus is insufficient and only a meyor is competent to deal with marketing (9%); lack of staff (9%); although the form of marketing is not institutionalized, it is exercised in practice through department of media activities and civic affairs (9%).

Only one town – Bratislava – has had its own marketing department defined within its organizational structure, Department of Communication and Marketing (the office of the meyor of the Capital Bratislava is in charge of it). It was established after communal election in December 2002 from a previous Press Department. Nowadays we have noticed a need to establish marketing departments also in other Slovak towns.

The marketing activities in the Slovak towns are performed by Town (City) Offices and their Town Development Departments, within the Cultural and Sport Departments, Departments of Building and Environment, Property Administration and Services Departments. Usually the advertising and promotion activities are included into main activities of Architecture and Spatial Planning Departments. The meyors´ offices are usually

responsible for promotion of cultural and sport events in the towns. Organizational – Legal Department publishes municipal press. External Public Relations Department is mainly oriented to publicity as well as Department of Media Activities and Civic Affairs, which concentrates on applying Public Relations. It is not unusual that the meyor´ s office with its departments and individual departments as Press Department, International Affairs Department, Promotion Department, Sponsorship Department is in charge of marketing activities (mainly on the Public Relations level). Some of them are performed also within Economic Development Department. Marketing activities of the towns are realized also by Information Centres, City Cultural and Information Centres, Information Systems and City Cultural Centres.

**Practical experience of implementation of town marketing into practice**

On the base of the structural interviews with the representatives of individual towns we can make out that marketing has not been established as an instrument of a complex development planning of majority of the Slovak towns, yet. According to the interviewees´ answers, marketing is the instrument which has not been used according to any plan, only in some spheres (most often in tourism), but they have not considered it the complex development instrument from their existing practice. Marketing activities have not been planned, coordinated and their conscious need has always come up with some problem in the town. Almost all the Slovak towns finance their marketing activities through their budgets, where there is more often "promotion" item and as a complementary source they use special - purpose enterprise funds. 40% of towns are experienced in finance the marketing activities also through a partnership with some investor. 60 % of the towns have had experience in engage external experts to solve the towns problems (most often they have been Regional Development Agencies). Cooperation with citizens was accessed very critically. Although the municipal representatives publish most of the marketing problems of their towns (e.g. via Internet), most often the citizens are only critics and impartial observers who are not willing to engage to comment proceedings.

**Use of promotion instruments in conditions of towns**

The most often used promotion instruments in Slovak towns are: Public Relations (66,7%), advertisement (54,2%), sales promotion and direct marketing (equally 12,5%) and finally personal sales (4,2%). However, during our personal visits of competent representatives of individual towns we met the fact that the representatives of about 70 % of the towns were not

absolutely sure about the content (definition) of some terms. Although many promotion instruments were already stated in questionary, in reality they were not used or the interviewees understood their means incorrectly. Another problem the interviewees had with giving examples of use of personal sales and direct marketing in conditions of the towns. The most intensive need they expressed in use of Public Relations what has been reflected in implementation of new standards into work process (concentration on a "customer").

## 4. Summarization of problems with town marketing in the Czech and Slovak Republics

In the next subchapter there are summarized the most sigificant problems which are connected with implementation of the marketing approaches in the Czech and Slovak towns. The paper summarizes published studies (see the review of references), as well as both authors´ own experience acquired within their scientific-research activities and consultancy.

**Different interpretation of the term town marketing**

In many towns there does not exist a uniform opinion of what town marketing means. In everyday use marketing means most of all promotion and communication. Problems with its definition, unclearness and various associations conneced wih this term often complicate its practical implementation. Some of the towns try to solve these problems in their own way; they do not use the controversary term "town marketing", but they substitute it by a less fashionable interpretation as "local partnership" or "cooperative town development", what, on the other hand, complicate expert discussions and also a research.

**Insufficient goal orientation of town marketing**

The absent goal orientation or unclear definition of town marketing goals introduce a similar problem. Usually, both problems occure together. The problem is, that participated actors do not set in advance the real goals they want to achieve and also a way (method) how to achieve them. The marketing goals of the town are very often set too widely or too generally (as e.g. sustainable town development or the competitive town), so this way the participated actors can imagine various things. Conflicts can usually occur as far as a specification of the concrete measures comes.

**Lack of funds**

Lack of funds is usualy a cardinal problem with which the other problems are narrowly connected. The problem is not only a general lack of funds determined for town marketing, but also a ratio of funds between public and private sectors. In both countries marketing activities of towns are mainly the local self-government´s matter or public budgets´matter. Enterpreneurs take part in theese activities only in case of projects which can bring them concrete benefits. There are only a few such examples. Majority of towns do not have further imagination how to finance their planned marketing activities in future. Many towns to finance their marketing activities try to attract some private entities. The experience of some towns shows that, on one hand, the enterpreneurs are interested in taking part in the marketing goals formulation process, but on the other hand, they are not always willing to take part financially in its realization. However, in last few years up to now we have been the eye witnesses of many interesting projects based on Public-Private Partnerships (PPP). These are the cases of technical infastructure, especially.

**Insufficiences in spheres of leadership and organization of the marketing process (human resource task)**

From a process point of view town marketing is a very significant task of the human resource quality. Town marketing requires marketing managers – professionals. Generally, we can say that there are not such professionals in both countries; or those who do marketing often do not have a capacity to do it fully. In many towns marketing is done by employees who do not have it in their main responsibilities. Marketing activities are mainly done by officials – employees of town development departments, departments of culture, or town promotion departments, who are "the closest" to town marketing. So, positions, responsibilities and working conditions of the Czech or Slovak town marketing managers are not comparable with the foreign ones (British, but also German). The marketing managers often do not have appropriate conditions for their work. They are load up under byreaucracy and they put a low responsibility at a dispose. The current situation is at least partly solved by a wave of young professionally competent people who want to "manage something".

**Participation of actors and their motivation**

Decision making about marketing strategies and projects is generally accepted more as a role of a local self-government than as a matter of all important actors from public and private sectors. Various forms of participation are still more a result of the by-chance-effort than the

purposeful participation, which would follow the idea that it is possible to achieve a maximum use of local sources and so developmet through participation of all important actors from public, as well as from private sectors.

Some sociological researches stress that in both countries, in comparison with West democracies, there is a relatively weakly developed citizenship participation and the civil society in general (see e.g. Z. Mansfeldová – A. Kroupa 2005). According to our opinion, the insufficient motivation and engagement of citizens have been caused by these facts: (1) during totality autonomous and creative activities and engagement of citizens was not required, and (2) the citizens feel to be "bored with politics and a policy" (corruption, lobby, bribery). Some authors (as e.g. J. Večerník) mention that individualizm, which was proclaimed especially in the begining of 90-ties of 20$^{th}$ century and market-oriented economy development led and have led recently to the fact that people try to satisfy more their individual material needs and the "right time" for their more intensive public engagement "has not come, yet" (J. Večerník – P. Matějů 1999).

Surprisingly low is the citizens´effort to boost their own ideas ad interests connected with development issues of the municipalities and towns. As we mentioned above, generally the people with visions and leadership competences (leaders) who would be able and willing to lead other members of the local or regional community absent. More intensive participation of the citizens we meet only connected with a solution of the problems which are closely related to them and they are personally interested in their solution. That is the reason why direct participation of the citizens in local and regional projects or town marketing projects has stayed very low.

The question of insufficient citizens´ participation in decision making processes is also connected with permanent distrust of a part of political élite as for the civil society and participation or the direct democracy itself.

**Insufficiently developed Public – Private Partnership**

The municipalities and towns in both countries have had quite little experience of a realization of common projects with a private sector within so called Public-Private Partnership. The fact, that creation of the prtnership has not been successful has its deep roots and it is influenced by many factors, not only a fact that legal regulations had limited "mixture" of public and private sources. According to some authors this problem is conneced with the permanent general distrust in private enterpreneurship and enterpreneurs, what we have met in the Czech Republic since the beginning of economic and social transformation.

Although some sociologic researches from last years have shown that acceptation of the enterpreneurs has changed in a positive way, the fact that e.g. local enterpreneurs have not been engaged in development processes is still a common practice. A lot of measures for the local economic development support has been realized without any consultations with enterprise public. The problem is also on a side of enterpreneurs. The enterprise self-government is weekly developed in both countries, so sometimes it is quite difficult to obtain a representative opinion from enterpreneurs without seeing it like the opinion of the narrow group of enerperneurs (lobby). A membership in the economic boards is not obligatory and they associate only some few percentage of the enterpreneurs, and there is only a few number of other enterprise associations and they do only limited activities.

It is necessary to understand the creation of the partnerships between the public and private sectors as a long time process. The first good examples are some cooperative projects mainly in the technical infrastructure sphere (waste transfer, revitalization of towns´ brownfields etc.).

**Insufficient use of experts and knowledge**

A lot of discussions about town marketing have been organized without any engagement of experts or expert knowledge. The most serious problem is that the towns voluntarily resign on a possibility to "learn from the best solutions". In practice we can meet some cases, that the towns desparately solve problems which have been already solved in other town. In such a case when the town marketing process is realized too separately and its representatives try to go their own way, there is a danger of "inattentiveness" in case of good and innovative ideas.

The local development´s weakness is also an insufficient ability to cummulate knowledge. The main reason is personal, as well as an organizational volatility and also generally insufficient partnership which would lead to effective change and spread of knowledge and experience.

In pratice we can often meet a sceptical attitude to innovations and new concepts. On the other hand, municipalities and towns often too uncritically follow some fashionable waves (trends), so called "herd effect" (all of them want to attract foreign investors, foreign tourists, build cycle routes, swimming-pools etc.). These two attitudes both often make acceptation of a realistic development vision impossible, and also realistic use of the best practices and theoretical knowledge and experience. It is connected with the knowledge, that the local self-

government representatives are ofen not able to do a self-critical reflexion and they consider the scientific and applied researches only of a limited significance.

**Unclear definition of town marketing towards the other roles of the town administration**

In fact, it is a definition of town marketing towads such spheres: town development (srategic planning), business environment support, tourism or Public Relations. The problems often arise when the towns, except for town marketing try to implement also e.g. Local Agenda 21 or other development concepts (TQM, BSC etc.). The round-table discussions may lead to different final results how to develop the town, what, finally may decrease a credibility of the municipal policy.

A big problem of the Czech and Slovak towns is that marketing does not fulfil a coordination role. The organizational tasks of town marketing are not considered important. In fact, there are not any subjects or mechanism which would contribute to this coordination.

**Problems with implementation and evaluation of marketing activities**

One of the weaknesses of the marketing process is the insufficient evaluation. The most often reason why the evaluation mechanism fails is that the responsible people from the town administration are overloaded, competences are not clearly determined, there are not enough possibilities of sanctions, criterions for the result control absent and the goals are not clearly set.

According to our opinion, the insufficient engagement of individual actors in the marketing process (especially in cases of enterprise and civil sectors) weakens a feeling of a need to realize the regular evaluation of accepted strategies and projects. The evaluation as an instrument of strategic management and also an instrument of learning almost has not been realized in conditions of both countries. This fact is often called as “undeveloped evaluation culture”.

## Conclusion

The Czech towns as well as the Slovak ones have had relatively good experience of marketing. First of all they positively accessed the fact that the long-term period process has been started and it will still continue. The most significant impact from applying marketing is improving communication between various groups of actors of the town development, e.g.

between the town, its citizens and enterpreneurs and also improving communication between officials and those who have been elected. Also the concrete realized projects were very positively accessed. The least satisfaction (although a ratio of those who were satisfied was higher than those nonsatisfied) was expressed in case of a weak motivation of the citizens as for the town development process. The municipal representatives did not succeed in creation of project groups and they did not always do the best in creation of the commisions and working groups and their engagement in the town development process. The performance of some measures has been the problem task.

If we try to evaluate a current situation in town marketing sphere, we can mention, that boh countries are situated in a similar situation which was sold by their neighbours – e.g. Germany or Austria approximately 10 years ago.

On a base of up to present experience we can state that there has not been any generally accepted neither theoretical, nor practical concept of town marketing solution. Even more, as we have mentioned above, more often we meet a sharpening of this term. Every town has to find its own concept and at the same time, off course, they should learn from those who are the best in this field. In both countries there are many towns like these.

A success of town marketing, its strategy and measures should be ensured mainly by the acceptance of as wide actors range as possible. Engagement of a wide spectrum of actors is necessary do do from a very beginnig – from discussions about the stategies, goals and measures. All the activities must be transparent and open (for other subjects and ideas) and individual projects must be evaluated from a point of iew of their benefits and realization.

The goal orientation and a detail elaboration of the individual marketing goals should not absent. The goals should be set hierarchically from general main goals, partial thematic goals to concrete project goals. The orientation to the target groups to which the suitable marketing mix should be adapted, is an absolute necessity.

Although the towns in both cuntries do more and more marketing activities, it is not clear, what activities primarily should be done, who should do them or who should be their organizers, what kind of organizational and legal forms should town marketing have etc. Our long-term researches show that they are mainly (excluding some rare exceptions) coincidental and uncoordinated activities. If they are organized in an integrated way, usually it is only in some directions (see for example industrial zone marketing, Public Relations etc.), but not completely.

## References


BERNÁTOVÁ, M. – VÁŇOVÁ, A.: Marketing pre samosprávy I. Marketing území. Banská Bystrica, UMB, 2000.

BERNÁTOVÁ, M. – VÁŇOVÁ, A.: Marketing pre samosprávy II. Komunikácia s verejnosťou. Banská Bystrica, UMB, 1999.

GRABOW, B. – GRÖMIG, B.H.: Stadtmarketing – eine kritische Zwischenbilanz. Difu – Beiträge zur Stadtforschung 25. Berlin: Deutsches Institut für Urbanistik, 1998, 218 s.

HOFMAN, J.: Od "úřednického" města k městu podporujícímu podnikání. In: Veřejná ekonomika a správa "99. Ostrava: Vysoká škola báňská - Technická univerzita, s. 51-53.

JANEČKOVÁ, L. – VAŠTÍKOVÁ, M.: Marketing měst a obcí. Praha: Grada, 1999, 178 s.

JEŽEK, J. - PAULIČKOVÁ, R.: Marketing of towns in theory and practice. Experience in applying marketing in the Czech Republic and the Slovak Republic. Mezinárodní vědecká konference ERSA ve Vysokých Tatrách, Nový Smokovec 27.-30.9.2005, Košice/ Bratislava: Technická univerzita Košice a Ekonomická univerzita Bratislava, s. 159-163.

JEŽEK, J.: Aplikovaná geografie města. Plzeň: Západočeská univerzitav Plzni, 2004, 145 s.

JEŽEK, J.: Interpretace městského marketingu v komunální praxi. Marketingová panoráma, 1/2004, 2004, s. 9-11.

JEŽEK, J.: Městský marketing v teorii a praxi. In: Vědecká konference Hradecké ekonomické dny 2003. Hradec Králové 4. a 5.2.2003. Hradec Králové: Fakulta informatiky a managementu, Univerzita Hradec Králové, 2003, s. 50-53.

JEŽKOVÁ, R.: Regionálny a mestský marketing. In: Buček, M. a kolektiv: Regionálny rozvoj. Novšie teoretické koncepcie. Bratislava: Ekonom, 2006, s. 199-262.

KONKEN, M.: Stadtmarketing – Kommunikation mit Zukunft. Messkirch: Gmeiner Verlag GmbH, 2004.

MALINOVSKÝ, J. : Zavádění marketingu do správy a řízení rozvoje měst v Moravskoslezském kraji. Ostrava: VŠB-TU Ostrava, Ekonomická fakulta, 2004, 112 s.

MANSFELDOVÁ, Z. – KROUPA, A.: Participace a zájmové organizace v České republice. Praha: Slon, 2005, 244 s.

PAULIČKOVÁ, R.: Využitie marketingových nástrojov v rozvoji miest: case study Slovensko. In: Marketing a médiá a Regionálny marketing. Zborník z medzinárodného odborného seminára Komunikácia 2003, Fakulta masmediálnej komunikácie Univerzity sv. Cyrila a Metoda, Trnava, 2003, s. 185-194.

PAULIČKOVÁ, R.: Regionálny a mestský marketing. Bratislava, Eurounion, 2005, 132 s.

PAULIČKOVÁ, R.: Teoretické otázky regionálního a mestského marketingu. Plzeň: Vydavatelství Západočeské univerzity v Plzni, 2005. 124 s.

RUMPEL, P.: Inovace, inovativní koncepty a přístupy v územním rozvoji. In: Rumpel, P. (ed.): Inovativní koncepty v socioekonomickém rozvoji územních jednotek. Ostrava: Ostravská univerzita, 2006, s. 24-37.

RUMPEL, P.: Teritoriální marketing jako koncept územního rozvoje. In: Spisy prací Přírodovědecké fakulty Ostravské univerzity 145/2002. Ostrava: Ostravská univerzita, 2004, 177 s.

SUCHÁČEK, J.: Territorial Marketing of Central European Cities: An Analytical Approach. In: Cities – Places of the Common Memory in the CEI Region, 2004, roč. 3 (č.1), s. 7-14.

VÁŇOVÁ, A.: Strategické marketingové plánovanie rozvoja územia. Studia oeconomica 31. Banská Bystrica: Univerzita Mateja Bela v Banskej Bystrici, 2006, 138 s.

VEČERNÍK, J. – MATĚJŮ, P.: Zpráva o vývoji české společnosti 1989 – 1998. Praha: Academia, 1999

WEBER, A.: Stadtmarketing in bayerischen Städten und Gemeinden. Arbeitsmaterialien zur Raumordnung und Raumplanung Heft 192, Lehrstuhl Wirtschaftsgeographie und Regionalplanung, Universität Bayreuth, 2000.

**Author:**

doc. Mgr. Ing. Renáta Ježková, PhD.

School in Sládkovičovo

269 Fučíkova Str., 925 21 Sládkovičovo

Slovak Republic

e-mail: renata.jezkova@vssladkovicovo.sk