
| RESEARCH ARTICLE

Policy Effect Assessment of the Construction of All-for-One Tourism Demonstration Zones in China--Based on Propensity Matching-Difference-in-Differences Model

Zhe Shan¹, Pengchao Zhang², Zongpeng Tang³, Hong Shi⁴, and Jiayi Ma⁴✉

¹*Southwestern University of Finance and Economics, Western Business School, Chengdu, China*

²*Henan University of Economics and Law, School of Tourism and Exhibition, Zhengzhou, China*

³*Southwestern University of Finance and Economics, School of Business Administration, Faculty of Business Administration, Chengdu, China*

⁴*Southwest Minzu University, School of Architecture, Chengdu, China*

Corresponding Author: Jiayi Ma, **E-mail:** 1360823985@qq.com

| ABSTRACT

The construction of all-for-one tourism demonstration zones is an important initiative for the development of China's tourism industry in recent years. However, there are few studies on the policy effect assessment of construction of all-for-one tourism demonstration zones. Taking county-level administrative regions in China as the research subjects, this paper constructs a panel model covering the period from 2010 to 2019 and uses propensity matching and difference-in-differences (PSM-DID) model to assess the impact of the construction of all-for-one tourism demonstration zones on the development of county-level tourism economy and their regional differences. The results show that: (1) The construction of all-for-one tourism demonstration zones essentially promotes the development of domestic tourism, while its influence on inbound tourism is relatively insignificant. (2) The construction of all-for-one tourism demonstration zones promotes the development of regional tourism economy in central and western regions, whereas such promotion is not obvious in northeastern and eastern China. This study provides a theoretical and empirical basis for improving the construction quality of all-for-one tourism demonstration zones.

| KEYWORDS

All-for-One Tourism Demonstration Zone, Propensity Matching, Difference-in-Differences, Domestic tourism, Inbound tourism

| ARTICLE INFORMATION

ACCEPTED: 20 April 2026

PUBLISHED: 16 May 2026

DOI: 10.32996/jths.2026.4.1.4

1. INTRODUCTION

The objective of tourism policies is to integrate the economic, political, cultural, intellectual, and sustainable benefits of tourism industry with residents and the nation at tourism destinations, to improve residents' quality of life and promote regional prosperity (Mihalič, 2009). To achieve this goal, it is essential to allocate fundamental production factors such as resources, labor, technology, and capital to regions, providing foundational guarantees for tourism development and thereby boosting the growth of the tourism industry (Chingarande & Saayman, 2018). Since 2008, regions including Zhejiang, Jiangsu, Sichuan, and Shandong in China have successively proposed the concepts and strategies of all-for-one tourism development and carried out local pilot explorations. The all-for-one tourism concept has been formally incorporated into national policies and has gradually become the new normal of China's tourism industry as well as the focus of regional economic development across the country. In 2015, the former China National Tourism Administration issued "the Notice on Launching the Establishment of National All-for-One Tourism Demonstration Zones, marking the official initiation of the construction of national all-for-one tourism demonstration zones in China. As one of the important tourism policies in recent years, the All-for-One Tourism Demonstration Zone relies mainly on county-level administrative regions to develop advantageous tourism industries. By optimizing the tourism environment, improving tourism service governance, innovating tourism product forms, integrating regional tourism resources, and promoting in-depth industrial integration, a few regional tourism destinations with exemplary and leading roles have been constructed, aiming to form and promote the all-for-one tourism development model within a specific administrative scope. In

Copyright: © 2026 the Author(s). This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC-BY) 4.0 license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>). Published by Al-Kindi Centre for Research and Development, London, United Kingdom.

accordance with the relevant requirements of all-for-one tourism policies, the establishment of All-for-One Tourism Demonstration Zones can effectively drive the growth of the tourism economy and facilitate the sound and rapid development of tourism at destinations. Therefore, this paper holds that scientifically evaluating the policy effects of constructing All-for-One Tourism Demonstration Zones is of great practical significance.

The innovative development philosophies of tourism in European and North American countries are consistent with the connotation of China's All-for-One Tourism. For instance, France advocated integrated urban-rural tourism, which organically integrated urban and rural tourism resources (Moinet, 2000). Relying on marine resources, Spain focused on fostering a tourism model themed on "sun and beach" (Cano de Mauvensin Fabaré, 2005; Martínez del Vas et al., 2024). The United States emphasized industrial integration by connecting tourism with diverse sectors to form various "tourism +" integrated industries, including tourism + sports, tourism + conferences and exhibitions, tourism + fashion, and tourism + real estate (Kwon et al., 2019). Chinese scholars have conducted in-depth investigations into the connotation, development paths, and local economic effects of All-for-One Tourism, accumulating numerous valuable research findings (Zhou et al., 2018). Li (2013) proposed the developmental concept of All-for-One Tourism, highlighting the integration of residents and tourists and integrated development of various industries which should be implemented across eight dimensions: full factors, full industries, whole processes, all round, full time scales, societal participation, comprehensive categories, and all tourist groups.

With the deepening of academic research on All-for-One Tourism, Lu et al. (2023), from the perspective of factor mobility, argued that All-for-One Tourism should break the boundaries of independent scenic spots. Through systematic planning of tourist origins, factor flow corridors, and pivotal nodes, 1the model facilitated the organic connection of ecological tourism elements and the optimization of spatial structures, 2promoted the transformation from single-scenic tourism to regional linkage, which realized the transition from the traditional tourism model to the all-domain tourism model (Zhang & Yue, 2016) and from the small-scale tourism model to the large-scale tourism model (He, 2016).

Furthermore, existing studies have proposed diversified development paths for All-for-One Tourism, covering All-for-One Tourism planning, smart tourism, industrial transformation and upgrading, and talent cultivation. The core objective of All-for-One Tourism is to shape the entire region into a unified tourism destination while eliminating the spatial limitations of individual scenic spots. Firstly, All-for-One Tourism planning served as the top-level regional strategic design to realize the integration of multiple plans (Lu et al., 2023). Secondly, establishing an intelligent tourism information service system effectively enhanced tourist satisfaction (Wei et al., 2020). It was essential to abandon the extensive development characterized by high energy consumption and high input, and promote industrial transformation and upgrading accordingly (Yue et al., 2025). In addition, importance should be attached to professional talent training, optimized governmental human resource management, and strengthened social responsibility governance (Yan et al., 2024). In summary, All-for-One Tourism acts as an effective driving force for regional economic growth, while its theoretical and empirical research boundaries still require further expansion. In regions suitable for development of All-for-One Tourism, All-for-One Tourism exerts a significant promoting effect on regional economic development.

At present, existing research on All-for-One Tourism Demonstration Zones mainly focuses on summarizing their geospatial distribution characteristics (Wang et al., 2023), influencing factors (Sun et al., 2023), tourism efficiency (Liu et al., 2023), development models (Xing & Shi, 2016), and competitiveness (Zhang et al., 2023). For example, Zhao and Wang (2017) pointed out that 262 All-for-One Tourism Demonstration Zones presented a spatial distribution pattern of dense agglomeration in central and eastern China and sparse layout in western China (Sun et al., 2023). From the perspective of all-for-one tourism, Ma and Wang (2025) explored the development of tourism corridors in Weinan City. They divided the tourism development space of Weinan into extremely important, important and generally important areas, and put forward differentiated tourism development strategies accordingly. Zhang et al. (2023) constructed a coupling coordination model of tourism efficiency and development level. The empirical results indicated evident spatial differences in the comprehensive tourism efficiency of 21 cities in Guangdong Province.

Meanwhile, the development level and influencing factors of all-for-one tourism have also attracted widespread academic attention. Wang et al. (2025) revealed that the coupling coordination degree between new urbanization and tourism economic development in nine provinces along the Yellow River Basin of China presented obvious spatial heterogeneity. The overall level remained relatively low with watershed gradient differences, and significant spatial convergence can be observed in the whole basin and upstream areas. By examining provincial tourism ecological efficiency in China, Li et al. (2022) found that the spatial agglomeration pattern was dominated by low-low agglomeration, followed by high-high agglomeration and low-high outliers. Although the eastern region did not have the highest ecological efficiency, technological progress and economic development exerted prominent spatial spillover effects. Zhao et al. (2022) argued that traffic accessibility, tourism resource endowment, tourism specialization level, industrial structure, informatization level and opening-up degree were the core factors affecting the evolution of regional tourism efficiency, which jointly formed the driving mechanism of regional tourism development. In addition, Liao et al. (2023) pointed out that there were distinct gaps in comprehensive tourism efficiency across Chinese

provinces. Scale efficiency positively supported comprehensive efficiency, while technical efficiency imposed both influencing and restricting effects. Several scholars have suggested that the establishment of All-for-One Tourism Demonstration Zones conformed to national development strategies and the requirements of supply-side structural reform. It can enhance the comprehensive competitiveness of tourism destinations, facilitate coordinated urban-rural development, and boost the growth of tourism economy and overall regional economy, thereby evolving into an important model for regional economic development (Yang, 2016).

Overall, the implementation of All-for-One Tourism Demonstration Zones can provide fundamental guarantees for tourism development. By allocating essential production factors such as resources and labor within a region, it stimulates the growth of the tourism economy. The construction of All-for-One Tourism Demonstration Zones aims not only to expand and strengthen the tourism industry, but also to promote overall regional economic growth through rationally guided tourism development (Zhang & Yue, 2016). However, during the establishment of demonstration zones, some administrative authorities have misunderstood the essential attributes and development goals of all-for-one tourism (Liu, 2016), and a few practical problems remain unresolved (Wu, 2020), which hinder the sustainable development of local tourism and the broader regional economy. Accordingly, the establishment of All-for-One Tourism Demonstration Zones should comply with the basic laws of tourism development. It is inappropriate to rely merely on government intervention while ignoring the decisive role of the market (Wang, 2016). Relevant authorities should break through cognitive limitations, update development concepts, and address practical challenges in regional economic and social progress (Wang, 2016). Based on a quasi-natural experiment, Liu et al. (2023) found that the construction of All-for-One Tourism Demonstration Zones exerted a significant positive effect on the high-quality development of tourism. Network infrastructure improvement and tourism talent agglomeration served as critical transmission mechanisms, offering empirical evidence for understanding the leading role of demonstration zones. Furthermore, research on the interaction between agriculture-tourism integration and tourism-driven poverty alleviation indicates that tourism has become a vital engine for rural revitalization and poverty reduction. The improvement of tourism poverty alleviation efficiency can further advance agriculture-tourism integration and boost rural development (Lu et al., 2023). In ethnic tourism destinations, tourism development helped enhance residents' livelihood capital and diversify livelihood strategies, while the poverty alleviation benefits showed obvious disparities across different communities (Huang et al., 2025).

Existing studies mainly focus on the conceptual connotation and development paths of all-for-one tourism, the economic impacts of typical local cases, the spatial distribution of demonstration zones, influencing factor analysis, tourism efficiency measurement, development models, and comprehensive development evaluation. Current literature lacks in-depth exploration of the policy effects of all-for-one tourism. Empirical research that adopts county-level objective data to evaluate the tourism economic effects of All-for-One Tourism Demonstration Zone Establishment in China remains insufficient. As the construction of demonstration zones continues to advance, there is an increasingly urgent demand for systematic policy effect evaluation. Therefore, this paper takes Chinese county-level administrative units as the research sample and constructs panel data from 2010 to 2019. By adopting the Propensity Matching-Difference-in-Differences Model, this paper scientifically evaluates the impact of All-for-One Tourism Demonstration Zone construction on county-level tourism economic development and its regional heterogeneity.

2. RESEARCH DESIGN

2.1 Research Methods

2.1.1 Propensity Matching Method

Before adopting the Difference-in-Differences Model, it is essential to select a control group with characteristics as similar as possible to the treatment group. This paper selects a total of 148 establishment units from the first and second batches of All-for-One Tourism Demonstration Zones in 2016 as the treatment group, and other 470 non-establishment units as the control group. Although it reduces sample selection bias to a certain extent, sample selection bias still exists due to the differences in area, altitude, climate and other conditions among the establishment units of All-for-One Tourism Demonstration Zones.

Therefore, this paper adopts the Propensity Matching method to solve the problem of sample selection bias, to make the characteristics of the treatment group and the control group as consistent as possible. The basic idea of Propensity Matching is that the observed variables of non-establishment unit i of All-for-One Tourism Demonstration Zones in the control group are as similar as possible to the observed variables of establishment unit j in the treatment group. This can ensure that when the tourism economic development of establishment units of All-for-One Tourism Demonstration Zones depends entirely on observed variables, control group i and treatment group j remain comparable. When using the Propensity Matching method, the propensity score p can be calculated according to multiple observed variables, and control group i and treatment group j are matched based on the similar propensity score p between the treatment group and the control group. The model is expressed as follows:

$$p_i(X) = Pr(PA_{it} = 1|X_i) = F[h(X_i)] \quad (1)$$

Among them, PA_{it} represents the dependent variable; $PA_{it} = 1$ denotes the treatment group, and $PA_{it} = 0$ denotes the control group. X_i refers to a set of characteristic variables, $h(\cdot)$ is a linear function, and $F(\cdot)$ is a logistic function.

2.1.2 Difference-in-Differences Model

This paper regards the establishment of All-for-One Tourism Demonstration Zones as a nationwide public policy quasi-natural experiment, and adopts the Difference-in-Differences Model for empirical testing to explore the impact of the establishment of All-for-One Tourism Demonstration Zones on tourism economic development. This paper assumes that the control group and the treatment group share a common development trend. Specifically, it assumes that the two groups maintain consistent changing trends before the implementation of the policy. The Difference-in-Differences Model is constructed as follows:

$$Y_{it} = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 PA_{it} + \alpha_2 year_t + \alpha_3 PA_{it} \times year_t + \alpha_4 X_{it} + \varepsilon_{it} \quad (2)$$

Among them, Y_{it} is the dependent variable, representing the tourist number or tourism income of city i in year t . PA_{it} denotes the individual dummy variable, where $PA_{it} = 1$ stands for the treatment group and $PA_{it} = 0$ stands for the control group. $year_t$ represents the time dummy variable; $year_t = 1$ indicates the years after the initiation of All-for-One Tourism Demonstration Zone construction, while $year_t = 0$ indicates the years before the construction. $PA_{it} \times year_t$ reflects the dummy variable of the policy effect generated by the establishment of All-for-One Tourism Demonstration Zones, and α_3 captures the policy impact, namely the difference coefficient between the treatment group and the control group, which is the core research focus of this paper. X_{it} refers to a series of control variables, including regional gross domestic product, fixed asset investment, fixed telephone subscribers, registered household population, administrative area, general public budget revenue, and employees in the tertiary industry. ε_{it} is the random error term.

2.2 Research Overview

The concept of China's all-for-one tourism was proposed in 2009, followed by the implementation and promotion of local pilot projects nationwide. In 2015, the former National Tourism Administration issued the Notice on Launching the Establishment of National All-for-One Tourism Demonstration Zones, marking the official launch of the establishment of All-for-One Tourism Demonstration Zones across China. Given that the establishment scope of All-for-One Tourism Demonstration Zones is confined to county-level administrative units, and fully considering data accessibility, research reliability, coverage and representativeness, this paper selects more than 2,000 county-level administrative units in China as the research samples, including county-level cities, counties, autonomous counties, banners, autonomous banners, forest districts, special districts and some municipal districts, with the research period ranging from 2010 to 2019. The data of All-for-One Tourism Demonstration Zones are derived from the official lists released by the former National Tourism Administration, covering 262 units in the first batch, such as Changping District and Pinggu District, and 238 units in the second batch, including Mentougou District and Huairou District. In total, there are 500 designated demonstration zone units.

2.3 Data Collection and Processing

Data are divided into three categories. First, tourism economic data, including total tourist arrivals, total tourism revenue, domestic tourist arrivals, domestic tourism revenue, inbound tourist arrivals, and inbound tourism revenue. These data are obtained from the statistical communiqués on national economic and social development of county-level administrative regions, such as the Statistical Communiqué of Yueqing City, Wenzhou on the 2019 National Economic and Social Development (<http://www.yueqing.gov.cn/>). Second, county-level economic development data, including regional gross domestic product, fixed asset investment, general public budget revenue, administrative area, registered household population, fixed telephone subscribers, and employees in the tertiary industry. These data are collected from the National Administrative Division Information Query Platform (<http://xzqh.mca.gov.cn/map>), China County Statistical Yearbook (<http://www.stats.gov.cn/>), China Regional Economic Statistical Yearbook (<http://www.stats.gov.cn/>), as well as government work reports and statistical yearbooks of relevant regions. Some missing data is supplemented by consulting the statistical bureaus, tourism administrations, and other official channels of local governments. Third, data on All-for-One Tourism Demonstration Zones, which are derived from the lists of the first and second batches of national establishment units of All-for-One Tourism Demonstration Zones announced by the former National Tourism Administration (<https://baike.baidu.com/>).

The data processing of this paper mainly includes three steps. First, this paper defines the research period from 2010 to 2019, lists county-level administrative units across China by province, extensively collects relevant research variables, and constructs panel data covering the period of 2010–2019. Second, in view of the missing values in the panel data, county-level administrative units with missing data for five years or more are eliminated. Finally, a total of 618 county-level administrative units is retained, and all provinces in China are divided into four major regions: Northeast, Eastern, Central and Western China. Third, to eliminate multicollinearity and the dimensional differences among various indicators, this paper adopts logarithmic transformation to realize the nondimensionalization of original data.

3. POLICY EFFECTS OF THE CONSTRUCTION OF CHINA’S ALL-FOR-ONE TOURISM DEMONSTRATION ZONES

3.1 Results of Propensity Matching

To verify the assumption of parallel trends between the treatment group and the control group, this paper takes the establishment units of All-for-One Tourism Demonstration Zones as the research sample. Specifically, it selects a total of 148 Establishment units from the first and second batches of All-for-One Tourism Demonstration Zones in 2016 as the treatment group, and the other 470 non-Establishment units as the control group. The Propensity Matching method is adopted to eliminate the sample selection bias between the control group and the treatment group. Through Propensity Matching, 12 samples of the control group are selected for matching.

To further accurately test the matching quality between the treatment group and the control group, this paper conducts a balance test, and the detailed results are presented in the following table. The balance test after Propensity Matching shows that the absolute value of the standardized deviation of all control variables is less than 5% after matching. In addition, the T-test results of all control variables indicate that the original hypothesis is rejected at the significance level of 0.05, which means there is no significant difference in these control variables after matching. It proves that no systematic error exists between the treatment group and the control group. Therefore, the selected samples basically satisfy the parallel trend assumption of the Difference-in-Differences Model.

Table 1. Balance test of propensity score match

| Variable | Unmatched | Mean | | % reduct | | t-test | | V(T)/V(C) |
|----------|-----------|---------|---------|----------|--------|--------|-------|-----------|
| | Matched | Treated | Control | % bias | bias | t | P> t | |
| lnIFA | U | 14.089 | 14.055 | 3.6 | | 0.37 | 0.710 | 0.87 |
| | M | 14.089 | 14.117 | -3.0 | 16.2 | -0.24 | 0.808 | 0.72* |
| lnGRP | U | 14.171 | 14.124 | 4.7 | | 0.48 | 0.633 | 0.70* |
| | M | 14.171 | 14.217 | -4.6 | 1.4 | -0.38 | 0.706 | 0.58* |
| lnAA | U | 7.588 | 7.6381 | -6.7 | | -0.68 | 0.497 | 0.71* |
| | M | 7.588 | 7.6984 | -14.7 | -120.3 | -1.08 | 0.283 | 0.43* |
| lnLU | U | 10.57 | 10.393 | 18.1 | | 1.82 | 0.070 | 0.62* |
| | M | 10.57 | 10.565 | 0.5 | 97.1 | 0.05 | 0.964 | 0.60* |
| lnREP | U | 3.672 | 3.7222 | -6.5 | | -0.67 | 0.502 | 0.77 |
| | M | 3.672 | 3.7245 | -6.8 | -4.7 | -0.60 | 0.551 | 0.81 |
| lnGPBR | U | 11.485 | 11.314 | 15.3 | | 1.57 | 0.117 | 0.75 |
| | M | 11.485 | 11.614 | -11.6 | 24.2 | -0.94 | 0.349 | 0.60* |
| lnTIP | U | 11.009 | 11.062 | -5.5 | | -0.58 | 0.565 | 0.83 |
| | M | 11.009 | 11.065 | -5.8 | -4.4 | -0.48 | 0.634 | 0.72* |

3.2 Policy Effects of the Construction of All-for-One Tourism Demonstration Zones

3.2.1 Policy Effects of All-for-One Tourism Demonstration Zones Construction on Tourism Revenue

The core policy effects present distinct structural characteristics (Table 2). After controlling regional economic characteristic variables, the establishment of national All-for-One Tourism Demonstration Zones significantly boosts the growth of total tourism revenue, with a policy coefficient of 0.471, which is highly significant at the 1% statistical level. It indicates that the construction of demonstration zones can drive an average increase of approximately 47.1% in local total tourism revenue, reflecting substantial policy dividends.

Further classification of market structure reveals obvious market heterogeneity in policy effects. The policy exerts a particularly prominent promoting effect on domestic tourism revenue, with an impact coefficient of 0.426, also significant at the 1% level. This demonstrates that policy implementation effectively stimulates market demand for domestic tourism. However, the impact on inbound tourism revenue shows statistical uncertainty. Although the baseline regression presents a weak positive effect with a coefficient of 0.0918, it fails to pass the significance test consistently, and the coefficient direction is reversed in the model with control variables included. Several factors may account for this discrepancy. First, in terms of policy design logic, the construction standards of All-for-One Tourism Demonstration Zones focus more on improving the experience of domestic tourists, such as the tourism toilet renovation campaign, transportation network optimization, and expansion of A-level scenic spots. These measures generate more direct marginal improvement effects on the domestic tourism market. Second, the development of inbound tourism is highly dependent on macro factors including international route accessibility, visa policies, exchange rate fluctuations and geopolitical conditions, which lie beyond the scope of county-level policy regulation. Such a differentiated effect pattern indicates that the current policy outcomes of All-for-One Tourism Demonstration Zones are mainly reflected in stimulating domestic demand. In the fields of cultivating international tourism attraction and improving cross-border service supporting facilities, policy design needs to be further optimized to promote the coordinated development of domestic and international tourism markets.

Table 2. The policy effect of the construction of comprehensive tourism demonstration areas on the total tourism revenue

| Variable | (1) lnTTR | (2) lnTTR | (3) lnTII | (4) lnTII | (5) lnDTR | (6) lnDTR |
|----------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|---------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| DID | 1.385*** (0.0710) | 0.471*** (0.0903) | 0.0918 (0.2232) | -0.351 (0.3288) | 0.797*** (0.1493) | 0.426*** (0.1540) |
| lnIFA | | 0.531*** (0.0660) | | 0.176 (0.2268) | | 0.465*** (0.1111) |
| lnLU | | 0.0275 (0.0733) | | 0.476** (0.2241) | | -0.303** (0.1384) |
| lnREP | | -0.158 (0.5338) | | 0.307 (0.7816) | | -1.080 (1.4995) |
| lnGPBR | | 0.779*** (0.0893) | | 0.380 (0.3706) | | 0.811*** (0.1775) |
| _cons | 11.77*** (0.0189) | -4.117* (2.2977) | 6.776*** (0.0493) | -6.592 (5.9381) | 12.40*** (0.0365) | 3.794 (6.0830) |
| N | 4485 | 2556 | 511 | 263 | 844 | 477 |
| R2 | 0.0897 | 0.2309 | 0.0004 | 0.0533 | 0.0408 | 0.3764 |
| F | 381.3 | 116.2 | 0.169 | 1.733 | 28.53 | 40.08 |

Note: Standard errors in parentheses* p < 0.1, ** p < 0.05, *** p < 0.01. lnTTR, lnTII, lnDTR respectively represent total tourism revenue, inbound tourism revenue, and domestic tourism revenue.

3.2.2 Policy Effects of All-for-One Tourism Demonstration Zone Construction on Tourist Arrivals

This study further examines the impact of All-for-One Tourism Demonstration Zone construction on the scale of the tourism market. The results show that, after controlling relevant factors, the demonstration zone policy exerts a significant promoting effect on total tourist arrivals with a coefficient of 0.201, which is significant at the 1% level. This indicates that the establishment of demonstration zones increases the total number of tourists by approximately 20.1% on average.

From the perspective of market segmentation, the policy presents a more obvious pulling effect on domestic tourist arrivals, with an influence coefficient of 0.241 and significance at the 5% level, proving that the policy effectively stimulates the travel demand of domestic residents. By contrast, although the impact on inbound tourist arrivals shows a positive correlation with a coefficient of 0.212, it fails to pass the conventional significance test and exhibits weak coefficient stability under different model specifications.

This finding is consistent with the analytical conclusions of tourism revenue, collectively revealing that the policy effects of All-for-One Tourism Demonstration Zone construction are distinctly domestic-oriented. While greatly driving the development of the domestic tourism market, there is no stable and significant statistical evidence to confirm its promotional impact on inbound tourism. Such differentiated outcomes reflect that inbound tourism development relies heavily on systematic factors, including the international tourism environment, cross-border transportation accessibility, and visa policies. It is difficult to achieve short-term progress merely through the independent implementation of demonstration zone policies.

Tab 3. The policy effect of the construction of comprehensive tourism demonstration areas on the total number of tourists

Policy Effect Assessment of the Construction of All-for-One Tourism Demonstration Zones in China--Based on Propensity Matching-Difference-in-Differences Model

| Variable | (1) lnTNT | (2) lnTNT | (3) lnNTA | (4) lnNTA | (5) lnNDT | (6) lnNDT |
|----------|----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|---------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| DID | 0.837*** (0.0471) | 0.201*** (0.0552) | 0.325* (0.1785) | 0.212 (0.3011) | 0.729*** (0.0941) | 0.241** (0.0963) |
| lnIFA | | 0.347*** (0.0399) | | -0.178 (0.2707) | | 0.435*** (0.0735) |
| lnLU | | -0.0715 (0.0454) | | -0.442 (0.4078) | | -0.119 (0.0983) |
| lnREP | | -0.0714 (0.3225) | | 0.367 (1.7909) | | 0.195 (0.6945) |
| lnGPBR | | 0.512*** (0.0543) | | 0.657 (0.4446) | | 0.441*** (0.1176) |
| _cons | 5.605*** (0.0125) | -3.961*** (1.3951) | 1.267*** (0.0471) | -0.339 (10.4480) | 5.768*** (0.0247) | -4.939 (3.1827) |
| N | 4351 | 2478 | 731 | 392 | 1329 | 720 |
| R2 | 0.0780 | 0.2646 | 0.0063 | 0.0388 | 0.0547 | 0.3196 |
| F | 316.1 | 134.2 | 3.306 | 1.750 | 60.03 | 44.07 |

Note: Standard errors in parentheses* p < 0.1, ** p < 0.05, *** p < 0.01. lnTNT, lnNTA, lnNDT respectively represent total tourism revenue, inbound tourism revenue, and domestic tourism revenue.

3.3 Regional Heterogeneity of Policy Effects of All-for-One Tourism Demonstration Zone Construction

3.3.1 Regional Heterogeneity in Policy Effects on Tourism Revenue

This study further examines the regional heterogeneity of the policy effects of All-for-One Tourism Demonstration Zones on total tourism revenue. The results reveal a distinct spatial pattern characterized by “stronger effects in the west and weaker effects in the east.”

At the regional level, the policy exerts a significant positive impact on total tourism revenue in both the central and western regions. Specifically, the policy effect is most prominent in the western region, with a coefficient of 0.795 that is highly significant at the 1% level. This indicates that the policy drives an average increase of approximately 79.5% in total tourism revenue for the region, representing the most substantial policy dividends. The policy effect in the central region is also significantly positive with a coefficient of 0.380, significant at the 1% level, demonstrating a steady pulling effect of demonstration zone construction on tourism development in central China.

In contrast, in the eastern region, although the policy effect is positive (coefficient of 0.183), it fails to pass the statistical significance test. This suggests that the marginal improvement effect of the policy on the region’s mature tourism market is relatively limited. Notably, the policy effect coefficient for the northeast region is negative (-0.298) and statistically insignificant. A thorough interpretation of this regional differentiation pattern requires an integrated analysis of the tourism industrial foundation and development stage of each region.

First, the strongest policy effect in the western region can be attributed to high elasticity under a low development base. The western region is endowed with abundant natural and cultural resources, yet it has long suffered from inadequate development due to inconvenient transportation and backward infrastructure. The financial support and infrastructure improvement brought by the establishment of All-for-One Tourism Demonstration Zones have rapidly unlocked its resource potential and effectively compensated for development shortcomings. Second, the central region occupies a pivotal geographic position connecting the east and the west. It possesses sound transportation conditions and a broad market hinterland. The implementation of relevant policies has effectively activated its hub function linking tourist origins and destinations, thereby boosting the rapid growth of the tourism industry. Third, the eastern region features a highly saturated tourism market, mature scenic spot development, and intense market competition. Accordingly, the demonstration zone policies have limited room for marginal improvement, focusing more on stock optimization rather than incremental expansion, which explains why no statistically significant policy effect has been observed. Finally, although the negative coefficient in the northeastern region is not statistically significant, it still sends out an alarming signal. This result may be closely related to the region’s heavy industry path and the insufficient marketization of its tourism industry. If policy investment fails to couple effectively with local industrial structures, it may lead to short-term resource crowding-out effects or further lock the region into traditional development paths.

This regional differentiation pattern indicates that the effectiveness of the All-for-One Tourism Demonstration Zone policy is closely correlated with regional economic development levels, tourism industry foundations, and resource endowments. The policy generates a significant marginal promotion effect in the central and western regions, which are rich in tourism resources

but remain underdeveloped. In contrast, its effects weaken in the eastern region with a saturated tourism market, while policy implementation faces prominent challenges in the northeastern region under structural transformation pressure. This suggests that future policy formulation and implementation should further highlight regionally differentiated orientations and strengthen coordination with local development conditions.

Tab 4. The regional difference of policy effect in the construction of comprehensive tourism demonstration areas (tourism revenue)

| Variable | overall | northeastern region | eastern region | central region | western region |
|----------|----------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| | lnTTR | lnTTR | lnTTR | lnTTR | lnTTR |
| DID | 0.471*** (0.0903) | -0.298 (0.4670) | 0.183 (0.1309) | 0.380*** (0.1309) | 0.795*** (0.1657) |
| lnIFA | 0.531*** (0.0660) | 0.293 (0.7477) | 0.573*** (0.0999) | 0.725*** (0.1169) | 0.495*** (0.1051) |
| lnLU | 0.0275 (0.0733) | -0.195 (0.9655) | -0.334*** (0.1175) | -0.154 (0.1027) | 0.217* (0.1256) |
| lnREP | -0.158 (0.5338) | 4.999 (4.6353) | 0.0446 (1.0707) | 0.520 (1.1785) | -0.368 (0.7437) |
| lnGPBR | 0.779*** (0.0893) | 0.0953 (0.8338) | 0.290* (0.1571) | 0.226 (0.1455) | 1.109*** (0.1380) |
| _cons | -4.117* (2.2977) | -9.173 (23.1117) | 4.330 (4.5778) | -1.189 (4.8575) | -8.353*** (3.2089) |
| N | 2556 | 51 | 734 | 530 | 1241 |
| R2 | 0.2309 | 0.0691 | 0.2652 | 0.3554 | 0.2344 |
| F | 116.2*** | 0.505*** | 40.21*** | 44.33*** | 56.71*** |

Note: Standard errors in parentheses* p < 0.1, ** p < 0.05, *** p < 0.01. lnTTR represents total tourism revenue.

3.3.2 Regional Heterogeneity of Policy Effects on Tourist Arrivals

This study further examines the regional heterogeneity of the impact of All-for-One Tourism Demonstration Zone establishment on total tourist arrivals. The results indicate that the pulling effect of establishment of national All-for-One Tourism Demonstration Zone on tourist arrivals also presents prominent regional differences, and its influence intensity is not fully consistent with the tourism revenue effect.

Specifically, the demonstration zone policy exerts the strongest driving effect on the growth of total tourist arrivals in the northeastern region, with a policy coefficient of 0.375, which is significant at the 5% level. It means that policy implementation expands the tourist scale of Northeast China by approximately 37.5% on average. The policy effect in the western region is also significant, with a coefficient of 0.234 and significance at the 5% level, verifying that the establishment of demonstration zones effectively attracts more tourists to western China. The central region also has a significant positive effect, with a coefficient of 0.157, significantly at the 10% level. Nevertheless, although the policy coefficient of the eastern region is positive (0.0882), it fails to pass the significance test, suggesting that at the current stage, the demonstration zone policy plays a relatively limited role in expanding the tourist scale in eastern China.

Notably, the northeastern region presents a significant positive effect on tourist arrivals (coefficient = 0.375, statistically significant), which stands in sharp contrast to its insignificant and negative effect on tourism revenue (coefficient = -0.298). This discrepancy reflects the region's weak conversion capacity for tourism consumption, as well as a structural phenomenon characterized by vigorous tourists yet low economic returns, which deserves further attention. Overall, the All-for-One Tourism

Demonstration Zone policy presents a spatial feature of northward and westward inclination in attracting tourists, and exerts prominent effects on the growth of tourist flows in northeastern and western regions.

Tab 5. The regional difference of policy effect in the construction of comprehensive tourism demonstration areas (number of tourists)

| Variable | overall | northeastern region | eastern region | central region | western region |
|----------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| | lnTNT | lnTNT | lnTNT | lnTNT | lnTNT |
| DID | 0.201*** (0.0552) | 0.375*** (0.1272) | 0.0882 (0.0694) | 0.157* (0.0804) | 0.234** (0.1055) |
| lnIFA | 0.347*** (0.0399) | 0.0826 (0.1945) | 0.359*** (0.0529) | 0.661*** (0.0682) | 0.243*** (0.0674) |
| lnLU | -0.0715 (0.0454) | -0.736*** (0.2489) | -0.326*** (0.0648) | -0.0770 (0.0621) | 0.0826 (0.0811) |
| lnREP | -0.0714 (0.3225) | 0.448 (1.2533) | 0.487 (0.5527) | 0.781 (0.6970) | -0.279 (0.4760) |
| lnGPBR | 0.512*** (0.0543) | 0.368 (0.2265) | 0.280*** (0.0803) | 0.274*** (0.0852) | 0.652*** (0.0899) |
| _cons | -3.961*** (1.3951) | 6.138 (6.1179) | -0.849 (2.3682) | -8.904*** (2.8828) | -4.783** (2.0633) |
| N | 2478 | 49 | 719 | 519 | 1191 |
| R2 | 0.2646 | 0.5413 | 0.4145 | 0.5561 | 0.1746 |
| F | 134.2*** | 7.554*** | 77.30*** | 97.97*** | 37.27*** |

Note: Standard errors in parentheses* p < 0.1, ** p < 0.05, *** p < 0.01. lnTNT represents total tourism arrivals.

4. CONCLUSIONS

The policy effects of All-for-One Tourism Demonstration Zone construction are mainly reflected in domestic tourism, while the impacts on inbound tourism are insignificant. The establishment of national All-for-One Tourism Demonstration Zones significantly boosts the growth of domestic tourism revenue, with a coefficient of 0.426 at the 1% significance level. The establishment exerts a positive yet insignificant influence on the growth of inbound tourism revenue, with a coefficient of 0.0918. In addition, the establishment of All-for-One Tourism Demonstration Zones effectively promotes the increase in domestic tourist arrivals, with a coefficient of 0.241, which is statistically significant at the 5% level. Similarly, it presents a positive but insignificant correlation with the growth of inbound tourist arrivals, with a coefficient of 0.212.

The policy effects of All-for-One Tourism Demonstration Zone construction are significant in the central and western regions, but not significant in the northeastern and eastern regions. The establishment of national All-for-One Tourism Demonstration Zones has remarkably promoted the growth of total tourism revenue in the central and western regions, while such effects are not significant in the northeastern and eastern regions. In addition, the establishment greatly drives the increase of total tourist arrivals in the northeastern, central and western regions, with insignificant impact observed in the eastern region.

This paper carries important practical significance for advancing the establishment of All-for-One Tourism Demonstration Zones and realizing the high-quality development of county-level tourism economy.

First, regions should attach importance to the domestic tourism market and foster the inbound tourism market. The construction of demonstration zones mainly focuses on cultivating branded products such as A-level scenic spots and tourist resorts, improving tourism infrastructure, and optimizing tourism service quality. In the future, greater efforts should be made in marketing promotion and product development for the inbound tourism market.

Second, regions should acknowledge regional differences and adopt an industrial integration strategy. The establishment of All-for-One Tourism Demonstration Zones exerts significant positive effects on the central and western regions, whereas the impacts on the eastern and northeastern regions are insignificant. The eastern and northeastern regions need to strengthen the driving capacity of demonstration zone construction, promote the integrated development of tourism with agriculture and industry, and actively develop tourism products, routes and service facilities to meet diversified tourist demands.

Adopting the Propensity Matching and Difference-in-Differences Model, this paper takes China's county-level administrative units as research samples to evaluate the impacts and regional differences of construction of All-for-One Tourism Demonstration Zone on county-level tourism economic development, thereby enriching the theories and methodologies of tourism policy research. There are inherent correlations in regional economic development. This paper focuses on the policy effects of demonstration zones at the county level while neglecting the inter-city connections and spatial interactions. Accordingly, the spatial spillover effects of All-for-One Tourism Demonstration Zones will be regarded as a key research direction in future studies.

Funding: This article was founded by Major Project of National Social Science Foundation of China (No. 24&ZD213).

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Publisher's Note: All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Cano de Mauvensin Fabaré, J. M. (2005). *Turismo cultural: manual del gestor de patrimonio*. Cordoba:Almuzara, 2005
- [2]. Chingarande, A., & Saayman, A. (2018). Critical success factors for tourism-led growth. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 20(6), 800-818. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jtr.2233>.
- [3]. He, J. (2016). Research on the concepts and models of tourism development: With a discussion on the concepts and models of comprehensive tourism development. *Tourism Tribune*, 31(12), 3-5. <https://doi.org/10.3969/j.issn.1002-5006.2016.12.002>
- [4]. Huang, Y., Feng, M., & Li, X. (2025). Not just survive, but thrive: examining livelihood capital, poverty reduction, and sustainable development in ethnic tourism destinations. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*, 66(2), 225-244. <https://doi.org/10.1177/19389655241258999>
- [5]. Kwon, Y., Lim, J., & Kim, E. (2019). Diversifying visitor demand and its impact on Las Vegas's tourism industry during recovery from the Great Recession. *Regional Science Policy & Practice*, 11(6), 955-970. <https://doi.org/10.1111/rsp3.12216>
- [6]. Li, S., Ren, T., Jia, B., & Zhong, Y. (2022). The spatial pattern and spillover effect of the eco-efficiency of regional tourism from the perspective of green development: An empirical study in China. *Forests*, 13(8), 1324. <https://doi.org/10.3390/f13081324>
- [7]. Li, X. J., Zhang, L. Y., & Cui, L. (2013). Comprehensive tourism: Idea innovation on building a world-class tourism destination. *Human Geography*, 28(03): 130-134. <https://doi.org/10.13959/j.issn.1003-2398.2013.03.019>
- [8]. Liao, Z., Zhang, L., & Liang, S. (2023). Spatio-temporal pattern evolution of China's provincial tourism efficiency and development level based on DEA-MI model. *Scientific Reports*, 13(1), 20227. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-023-46884-5>
- [9]. Liu, J. (2016). The background, misunderstandings and starting points of establishing comprehensive tourism. *Tourism Tribune*, 31(12), 7-9. <https://doi.org/10.3969/j.issn.1002-5006.2016.12.004>
- [10]. Liu, J., Wang, Z., & Li, C. (2023). All-for-One tourism demonstration zones and high-quality development of tourism: Evidence from the quasi-natural experiment in China. *Sustainability*, 15(15), 11626. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su151511626>
- [11]. Lu, Q., Liu, Y., Gao, Y., Zhang, Z., Cui, L., & Sun, X. (2023). Realization path of comprehensive tourism in leisure agriculture based on perspective of element flow: A case study of chongqing. *Acta Scientiarum Naturalium Universitatis Pekinensis*, 59(03), 523-531. <https://doi.org/10.13209/j.0479-8023.2023.026>.
- [12]. Lu, W., Lv, Y., Zhou, X., Wu, Y., & Gu, X. (2023). The Impact of Governance Structures on the Distribution of Land Consolidation Benefits in Urban Areas: Case Studies in Ningbo, China. *Land*, 13(1), 46. <https://doi.org/10.3390/land13010046>
- [13]. Ma, Q., & Wang, J. (2025). Construction and network system evaluation of tourism corridors from a comprehensive perspective: A case study of Weinan City. *Economic Geography*, 45(7), 247-254. <https://doi.org/10.15957/j.cnki.jjdl.2025.07.025>
- [14]. Martínez del Vas, G., Puig-Cabrera, M., Cádiz-Gómez, M., & Diego, A. A. D. (2024). Smart management of tourist coastal areas in a reborn tourism era: transitioning from safe to sustainable beaches within the spanish sun and sand model. *Journal of Tourism, Sustainability and Well-being*, 12. <https://doi.org/10.34623/v98m-kf77>
- [15]. Mihalič, T. (2009). Tourism policy and planning: Yesterday, today, and tomorrow. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 36(1), 157-158. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2008.06.011>
- [16]. Moinet, F. (2000). *Le tourisme rural: comment créer et gérer*. Paris: Editions France Agricole, 152-153.

- [17]. Sun, A., Chen, L., Yoshida, K., & Qu, M. (2023). Spatial patterns and determinants of bed and breakfasts in the all-for-one tourism demonstration area of China: A perspective on urban-rural differences. *Land*, 12(9), 1720. <https://doi.org/10.3390/land12091720>
- [18]. Wang, J., Wu, T., He, Z., & Li, M. (2025). The Coupling Coordination and Convergence of New Urbanization and Tourism Economic Development in the Nine Provinces along the Yellow River. *Journal of Resources and Ecology*, 16(3), 642-654. <https://doi.org/10.5814/j.issn.1674-764x.2025.03.004>
- [19]. Wang, L., Shi, P., & Zhang, Y. (2023). Spatial distribution, type structure and driving mechanism of national comprehensive tourism demonstration zone in China. *Geographical Science*, 43(10), 1815-1824. <https://doi.org/10.13249/j.cnki.sgs.2023.10.013>
- [20]. Wang, Y. (2016). Comprehensive tourism requires brand-new thinking. *Tourism Tribune*, 31(12), 9-11. <https://doi.org/10.3969/j.issn.1002-5006.2016.12.005>
- [21]. Wei, C., Wang, Q., & Liu, C. (2020). Research on construction of a cloud platform for tourism information Intelligent Service based on blockchain technology. *Wireless Communications and Mobile Computing*, 2020(1), 8877625. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2020/8877625>
- [22]. Wu, Z. (2020). Exploration and reflection on the innovative development of comprehensive tourism: A case study of Guangdong Province. *Tourism Tribune*, 35(2), 8-10. <https://doi.org/10.19765/j.cnki.1002-5006.2020.02.005>
- [23]. Xing, J., & Shi, P. (2016). From concept to practice: Emphasizing the promotion of comprehensive tourism development through scientific and technological innovation. *Tourism Tribune*, 31(12), 5-7. <https://doi.org/10.3969/j.issn.1002-5006.2016.12.003>
- [24]. Yan, L., Jiang, Y., & Wen, J. (2024). Tourism talent management: empirical research among tourism academics, practitioners, and government officials. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 28(3), 400-416. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2024.2302063>
- [25]. Yang, Z. (2016). The connotation and development stages of comprehensive tourism. *Tourism Tribune*, 31(12), 1-3. <https://doi.org/10.3969/j.issn.1002-5006.2016.12.001>
- [26]. Yue, Q., Zhang, Y., Liao, Y., Liao, L., & Yu, J. (2025). Does Low-Carbon City Transition Empower Tourism Economy? Evidence from China. *Sustainability*, 17(3), 1238. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su17031238>
- [27]. Zhang, H., & Yue, Y. (2016). Rational thinking on comprehensive tourism. *Tourism Tribune*, 31(9), 15-17. <https://doi.org/10.3969/j.issn.1002-5006.2016.09.007>
- [28]. Zhang, L., Marzuki, A., & Liao, Z. (2023). The coordination pattern of tourism efficiency and development level in Guangdong Province under high-quality development. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 10(1). <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-023-02314-5>
- [29]. Zhang, S., Chi, L., Zhang, T., & Wang, Y. (2023). Optimization of Tourism Management Based on Regional Tourism Competitiveness Evaluation: Evidence from Ningxia Hui Autonomous Region, China. *Sustainability*, 15(12), 9591. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su15129591>
- [30]. Zhao, S., Huang, T., & Xi, J. (2022). Understanding the Evolution of Regional Tourism Efficiency: Through the Lens of Evolutionary Economic Geography. *Sustainability*, 14(17), 11042. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su141711042>
- [31]. Zhou, Y., Shen, M., Wu, J., & Wei, X. (2018). Stepping towards holistic tourism: Supply and demand mismatch at tourism destination and possible solutions. *Tourism Tribune*, 33(6), 36-48. <https://doi.org/10.3969/j.issn.1002-5006.2018.06.009>