

URBAN TOURISM STUDIES: A TRANSVERSAL RESEARCH AGENDA

KO KOENS*  AND CLAUDIO MILANO† 

*Inholland University of Applied Sciences, Rotterdam, the Netherlands

†Department of Social Anthropology, University of Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain

The debate on tourism in cities, both academically and in practice, has for a long time taken place in relative isolation from urban studies. Tourism is mostly addressed as an external agent and economic force that puts pressure on cities rather than as an interdependent part of city systems. The recent debate on city touristification and excessive dependence on the visitor economy, as well as the associated processes of exclusion, and displacement of local city users, serves to highlight how tourism is an integral part of urban developments. A wider urban perspective is needed to understand the processes underlying the tourism phenomena and more transdisciplinary perspectives are required to analyze the urban (tourism) practices. The current article seeks to contribute to such a perspective through a discussion of the literature on urban and tourism studies, and related fields such as gentrification, mobilities, and touristification. Based on this, theoretical reflections are provided regarding a more integral perspective to tourism and urban development in order to engage with a transversal urban tourism research agenda.

Key words: Urban tourism; Touristification; Gentrification; Transdisciplinary; Research agenda

Introduction: The Interwoven Relation Between Tourism and Urban Spaces

Since the 1980s urban spaces and cities have begun to play a leading role in the context of contemporary international tourism, through a gradual and concurrent urbanization of tourist experiences and a touristification of cities. With regards to the former, prior to the pandemic, visitor numbers in

cities grew faster than tourist numbers to other types of destinations (UNWTO, 2018), and many cities have bounced back very quickly post-COVID-19 (WTTC, 2022). The rise and continuing popularity of city destinations can be largely attributed to increased accessibility (e.g., low-cost carriers) and the rise of short-term rental services (Koens et al., 2018). Low-cost carriers have been successful in disrupting a transportation sector, which already

Address correspondence to Ko Koens, Inholland University of Applied Sciences, Posthumalaan 90, 3072 AG, Rotterdam, the Netherlands. E-mail: ko@kokoens.com

was rooted in a growth paradigm. Thus, they revolutionized the European urban tourism segment, but also helped the city-break segment to take off worldwide since the turn of the millennium (e.g., through companies such as AirAsia, Gol, Volaris, LAN) (Nilsson, 2020). Platform capitalism and short-term rental services on their part have provided alternative means of income for real estate investors and increased the range of hospitality options in cities for visitors (Guttentag, 2019).

Alongside the urbanization of tourism came the touristification of cities. As Mullins (1991) noted, cities are increasingly built around the supply and consumption of a wide variety of goods and services for fun, pleasure, relaxation, and recreation rather than exclusively for basic needs such as housing, health care, and education. Increasingly, emphasis is put on making urban spaces more attractive and scenic, while the advent of the so-called “experience economy” has also led to more facilities aimed at providing hospitality and leisure. Historical centers, monuments, and new cultural references are now a fixed part of the urban experience. In fact, urban spaces increasingly resemble so-called “experienescares”; “stylized landscapes that are strategically planned, laid out and designed” for experience seeking consumers both local and from elsewhere (O’Dell & Billing, 2005, p. 16).

Within a governance context, the emblematic changes in the political economy of cities have been described as the leap from an economic structure based on liberalism principles to one that is based on a neoliberal philosophy that eschews any intervention in the market. The accompanying regulatory transformations have led to a spatial and symbolic restructuring of contemporary cities (Harvey, 2007). In this context, the status of cities as places of exoticism within the entertainment industry (Sassen & Roost, 1999) as well as the rise of creative tourism (Peck, 2005) and urban placemaking interventions (Lew, 2017) that bring together tourists and locals, allowed for tourism to grow relatively unhindered. In addition, the perceived ability of tourism to help cities to cope with economic crises in other sectors led to a competition between cities for tourism and the introduction of aggressive policies to make cities more attractive for visitors (Judd, 2015). These examples highlight tourism’s remarkable capacity to shape urban

neoliberal policies (Mosedale, 2016) and the application of concepts such as sense of place (Massey, 2005) to allow existing consumer-oriented (public) spaces to be converted into destinations that attract, among others, talented workers, international students, digital nomads, and short-term visitors.

After decades of relative tourism prosperity, the discussion on tourism impacts became more critical in the second decade of the 21st century, as social movement groups and other grassroots organizations started to criticize unbridled tourism growth policies. The fact that these groups often focused on other elements rather than tourism per se has made clear that there is a need to take a broader perspective on tourism development (Milano, Novelli, & Cheer, et al., 2019). What may be described as tourism problems can at least partially be attributed to broader city developments and urban policies. Subsequent discussions on city touristification and excessive dependence on the visitor economy, as well as the associated processes of exclusion, displacement of local city users, have served to further highlight the need to view tourism as integrally entwined with urban society. During the COVID-19 pandemic council budgets of several major European cities came under pressure, because of a lack of income through tourist taxes (Jiricka-Pürerer et al., 2020; Van der Borg, 2022). Also based on the prepandemic criticism on negative tourism externalities, at least in some cities, a shift in narrative from destination marketing to a broader urban governance perspective that may even include demarketing of touristified places (Tourism Quest, 2023).

The relation between tourism and cities thus may be fluid and changing but it is always present in different shapes and forms. The overarching impacts of tourism on urban spaces and societies go beyond “tourism,” while the tourism system, its stakeholders, and its supply chains are woven into the wider city fabric. This suggests that to understand the role of tourism in a city, including how this may lead to issues and impacts, as well as so-called over- and undertourism, it is necessary to analyze tourism from a wider transversal and transdisciplinary urban perspective that views tourism as an integral part of city development and city life (Milano & Koens, 2022). The current article seeks to contribute to such an approach by looking at the evolution and relations

between urban and tourism studies, and related fields such as gentrification, mobilities, and critical placemaking. Based on this, an initial research agenda for urban tourism studies is set out that can facilitate a wider debate on the reactivation and development of tourism in a (post-)COVID-19 pandemic context.

The Evolution of the Encounter of Urban and Tourism Studies

Contributions From Tourism Studies

The emphasis in tourism research has long been on businesses rather than systems, thus ignoring the fundamental societal embeddedness of tourism (Gerritsma, 2019). This is not to say that tourism academics have never been involved with wider debates of place and space. Recent literature has pointed to the engagement of tourism scholars in these issues (Milano & Koens, 2022). For instance, the early work of tourism scholars was largely explorative, but that during the 1980s it also began to include elements of activism. Of note here is the work on unplanned tourism development in Spanish coastal regions, where mass tourism development wreaked havoc on local communities, thus highlighting the fragility of such areas (Gaviria, 1974; Jurdao, 1979). As tourism as a field of research was not well established then, there was a strong input from other disciplines. This included ideas from anthropology (Boissevain, 1979), economics (Butler, 1980), and sociology (Doxey, 1975), but also geography and urban planning (Pearce, 1979). In the late 1970s and 1980s tourism analysis became more distinct, although authors continued to argue tourism was a social activity that requires a systemic approach (Krippendorf, 1987; Leiper, 1979), or the need to relate tourism development to wider urban planning debates (e.g., Jansen-Verbeke, 1986; Meethan, 1996).

The emphasis of academic research shifted more towards managing tourism in the mid to late 1990. Rather than focusing on inherent structural and political issues that come with tourism, attention was put on ways of limiting negative effects of tourism and the potential ability of tourism growth as a force for good. In this case the benefits of tourism were most commonly economic in nature or related to job creation (Saarinen, 2006; Scheyvens,

2007). Several authors in tourism studies around this time noted that this could be interpreted as an evolution towards disciplinary status akin to business studies (e.g., Goeldner, 1988).

Others warned against this, reiterating that “scientific” tourism knowledge development would require a holistic perspective where a tourism epistemology is developed as part of a larger multidisciplinary context (Jafari, 2001). “If tourism studies is overwhelmingly populated by researchers of the business of tourism, tourism studies becomes the business of tourism. But from a theoretical perspective, tourism studies can be whatever aspect of tourism might be carved out” (Tribe, 1997, p. 655). An excessive focus on tourism as an (economic) discipline, critics warned, would lead tourism scholarship to become increasingly self-referential, and risked losing touch with broader societal debates (Tribe, 1997). These turned out to be prophetic words, as in a study by Wardle and Buckley (2014) it was found that the vast majority of tourism studies were published in tourism journals and that only a limited group of scholars published outside of tourism journals. In addition, the economic-centric perspective of tourism has held back tourism scholars from engaging in (critical) dialogue with other disciplines, thus limiting the “scientific” quality of tourism publications (Seraphin & Korstanje, 2019).

In the context of urban tourism, a number of seminal publications at the time already warned against an such an inward looking and economically oriented approach, instead emphasizing the need to engage more with wider urban planning literature (Ashworth & Page, 2011; Pearce, 2001). However, this has not necessarily happened, as exemplified by the work on short-term rental services, which relate both to planning and housing debates, as well as tourism. Up until around 2015 most of the work on short-term rentals was published by academics outside of the realm of tourism (e.g., in urban planning journals). Since then, however, works have been published more and more in tourism journals (González-Pérez, 2019; Ioannides et al., 2019; Rodríguez-Pérez de Arenaza et al., 2022), even when there is some overlap from academics from outside of tourism (Dann et al., 2018; Guttentag, 2019; Wachsmuth & Weisler, 2018).

At the same time, attention to urban tourism has increased in recent years, and the literature on the

topic has diversified, which has opened up possibilities for greater engagement with other research areas (Page & Duignan, 2023). Of particular note is the work to implement complexity and systems theory within tourism to counter the reductionist approaches that have dominated tourism management. Its findings suggest the need for a change of attitude towards managing tourism and focusing on developing more dynamic and adaptive methods and concepts to deal with the inherent complexity of tourism (Baggio, 2008). Such perspectives have increased in prominence since the rise of the debates regarding overtourism, a discussion that initially came to the fore because of issues relating to urban tourism in Europe (Milano, Cheer, & Novelli, 2019). The increasing resistance to tourism growth and tourism impacts in cities that led to the term overtourism being popularized were not limited to the tourism industry and the geographical spaces that have historically hosted most visitors (e.g., city centers, specific tourist attractions). Indeed, several of the early key publications on the topic already pointed to the need to relate tourism issues to those in urban design (Panayiotopoulos & Pisano, 2019) and urban planning (Koens et al., 2018; Milano & Mansilla, 2018), particularly with regards to the sharing of urban spaces, perceived impacts, and the political economy of city tourism, and interest in these topics appears to be still gaining ground.

Recently, the urban tourism debate has, for example, started to engage more with “tourism off the beaten track” and the role of tourism in secondary and tertiary destinations. Visitors seek to integrate more with local life and experiences are created that can be enjoyed by both tourists and residents (Frisch et al., 2019; Koens, 2021; Maitland, 2008; Maitland & Newman, 2014; Novy & Hunin, 2009; Rogerson, 2016). The main objective within this kind of tourism is the supposedly authentic and unspoiled places, which is seen as attractive in a world where city centers of globalized tourist cities become more and more similar. Platform capitalism has also fostered the touristification of everyday life in nontourist areas by bringing hospitality infrastructures beyond the city centers. The absence of legislation and regulations in the 2010s has allowed this proliferation, conversion, and specialization of the economic urban fabric towards tourism.

Contributions From Urban Studies

Tourism academia may have developed largely in isolation from wider urban governance processes and urban studies. However, urbanists also made few efforts to engage with tourism. This was strikingly visible during the bicentennial United Nations Conference on Housing and Sustainable Urban Development (Habitat III) in Quito in 2016. The conference served to launch the New Urban Agenda as a shared inclusive vision of cities for all. Of the hundreds of sessions that were held, only one explicitly mentioned tourism, and this had been organized by UNWTO. In fact, in the entire New Urban Agenda, the word tourism is mentioned only once and that is as a sector that can support city economies (UNHABITAT, 2016). It is not just urban practitioners that paid little attention to tourism, academics in urban studies have also long ignored tourism as a specific concept for understanding city life (Law, 1992). This may have been due to the dispersed nature of tourism, or tourism’s reputation for having few negative environmental and economic impacts (Holjevac, 2003). Whatever the reason may be, little research dealing explicitly with tourism has been published in journals focusing on urban studies (Newman, 2002).

That is not to say that urban tourism was never discussed in urban studies. Urban scholars already noted in the late 1990s that tourism should not be studied as a separate entity or sector in the city (Judd, 1995; Judd & Fainstein, 1999). Rather than studying tourism per se, work has been done on topics that tourism relates to, such as the quality of life in cities, the (over)use of infrastructure and public spaces, urban livelihoods, the urban housing crisis, unequal distribution of urban benefits, managing heritage, dealing with waste, and climate adaptation (Beswick et al., 2016; Brambilla et al., 2013; Buehler & Pucher, 2011; Ravazzoli & Torricelli, 2017).

To highlight how urban studies’ literature has engaged with issues that are central to tourism, it is useful to look at two concepts. The first of these deals with the Creative City, which was developed by Charles Landry in the late 1980s, and refined in the book “The Creative City: A Toolkit for Urban Innovators” (Landry, 2012a). It mainly deals with the role of culture, creative activities, and people in

the city development process. The creative capacity of a place is said to be “shaped by its history, its culture, its physical setting and its overall operating conditions,” which determines its character and “mindset.” On this matter, a contrast can be made between a paradigm that focuses on the “hardware” or physical structures of a city, and “creative city making,” which emphasizes the need to also understand the software – “how a place feels, its capacity to foster interactions and to develop and harness skill and talent” (Landry, 2012b, p. 10). Culture and social relations are seen as key for a high quality of life, but they are also viewed as having the ability to act as a catalyst for change, transformation, and renewal of urban spaces.

To relate this back to tourism, such thinking can be observed in practical terms in the “culture-led generation” programs that have become abundant in European cities, where cultural or creative quarters have been actively developed, and formed the basis of city marketing strategies to develop a place identity that attracts specific groups of presumably desirable tourists (Baycan & Girard, 2016). An underlying idea within this work is that the diversity of experiences and multiplicity of stakeholders can foster innovation to help further the quality of spaces, places, and governance in cities (Bradford, 2004), albeit that little clarity is provided of how this can be achieved. The creative tourism literature has built on from this but has also provided a much-needed critical perspective on the hype that sometimes surrounds the “creative cities” concept (Richards, 2011). Possibly because of this, the work on creative tourism only finds its way back into urban studies to a limited extent and there is only limited engagement between the two bodies of literature.

A second example stems from the work of Richard Sennett, whose discussions on city life and city design have been highly influential in the past 20 years. Sennett focused on social experiences in cities and the sense of estrangement that modern-day cities may put on its inhabitants. His work highlighted the need for different city users to engage with each other and cooperate to create better urban spaces, as he argued for greater reciprocity and identification with the other in the urban commons (Sennett, 2019). At the same time, he highlighted the perpetual difficulty of ensuring such interaction

when engaging with the design of the city (Sennett, 2003, 2013). Sennett also has engaged with ways of innovating processes of planning. Following in the footsteps of Jane Jacobs, he contrasted top-down planning practices with the lived experience of daily life. He noted that city making is too rigid and that alternative, undetermined city-making practices may lead to more life-enhancing designs. This would include design interventions that allow for unplanned activities and open-ended urban configurations, again with the aim of increasing interaction and creating a stronger sense of belonging to all that make use of the city (Sennett, 2019; Sennett & Sendra, 2020).

Finally, Harvey’s (2012) analysis on the role of urbanization and the attempts to create new urban commons as well as the shaping of cities within the global capitalist system highlighted the role of tourism and the cultural-based industries as key for urban life and the urban political economy. Such work follows on from the Lefebvrian analysis with regards to the right to the city in which he already highlighted the importance of developing a city for all. Lefebvre’s lens has also been applied for the analysis of the roles and practices of the urban spatial dimensions of platform capitalism and urban activism and politics of the inhabitant (Farmaki et al., 2020; Purcell, 2002). These ideas resonate with tourism, for example with concepts like “city hospitality” and “hospitable public spaces for all” (Koens, Melissen et al., 2021; Morton & Johnson, 2019), which have difficulty finding their way into the urban planning literature (Pasquinelli & Trunfio, 2020).

While tourism studies and urban studies have developed rather independently in the past 20 years, stronger transdisciplinary perspectives are increasingly advocated. As tourism has become increasingly enmeshed in urban systems over the past 20 years, a dispersed perspective appears insufficient to address key topics like touristification, transnational gentrification, and over- and undertourism.

Theoretical Encounters Between Urban and Tourism Studies

Given that the expansion of the visitor economy strongly relates to developments and discourses that deal with housing, ecology, and mobilities, an

increasing interest of urban scholars in tourism is desirable. Comprehensive perspectives on destinations that move beyond tourism as an economic force are required to shed light on the complex relationship tourism development has with mobilities, housing, planning, and architecture (A. Smith & Graham, 2019). The post-COVID-19 debates on excessive dependence on the visitor economy, and the associated processes of exclusion and displacement of local city users, further highlighted tourism is an integral part of city development (Milano & Koens, 2022).

The wide range of local actors and stakeholders who are negatively affected by tourism may be a reason why urban scholars started to look more into tourism externalities. Initially such externalities focused on European cities, particularly within the overtourism debate, but the interest on tourism externalities in an urban setting now also can be observed within an Asian context (Sheng et al., 2017; Yip & Tran, 2016). The majority of such work is still authored by tourism academics, but publications in nontourism journals are increasing (e.g., Cocola-Gant & Lopez-Gay, 2020; Pasquinelli & Trunfio, 2020; Sigler & Wachsmuth, 2020). The growing awareness with regards to tourism within the urban literature is also suggested by an increase in the number of articles that contain the word “tourism” in their title. A simple search on Science direct revealed that up until 2012 an average of 14 articles per year did so. However, since then the number has shot up. From 2013 onwards, an average of 56 articles had tourism in the title and in the past 3 years this was already 86. While this is certainly no conclusive evidence, it does point towards a trend of increasing attention to tourism.

The discussion surrounding short-term rental services appears to be a key development on this matter. Particularly in the Mediterranean and Eastern Europe, these debates do not remain within the confines of tourism. Instead, tourism externalities are related to existing debates of housing shortages, exclusion, and disempowerment of certain groups of residents (Mansilla & Milano, 2019; Pobric & Robinson, 2019; Roelofsen, 2018; M. K. Smith et al., 2018). In the last decades, tourism as a driver of gentrification processes is increasingly considered as a key issue, also due to the increase of foreigners’ enclaves in the contemporary tourist city

(Cocola-Gant, 2018; Cocola-Gant & Lopez-Gay, 2020; González-Pérez, 2019; Sequera & Nofre, 2018). The linkages between tourism, gentrification, and urban change require closer consideration. Conceptual frameworks with regards to gentrification that have been used by urban studies may be incomplete when analyzing the different forces and actors that play a key role in the touristification and/or tourism gentrification of urban places (Gotham, 2005; Sequera & Nofre, 2018). More specifically the double dichotomy speculation-expulsion and gentrification-displacement in itself is not sufficient to explore in detail the phenomena of touristification in urban settings. A better conceptual and theoretical framework to explore touristification and gentrification might consider the central role of tourism and urbanism in post-industrial societies landscapes (Cocola-Gant, 2018).

A useful starting point for such discussions can be the concept of placemaking, which exists in both urban studies (Courage et al., 2021), as well as tourist studies (Richards, 2017), even when both are interpreted in different ways. Within urban studies the emphasis has historically been on creating a built environment that improves residents’ lives by putting people central when developing places. In tourism, on the other hand, the concept is commonly linked with a rethink of the relationship between people and place, as different types of city users (e.g., residents, visitors, commuters) need to not only relate to a physical place but also to each other (Richards, 2021). This body of work is mostly aligned with what has been termed “creative placemaking” in urban and regional planning. It is perhaps not surprising that the tourism placemaking literature therefore relates strongly with creative tourism (Markusen & Gadwa, 2010; Richards, 2020). Increasingly, though, publications, both in the tourism and urban studies literature, suggest that there is much to gain from a deeper understanding of the different ways of interaction between tourism and placemaking for daily life (e.g., Lew, 2017; Mansilla & Milano, 2019; Strydom et al., 2018).

This opens possibilities for new work, but also to revisit earlier work from within urban studies and urban planning, for example, with regards to the mixed use development of urban places (Jacobs, 1961), or the work that emphasizes the need for

more open forms of planning where citizens and planners (and visitors) experiment together to create a more livable city (Sennett, 2019). With regards to such experimentation, in tourism literature there is a strong increase of design-based research, which builds upon techniques and methods that may have been more common in urban studies but are now also applied to create experiences that are both engaging and provide benefits for destinations (Koens, Smit, & Melissen, 2021; Stienmetz et al., 2020; Tussyadiah, 2014).

One highly important theoretical perspective that has become a poster child for what can be gained from a more transdisciplinary approach between urban and tourism studies is the highly successful and now well-known mobilities paradigm, which provides a different lens to frame issues that are commonly associated with tourism (Cresswell, 2006; Hannam et al., 2014; Sheller & Urry, 2006). One of the reasons for the success of the mobilities paradigm is that it has added a layer of complexity to better appreciate how places are performed and consumed. The value of this has come to fruition in recent years, as it has great benefits when discussing new forms of mobility such as digital nomadism, residential tourism, or the international students living as temporary residents (Milano & Koens, 2022).

The burgeoning literature on critical place branding provides another possibility for cross-fertilization. It may lead to new economic opportunities based on place-based value creation by reinforcing and representing assets of a place in cohesive matter, but there is also a need to critically engage with governance on this matter. As critics of place branding have pointed out, brands are not neutral and there are potential democratic deficits with regards to governance when spatial planning and place branding intertwine (Kavaratzis & Hatch, 2021; Van Assche et al., 2020). Similarly, the regenerative debate that now seems to have come in fashion in tourism studies could well benefit from the discussions that have taken place on the matter in urban studies for more than 10 years (du Plessis, 2012; Girardet, 2010). Undoubtedly there are lessons to be learned here to prevent the concept being oversimplified or appropriated by industry to continue business as usual. The same can be said about smart discourses, which tourism scholars are increasingly starting to engage with (Buhalis, 2019; Shafiee

et al., 2019). In doing so, relatively little notion appears to be taken of critical work that has been developed by urban scholars investigating Smart Cities (Cardullo & Kitchin, 2019; Vanolo, 2014), even when this may provide useful input when it comes to the limited success of smart tourism solutions or issues with digital platform capitalism.

Conclusion: Towards a Transversal Research Agenda of Urban Tourism

While many early scholars on tourism emphasized the need for more holistic and systemic perspectives, (Boissevain, 1979; Leiper, 1979; Pearce, 1979), it can be argued that progress has been limited. Many publications today still focus on identifying and analyzing potential and benefits and negative impacts directly related to tourism, with similar results as those found by academics who did similar work in the early 1990s (see, e.g., Law, 1992). Few works problematize tourism practices in urban settings in a critical framework that analyzes the political economy of urban tourism and the broader approach of underlying material and symbolic structures. If anything, the overtourism debate and COVID-19 has shown how crucial it is to face the challenge of contemporary tourism within a wider transdisciplinary urban research agenda. The contemporary challenges of urban tourism cannot be dealt with using traditional economically oriented quantitative models of tourism management and planning. Instead, new perspectives and tools are needed to deal with the complexities and realities of tourism economics and mobilities within contemporary cities.

The more transdisciplinary debates that have sprung up in recent years have provided new frames of reference and perspectives to view tourism in a more holistic way. A new research agenda on urban touristification is needed to overcome the incomplete analysis on touristification and gentrification as well as to address the intricate study of tourism in urban settings (Sequera & Nofre, 2018). Such work can build on transdisciplinary, critical, and systemic tourism perspectives that have existing in the tourism literature for many years (e.g., Leiper, 1979; Meethan, 1996; Tribe, 1997). A transversal perspective could provide new insights with regards to several key debates in tourism, as it provides a

richer pallet of perspectives to understand the processes underlying urban tourism. For overtourism and overcrowding, it might help clarify where different streams of city users meet, the symbolic appropriation of public spaces, where interests clash, and how physical and social structures in cities can be designed to address issues when local city users and tourists engage with each other (Crick, 1989). The use of (public) space and the cities model is another topic that would strongly benefit from transversal research that appreciates different ways in which city users want to engage with space and place. Naturally, the climate emergency and urban political ecology also would benefit from such a perspective. These issues are far too complex to investigate only through an urban or tourism lens. Such a perspective may help generate greater attention to the imminent crises that many tourist cities will face.

A transversal research agenda would need to consider critical perspectives that emphasize the importance of socioeconomic structural inequalities, the labor debate, the class struggle within the urban context, and externalities that come with tourism from a wider political economy of urban tourism perspective. After all, similar inequalities have existed in urban design and development for over 50 years, and they have been enlarged by tourism activities (Meethan, 1996). In recent times, heightened focus on touristification within the political agendas of urban social movements underscores the crucial consideration in addressing these concerns. Of course, there are many more topics where a transversal perspective could be beneficial or where such a perspective is already developing. The transdisciplinary body of work that may come from this perspective could help to engage more seriously with urban tourism related practices and externalities. Such work might make also academic contribution more relevant and impactful for practitioners, as well as scholars from different disciplines, given that it is likely to better reflect the realities of tourism in practice. In this way it can support the development of novel insights and perspectives that push the boundaries of what we call urban tourism research.


Acknowledgments

Grant EU HORIZON 2020, SMARTDEST project under the Grant Agreement No. 870753.

Grant RYC2021-032437-IbyMCIN/AEI/10.13039/501100011033 and by the European Union Next GenerationEU/PRTR.

ORCID

Ko Koens:  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2803-0098>

Claudio Milano:  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4349-367X>

References

- Ashworth, G. J., & Page, S. J. (2011). Urban tourism research: Recent progress and current paradoxes. *Tourism Management*, 32(1), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2010.02.002>
- Baggio, R. (2008). Symptoms of complexity in a tourism system. *Tourism Analysis*, 13(1), 1–20.
- Baycan, T., & Girard, L. F. (2016). *Sustainable city and creativity: Promoting creative urban initiatives*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315611464>
- Beswick, J., Alexandri, G., Byrne, M., Vives-Miró, S., Fields, D., Hodkinson, S., & Janoschka, M. (2016). Speculating on London's housing future. *City*, 20(2), 321–341. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13604813.2016.1145946>
- Boissevain, J. (1979). The impact of tourism on a dependent island: Gozo, Malta. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 6(1), 76–90. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383\(79\)90096-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383(79)90096-3)
- Bradford, N. (2004). *Creative cities: Structured policy dialogue report* (Research Report F/45). Canadian Policy Research Networks Inc. https://oaresource.library.carleton.ca/cprn/31340_en.pdf
- Brambilla, M., Michelangeli, A., & Peluso, E. (2013). Equity in the city: On measuring urban (ine)quality of life. *Urban Studies*, 50(16), 3205–3224. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098013484539>
- Buehler, R., & Pucher, J. (2011). Making public transport financially sustainable. *Transport Policy*, 18(1), 126–138. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tranpol.2010.07.002>
- Buhalis, D. (2019). Technology in tourism—from information communication technologies to eTourism and smart tourism towards ambient intelligence tourism: A perspective article. *Tourism Review*, 75(1), 267–272. <https://doi.org/10.1108/TR-06-2019-0258>
- Butler, R. (1980). The concept of a tourist area cycle of evolution: Implications for management of resources. *The Canadian Geographer/Le Géographe Canadien*, 24, 5–12.
- Cardullo, P., & Kitchin, R. (2019). Smart urbanism and smart citizenship: The neoliberal logic of 'citizen-focused' smart cities in Europe. *Environment and Planning C: Politics and Space*, 37(5), 813–830.
- Cocola-Gant, A. (2018). Tourism gentrification. In L. Lees & M. Phillips (Eds.), *Handbook of gentrification studies* (pp. 281–293). Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Cocola-Gant, A., & Lopez-Gay, A. (2020). Transnational gentrification, tourism and the formation of 'foreign

- only' enclaves in Barcelona. *Urban Studies*, 57(15), 3025–3043. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098020916111>
- Courage, C., Borrup, T., Rosaria Jackson, M., Legge, K., McKeown, A., Platt, L., & Schupbach, J. (Eds.). (2021). *The Routledge handbook of placemaking*. Routledge. <https://www.routledge.com/The-Routledge-Handbook-of-Placemaking/Courage-Borrup-Jackson-Legge-Mckeown-Platt-Schupbach/p/book/9780367220518#>
- Cresswell, T. (2006). *On the move: Mobility in the modern western world*. Taylor & Francis.
- Crick, M. (1989). Representations of international tourism in the social sciences: Sun, sex, sights, savings, and serenity. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 18(1), 307–344.
- Dann, D., Teubner, T., & Weinhardt, C. (2018). Poster child and guinea pig—Insights from a structured literature review on Airbnb. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 31(1), 427–473. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-03-2018-0186>
- Doxey, G. V. (1975). A causation theory of visitor-resident irritants: Methodology and research inference. In *Travel and Tourism Research Associations Sixth Annual Conference Proceedings* (pp. 195–198). Travel Research Association.
- du Plessis, C. (2012). Towards a regenerative paradigm for the built environment. *Building Research & Information*, 40(1), 7–22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09613218.2012.628548>
- Farmaki, A., Christou, P., & Saveriades, A. (2020). A Lefebvrian analysis of Airbnb space. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 80, 102806. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2019.102806>
- Frisch, T., Sommer, C., Stoltenberg, L., & Stors, N. (Eds.). (2019). *Tourism and everyday life in the contemporary city* (1st ed.). Routledge.
- Gaviria, M. (1974). *España a Go-Go: Turismo charter y neocolonialismo del espacio [Spain to Go-Go: Charter tourism and neocolonialism of space]*. Ediciones Turner.
- Gerritsma, R. (2019). Overcrowded Amsterdam: Striving for a balance between trade, tolerance and tourism. In C. Milano, J. M. Cheer, & M. Novelli (Eds.), *Overtourism: Excesses, discontents and measures in travel and tourism* (pp. 125–147). CABI. <https://doi.org/10.1079/9781786399823.0125>
- Girardet, H. (2010). *Regenerative cities*. <https://www.osti.gov/etdeweb/biblio/21530017>
- Goeldner, C. R. (1988). The evaluation of tourism as an industry and a discipline. *Paper presented at the International Conference for Tourism Educators mimeo*, Guildford. University of Surrey.
- González-Pérez, J. M. (2019). The dispute over tourist cities. Tourism gentrification in the historic Centre of Palma (Majorca, Spain). *Tourism Geographies*, 22(1), 171–191. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616688.2019.1586986>
- Gotham, K. F. (2005). Tourism gentrification: The case of New Orleans' vieux carre (French Quarter). *Urban Studies*, 42(7), 1099–1121.
- Guttentag, D. (2019). Progress on Airbnb: A literature review. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Technology*, 10(4), 814–844. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JHTT-08-2018-0075>
- Hannam, K., Butler, G., & Paris, C. M. (2014). Developments and key issues in tourism mobilities. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 44, 171–185. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2013.09.010>
- Harvey, D. (2007). *A brief history of neoliberalism*. Oxford University Press.
- Harvey, D. (2012). *Rebel cities: From the right to the city to the urban revolution*. Verso Books.
- Holjevac, I. A. (2003). A vision of tourism and the hotel industry in the 21st century. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 22(2), 129–134. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0278-4319\(03\)00021-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0278-4319(03)00021-5)
- Ioannides, D., Röslermaier, M., & Van Der Zee, E. (2019). Airbnb as an instigator of 'tourism bubble' expansion in Utrecht's Lombok neighbourhood. *Tourism Geographies*, 21(5), 822–840.
- Jacobs, J. (1961). *The death and life of great American cities*. Knopf Doubleday Publishing Group.
- Jafari, J. (2001). The scientification of tourism. In V. Smith & M. Brent (Eds.), *Hosts and guests revisited: Tourism issues of the 21st century* (pp. 28–41). Cognizant Communication Corporation.
- Jansen-Verbeke, M. (1986). Inner-city tourism: Resources, tourists and promoters. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 13(1), 79–100. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383\(86\)90058-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383(86)90058-7)
- Jiricka-Pürner, A., Brandenburg, C., & Pröbstl-Haider, U. (2020). City tourism pre- and post-covid-19 pandemic—messages to take home for climate change adaptation and mitigation? *Journal of Outdoor Recreation and Tourism*, 31, 100329.
- Judd, D. R. (1995). Promoting tourism in US cities. *Tourism Management*, 16(3), 175–187.
- Judd, D. R. (2015). *The infrastructure of play: Building the tourist city*. Routledge.
- Judd, D. R., & Fainstein, S. S. (1999). *The tourist city*. Yale University Press.
- Jurdao, F. (1979). *España en venta: compra de suelos por extranjeros y colonización de campesinos en la Costa del Sol [Spain for sale: Purchase of land by foreigners and colonization of farmers on the Costa del Sol]*. Ayuso.
- Kavaratzis, M., & Hatch, M. J. (2021). The elusive destination brand and the ATLAS wheel of place brand management. *Journal of Travel Research*, 60(1), 3–15. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287519892323>
- Koens, K. (2021). *Reframing urban tourism*. Inaugural Lecture, Hogeschool Inholland, Rotterdam. https://pure.buas.nl/files/15652793/koens_2021_inaugural_lecture.pdf
- Koens, K., Melissen, F., Mayer, I., & Aall, C. (2021). The smart city hospitality framework: Creating a foundation for collaborative reflections on overtourism that support destination design. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*, 19, 100376. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdmm.2019.100376>

- Koens, K., Postma, A., & Papp, B. (2018). Is Overtourism Overused? Understanding the Impact of Tourism in a City Context. *Sustainability*, 10(12), 4384. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su10124384>
- Koens, K., Smit, B., & Melissen, F. (2021). Designing destinations for good: Using design roadmapping to support pro-active destination development. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 89, 103233. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2021.103233>
- Krippendorff, J. (1987). Ecological approach to tourism marketing. *Tourism Management*, 8(2), 174–176.
- Landry, C. (2012a). *The creative city: A toolkit for urban innovators*. Routledge.
- Landry, C. (2012b). *The origins & futures of the creative city*. Comedia. <https://www.bol.com/nl/nl/p/the-origins-futures-of-the-creative-city/9200000032413914/>
- Law, C. M. (1992). Urban tourism and its contribution to economic regeneration. *Urban Studies*, 29(3–4), 599–618. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00420989220080581>
- Leiper, N. (1979). The framework of tourism: Towards a definition of tourism, tourist, and the tourist industry. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 6(4), 390–407.
- Lew, A. A. (2017). Tourism planning and place making: Place-making or placemaking? *Tourism Geographies*, 19(3), 448–466. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616688.2017.1282007>
- Maitland, R. (2008). Conviviality and everyday life: The appeal of new areas of London for visitors. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 10(1), 15–25. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jtr.621>
- Maitland, R., & Newman, P. (2014). *World tourism cities: Developing tourism off the beaten track*. Taylor & Francis.
- Mansilla, J. A., & Milano, C. (2019). Becoming centre: Tourism placemaking and space production in two neighborhoods in Barcelona. *Tourism Geographies*, 24(4–5), 599–620. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616688.2019.1571097>
- Markusen, A., & Gadwa, A. (2010). Arts and culture in urban or regional planning: A review and research agenda. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 29(3), 379–391. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0739456X09354380>
- Massey, D. (2005). *For space*. SAGE.
- Meethan, K. (1996). Consuming (in) the civilized city. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 23(2), 322–340.
- Milano, C., Cheer, J. M., & Novelli, M. (2019). *Overtourism: Excesses, discontents and measures in travel and tourism*. CABI.
- Milano, C., & Koens, K. (2022). The paradox of tourism extremes; excesses and restraints in times of COVID-19. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 25(2), 219–231. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2021.1908967>
- Milano, C., & Mansilla, J. A. (2018). *Ciudad de vacaciones: Conflictos urbanos en espacios turísticos [Vacation city: Urban conflicts in tourist spaces]*. Pol-len edicions.
- Milano, C., Novelli, M., & Cheer, J. M. (2019). Overtourism and degrowth: A social movements perspective. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 27(12), 1857–1875. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2019.1650054>
- Morton, I. J., & Johnson, J. (2019). Planning for hospitable public spaces and the changing city: A content analysis of the city of Sunderland Unitary Development Plan. *Hospitality & Society*, 9(3), 267–290. https://doi.org/10.1386/hosp_00002_1
- Mosedale, J. (2016). *Neoliberalism and the political economy of tourism*. Routledge.
- Mullins, P. (1991). Tourism urbanization. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 15(3), 326–342
- Newman, H. K. (2002). Race and the tourist bubble in downtown Atlanta. *Urban Affairs Review*, 37(3), 301–321.
- Nilsson, J. H. (2020). Conceptualizing and contextualizing overtourism: The dynamics of accelerating urban tourism. *International Journal of Tourism Cities*, 6(4), 657–671. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJTC-08-2019-0117>
- Novy, J., & Hunin, S. (2009). New tourism (areas) in the “New Berlin.” In R. Maitland & P. Newman (Eds.), *World tourism cities: Developing tourism off the beaten track* (pp. 87–109). Routledge.
- O’Dell, T., & Billing, P. (2005). *Experiencescapes: Tourism, culture and economy*. Copenhagen Business School Press DK.
- Page, S. J., & Duignan, M. (2023). Progress in tourism management: Is urban tourism a paradoxical research domain? Progress since 2011 and prospects for the future. *Tourism Management*, 98, 104737.
- Panayiotopoulos, A., & Pisano, C. (2019). Overtourism dystopias and socialist utopias: Towards an urban armature for Dubrovnik. *Tourism Planning and Development*, 16(4), 393–410.
- Pasquinelli, C., & Trunfio, M. (2020). Reframing urban overtourism through the smart-city lens. *Cities*, 102, 102729. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2020.102729>
- Pearce, D. G. (1979). Towards a geography of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 6(3), 245–272. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383\(79\)90101-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383(79)90101-4)
- Pearce, D. G. (2001). An integrative framework for urban tourism research. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 28(4), 926–946. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383\(00\)00082-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383(00)00082-7)
- Peck, J. (2005). Struggling with the creative class. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 29(4), 740–770.
- Pobric, A., & Robinson, G. M. (2019). Recent urban development and gentrification in post-Dayton Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina. *Cities*, 89, 281–295.
- Purcell, M. (2002). Excavating Lefebvre: The right to the city and its urban politics of the inhabitant. *GeoJournal*, 58(2–3), 99–108.
- Ravazzoli, E., & Torricelli, G. P. (2017). Urban mobility and public space. A challenge for the sustainable liveable city of the future. *The Journal of Public Space*, 2(2), 37–50. <https://doi.org/10.5204/jps.v2i2.91>
- Richards, G. (2011). Creativity and tourism: The state of the art. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 38(4), 1225–1253. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2011.07.008>

- Richards, G. (2017). From place branding to placemaking: The role of events. *International Journal of Event and Festival Management*, 8(1), 8–23. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEFM-09-2016-0063>
- Richards, G. (2020). Designing creative places: The role of creative tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 85, 102922. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2020.102922>
- Richards, G. (2021). Making Places through creative tourism. In N. Duxbury (Ed.), *Cultural sustainability, tourism and development: (Re)articulations in tourism contexts*. Routledge.
- Rodriguez-Perez de Arenaza, D., Hierro, L. Á., & Patiño, D. (2022). Airbnb, sun-and-beach tourism and residential rental prices. The case of the coast of Andalusia (Spain). *Current Issues in Tourism*, 25(20), 3261–3278. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2019.1705768>
- Roelofsens, M. (2018). Exploring the socio-spatial inequalities of Airbnb in Sofia, Bulgaria. *Erdkunde*, 72(4), 313–327. <https://doi.org/10.3112/erdkunde.2018.04.04>
- Rogerson, C. M. (2016). Secondary cities and tourism: The South African record. *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure*, 5(2), 1–12.
- Saarinen, J. (2006). Traditions of sustainability in tourism studies. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 33(4), 1121–1140. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2006.06.007>
- Sassen, S., & Roost, F. (1999). The city: strategic site for the global entertainment industry. In D. R. Judd & S. S. Fainstein (Eds.), *The tourist city* (pp. 143–154). Yale University Press.
- Scheyvens, R. (2007). Exploring the tourism-poverty nexus. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 10(2–3), 231–254.
- Sennett, R. (2003). Cosmopolitanism and the social experience of cities. In S. Vertovec, S. Learmount, & R. Cohen (Eds.), *Conceiving Cosmopolitanism: Theory, context and practice* (pp. 42–47). Oxford University Press.
- Sennett, R. (2013). *Together: The rituals, pleasures and politics of cooperation*. Yale University Press.
- Sennett, R. (2019). *Building and dwelling: Ethics for the city* (Reprint ed.). Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Sennett, R., & Sendra, P. (2020). *Designing disorder: Experiments and disruptions in the city*. Verso.
- Sequera, J., & Nofre, J. (2018). Shaken, not stirred. *City*, 22(5–6), 843–855. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13604813.2018.1548819>
- Seraphin, H., & Korstanje, M. E. (2019). Challenges and dilemmas of tourism studies for the 21st century: Is tourism in bias of disappearance? In V. Ratten, V. Braga, J. Álvarez-GarcíaTourism, & M. De la Cruz del Rio-Rama (Eds.), *Tourism innovation* (pp. 31–44). Taylor & Francis. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429022814-3>
- Shafiee, S., Ghatari, A. R., Hasanzadeh, A., & Jahanyan, S. (2019). Developing a model for sustainable smart tourism destinations: A systematic review. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 31, 287–300. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2019.06.002>
- Sheller, M., & Urry, J. (2006). The new mobilities paradigm. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space*, 38(2), 207–226. <https://doi.org/10.1068/a37268>
- Sheng, L., Li, T., & Wang, J. (2017). Tourism and externalities in an urban context: Theoretical model and empirical evidence. *Cities*, 70, 40–45.
- Sigler, T., & Wachsmuth, D. (2020). New directions in transnational gentrification: Tourism-led, state-led and lifestyle-led urban transformations. *Urban Studies*, 57(15), 3190–3201. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098020944041>
- Smith, A., & Graham, A. (2019). *Destination London: The expansion of the visitor economy*. University of Westminster Press.
- Smith, M. K., Egedy, T., Csizmady, A., Jancsik, A., Olt, G., & Michalkó, G. (2018). Non-planning and tourism consumption in Budapest's inner city. *Tourism Geographies*, 20(3), 524–548. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616688.2017.1387809>
- Stienmetz, J., Kim, J. (Jamie), Xiang, Z., & Fesenmaier, D. R. (2020). Managing the structure of tourism experiences: Foundations for tourism design. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*, 19, 100408. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdmm.2019.100408>
- Strydom, W., Puren, K., & Drewes, E. (2018). Exploring theoretical trends in placemaking: Towards new perspectives in spatial planning. *Journal of Place Management and Development*, 11(2), 165–180. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JPM-11-2017-0113>
- Tourism Quest. (2023). *Amsterdam Sets Up an Urban Tourism Policy Based on Quality in 2023*. <https://tourismquest.com/2023/02/25/amsterdam-sets-up-an-urban-tourism-policy-based-on-quality-in-2023/>
- Tribe, J. (1997). The indiscipline of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 24(3), 638–657.
- Tussyadiah, I. P. (2014). Toward a theoretical foundation for experience design in tourism. *Journal of Travel Research*, 53(5), 543–564. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287513513172>
- UNHABITAT. (2016). New Urban Agenda: Quito Declaration on Sustainable Cities and Human Settlements for All. *United Nations Conference on Housing and Sustainable Urban Development (Habitat III)*. <https://habitat3.org/wp-content/uploads/NUA-English.pdf>
- UNWTO. (2018). *Overtourism? Understanding and managing urban tourism growth beyond perceptions*. <https://doi.org/10.18111/9789284419999>
- Van Assche, K., Beunen, R., & Oliveira, E. (2020). Spatial planning and place branding: Rethinking relations and synergies. *European Planning Studies*, 28(7), 1274–1290. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09654313.2019.1701289>
- Van der Borg, J. (Ed.). (2022). *A research agenda for urban tourism*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Vanolo, A. (2014). Smartmentality: The smart city as disciplinary strategy. *Urban studies*, 51(5), 883–898. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098013494427>

- Wachsmuth, D., & Weisler, A. (2018). Airbnb and the rent gap: Gentrification through the sharing economy. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space*, 50(6), 1147–1170. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0308518X18778038>
- Wardle, C., & Buckley, R. (2014). Tourism citations in other disciplines. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 46, 166–168. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2014.01.002>
- WTTC. (2022). *Cities Economic Impact Report*. <https://wttc.org/research/economic-impact/cities>
- Yip, N. M., & Tran, H. A. (2016). Is ‘gentrification’ an analytically useful concept for Vietnam? A case study of Hanoi. *Urban Studies*, 53(3), 490–505. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098014566364>