

Tilburg University

The smart city hospitality framework

Koens, Ko; Melissen, Frans; Mayer, Igor; Aall, Carlo

Published in:
Journal of Destination Marketing & Management

DOI:
[10.1016/j.jdmm.2019.100376](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdmm.2019.100376)

Publication date:
2021

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

[Link to publication in Tilburg University Research Portal](#)

Citation for published version (APA):
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, Article 100376. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdmm.2019.100376>

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



Research Paper

The Smart City Hospitality Framework: Creating a foundation for collaborative reflections on overtourism that support destination design

Ko Koens^{a,b,*}, Frans Melissen^a, Igor Mayer^a, Carlo Aall^c

^a Breda University of Applied Sciences, PO. Box 3917, 4800, DX, Breda, the Netherlands

^b University of Johannesburg, South Africa

^c Western Norway Research Institute Box 163, NO-6851, Sogndal, Norway

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Destination design
Participatory design
Transition management
Resilience
Urban tourism
Sustainable tourism governance
City hospitality
Overtourism

ABSTRACT

This paper introduces the Smart City Hospitality Framework, which could serve as the foundation for a destination-design-driven approach to urban tourism governance and dealing with overtourism issues. This conceptual framework is purposely designed to stimulate collaborative (informed) reflections on overtourism and urban tourism development that could support system analyses, problem structuring and development of transition agendas and pathways within the context of turning urban tourism into a transition arena that contributes to setting in motion a sustainability transition at city level. It merges the dimensions of sustainable development (environmentally responsible and equitable economic development) and city hospitality (the extent to which the city acts as a good 'host' to all its 'guests', including residents and businesses). Resilience resides at its centre to highlight the temporal aspects of these dimensions, and their interdependencies. To show how this framework can serve as the foundation for destination design efforts in practice, a short description of (experiences with) serious game-playing sessions that employ its logic in six European cities is provided.

1. Introduction

Historically, tourism has been regarded as a relatively low-impact economic activity that contributes to cultural progress within societies and the mostly increased welfare of the resident population. It has also established itself as an integral part of city life, even in cities where the local economy is not dominated by tourism and leisure production (Hall, 2006). At the same time, the sector and its associated challenges and opportunities, has largely been ignored in the discourse on sustainable urban development and urban planning (see e.g. UNHABITAT, 2016). The rapid growth of tourism, however, represents an increasingly important concern within urbanised societies. Increasing pressure on urban destinations as a result of tourism has led to the popularisation of the term 'overtourism', to describe a situation where tourism "excessively influences the perceived quality of life of citizens and/or quality of visitors' experiences in a negative way" (UNWTO, 2018, p. 6). Within this context, it is important to note that this negative impact is not just linked to absolute numbers of tourists but also further aggravated by changes in the behaviour of tourists and physical touristification of cities, with the negative effects of the growing popularity of Airbnb and the like on availability and affordability of housing for residents, and the

rise of so-called Nutella-shops as two well-known examples of the latter (Koens, Postma, & Papp, 2018, 2019; Nieuwland & van Melik, 2018). Simultaneously, the contribution of tourism to local, regional and global environmental issues like pollution, reduced air quality and climate change has become highly problematic and is predicted to increase even further (Aall, 2014).

In dealing with these negative influences, policymakers have so far mostly focused on increasing the capacity of existing systems in efforts to adapt to or mitigate the negative effects of tourism. Tackling the underlying causes of these effects has received less attention both in practice and in literature (Santarius, Walnum, & Aall, 2016). The limitations of relying on these 'effect-oriented' approaches in the context of urban tourism are highlighted by the situation in popular European tourism cities (e.g. Amsterdam, Barcelona, Venice), where opponents question current management strategies and call for limiting visitor numbers (Russo & Scarnato, 2017). What is more, based on increasing mobility and travel worldwide, visitor numbers are expected to rise for the foreseeable future and, thus, so are the negative effects. To be able to cope, cause-oriented strategies and radical solutions may be required to allow city tourism to transform into a structurally more inclusive and sustainable practice (Paavola, Gouldson, & Kluvánková-Oravská, 2009).

* Corresponding author. Breda University of Applied Sciences, PO. Box 3917, 4800, DX, Breda the Netherlands.

E-mail addresses: Koens.k@buas.nl (K. Koens), Melissen.f@buas.nl (F. Melissen), Mayer.i@buas.nl (I. Mayer), caa@vestforsk.no (C. Aall).

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdmm.2019.100376>

Received 29 March 2019; Received in revised form 9 August 2019; Accepted 25 August 2019

Available online 3 September 2019

2212-571X/© 2019 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

“Engagement between tourism and the multiplicity of public and commercial organisations with varying levels of involvement with tourism in urban areas” is required to help develop a coherent vision on tourism that relates to and integrates with wider city development (Edwards, Griffin, & Hayllar, 2008, p. 1033; Koens et al., 2018). This means reconceptualising the role of tourism within urban societies, rather than limiting the discussion to an unbalanced development of tourism and the way tourism policy creates ‘tourist bubbles’ (Füller & Michel, 2014). A deeper analysis of underlying issues is needed, with an eye on creating a more sustainable city to live in for current and future generations. As succinctly put by Pasquinelli (2017, p. 30), “instead of limiting the analysis of urban tourism to its stigmatisation as the ‘big enemy’ of the liveable city, there is a need to produce analytical frameworks able to support the planning, managing, and even engineering of city tourism”.

The current paper answers to this call by focusing on a systemic conceptualisation of sustainable tourism development within the wider context of sustainable urban development. This conceptualisation is based on reflecting on the culmination of findings from a three-year research programme on sustainable urban tourism in six European cities that included an extensive literature review, 60 interviews with key stakeholders, participant observation, a Q-sort study and serious-gaming stakeholder workshops based on a serious game specifically developed for this purpose. This serious game was developed to stimulate collaborative reflections by local stakeholders on sustainable urban tourism futures. This paper introduces the conceptual framework that served as the basis for this game and that could support a destination design-driven approach to tourism governance beyond the scope of this particular research programme. This approach is based on eliciting ‘reflective conversations with the situation at hand’ (Schön, 1983) and collaboratively exploring implications of possible interventions; key elements of a design-thinking perspective (Cross, 2011) on tourism governance. By analysing the impact and role of tourism within the wider context of sustainable development, such an approach can support the transition towards environmentally and socially responsible tourism that actually contributes to long-term prosperity of cities as a whole, in every sense of the word. The underlying premise is that a sustainable city needs to act as a good host to both its visitors and its residents and other local stakeholders. Collaborative informed reflections on the future of urban systems and the role of tourism in this future are essential to help redirect (Fry, 2009) tourism decision- and policymaking, and align it with dominant discourses in a city. In this way it can assist in setting in motion a transition towards systems that are based on principles of long-term resilience and sustainable development of those systems (Wittmayer, Steenbergen, Frantzeskaki, & Bach, 2018).

The paper starts with a discussion of current work on sustainable urban tourism and highlights the necessity to apply a cause-oriented systemic perspective to destination design, which addresses the systemic flaws underlying current tourism systems and the management of these systems. Following this, transformative or transition approaches are introduced as an innovative perspective to further the debate on this matter. Based on this thinking, the Smart City Hospitality Framework is introduced as a reference point for using the principles of a transition approach as the foundation for a destination design-driven approach to urban tourism governance and dealing with overtourism issues, the relevance of which is subsequently discussed in the final section of the paper.

2. The need for a systematic conceptualisation of sustainable urban tourism

Historically, urban tourism has received relatively little attention in the literature on both urban planning and sustainable tourism (Ashworth & Page, 2011). Moreover, the emphasis has long since been put on environmental issues compared to the socio-cultural impacts and prospects (Bramwell, 2015; Buckley, 2012; Ruhanen, Weiler, Moyle, & McLennan, 2015). However, largely due to the increasing attention to what is now called overtourism, the industry and tourism scholars have started to engage more with urban tourism in general and social impacts in particular in recent years

(Koens et al., 2018). Representative tourism organisations have produced reports that describe options to tackle overtourism (UNWTO, 2018, 2019; WTTC, 2017). In tourism academia, an ever-increasing range of output, mostly case studies, is being published to discuss the impact of tourism on specific cities. Their focus has been, among others, to determine factors that impact on resident satisfaction (Kuščer & Mihalič, 2019), establish potential areas of conflict (Postma & Schmuecker, 2017), management and planning strategies (Seraphin, Sheeran, & Pilato, 2018; Smith et al., 2018), protest movements’ engagement with tourism and the role of the media (Hughes, 2018; Milano, 2018).

Koens et al. (2018; 2019) have moved beyond a single-case-study approach as they compare perceptions of overtourism in cities across Europe. They show how issues ascribed to overtourism in cities, are not tourism-only problems and argue it is necessary to place tourism impacts and solutions in a wider economic, social and cultural city context. With this, they reiterate Hannam, Butler and Paris’ (2014) argument that tourism should be “seen as integral to wider processes of economic and political development processes and even constitutive of everyday life” (p. 172). The binary distinction that is often made between guests and hosts insufficiently encompasses this perspective. Instead, all different city stakeholders, such as indigenous residents, day-trippers, immigrants, business and leisure visitors, are jointly responsible for creating the unique city environment that plays host to all of them (Smith & Zatori, 2016). Tourism can thus be argued to have the potential to contribute to sustainable urban development, for example by supporting participatory public spaces, where people from different backgrounds mingle and hope to create a civil, vibrant and safe urban environment (Fainstein, 2010; Sennett, 1992, 2013). The viability of retail businesses in cities also increasingly depends on the combined spending of inhabitants, tourists and transient customers (e.g. commuters) (Ruault, 2017).

However, without an overarching shared decision-making framework, it remains very difficult to ensure the benefits and burdens of tourism are shared in an equitable way and that the root causes of an unsustainable development are addressed. In theory, seeking shared interests between hosts, visitors and the tourism industry is a very attractive idea, and indeed cooperation with residents has been suggested as a means to mitigate annoyances (Kuščer & Mihalič, 2019). However, it is proving difficult to ensure that such cooperation feeds into actual policymaking. If decision-making rests on seeking uninformed consensus “under the banner of democratic design” (Fry, 2009, p. 10), rather than being truly participatory and circumstantially reactive, it will fail. It will also fail if the onus for acting remains on individual tourists, tourism entrepreneurs and residents, all of whom are unable to take fully informed decisions regarding the future development of the city and the role tourism can play in that development (Koens & Thomas, 2016). Simultaneously, urban tourism planning ‘on the ground’ remains fragmented, as policymakers predominantly take ad-hoc approaches to issues as they arise (Smith et al., 2018). As a result, residents and entrepreneurs at the margins will commonly struggle to benefit from tourism, even when it brings substantial social and economic gains at the city level (Paton, McCall, & Mooney, 2016; Rogerson, 2016; Russo & Scarnato, 2017).

Here, reference can be made to the systemic dimension of the concept of sustainable development, which relates to more than simply balancing the environmental, social and economic dimensions of specific ‘isolated’ actions/decisions/policies at a specific point in time at an aggregated level (Destatte, 2010): it relates to aiming for long-term ecological sustainability while meeting the needs of all people today and in the future (Aall, 2014). Within the context of tourism in cities, this means that operationalizing sustainable urban tourism (development) cannot be limited to simply aiming to sustain urban tourism or even to minimise the negative impacts of urban tourism through balancing its environmental, social and economic dimensions. Instead, it requires operationalizing sustainable urban tourism (development) as urban tourism (development) that promotes/contributes to this wider

process of change.

However, even the most advanced and inclusive existing sustainable governance practices such as collaborative planning (Parker, 1999), community-based destination governance (Jamal & Watt, 2011) or relational and multi-stakeholder approaches (Bramwell, 2011; Waligo, Clarke, & Hawkins, 2013) tend to focus on increasing the capacity of existing systems to adapt to an increasingly complex society. Such a perspective is increasingly problematic for decision-making and policy development aimed at the management of urban tourism (Cheer, Milano, & Novelli, 2019). Take, for example, the current practices of spreading tourists to previously undiscovered areas, which have become an integral part of tourism management strategies in more and more cities. While this may increase the overall tourism carrying capacity of these cities, spreading of visitors can actually reinforce the negative perceptions of residents with regards to tourism in the newly visited areas (Koens et al., 2018), particularly if these perceptions are further strengthened by seeing shared economy accommodation services in these areas as the cause of increased house prices and rents (Matoga & Pawlowska, 2016).

Unfortunately, so far only a few authors have applied a cause-oriented systemic perspective that addresses the driving forces of urban development and the role of tourism within that development (Næss & Vogel, 2012). This contributes to radical solutions that challenge the existing system largely remaining ignored on the ground, as the focus of tourism governance mostly continues to be on incremental improvements, even when these are unlikely to sufficiently address the challenges that face urban tourism today, such as climate change or multifaceted and inequitable distribution of impacts of overtourism. Some even argue that if decision- and policymakers continue to fail to address the underlying causes of unsustainable tourism development, the “increasing dimension of tourism in urban societies could be a driver for regime changes” (Russo & Scarnato, 2017, p. 1). However, given the urgency of the situation, rather than waiting and hoping for regime changes to magically produce a panacea, it may be wiser for academics, policymakers, practitioners and other stakeholders to take a more pro-active approach to destination design. Such a cause-oriented systemic perspective focuses on realising a transformative change of tourism that is based on new forms of governance of the tourism system and its surroundings (Gössling, Hall, Ekström, Engeset, & Aall, 2012; Scuttari, Volgger, & Pechlaner, 2016). While there is only limited knowledge within the tourism domain on how to make the transition to a more sustainable system, such transitions have already been discussed extensively within wider literature.

3. Transformations and transitions

Transformative or transition approaches have come to the forefront in literature in recent years, as a reaction to the limitations of current socio-economic and political systems to achieve sustainable development. The premise here is that stakeholders prefer adaptive management and effect-oriented solutions that increase the resistance of the system to negative impacts. In other words, the logic and direction of current systems will be towards “incremental socio-technological change along established pathways of development” (Markard, Raven, & Truffer, 2012, p. 957). However, it is becoming increasingly clear that such measures may be insufficient to deal with complex sustainability issues like climate change or the overconsumption of natural resources and the fair distribution of wealth across the population (Gillard, Gouldson, Paavola, & Van Alstine, 2016). The aim of sustainability transition approaches therefore is to shift the existing system and to replace it with one that is more sustainable. In other words it seeks a “radical transformation towards a sustainable society, as a response to a number of persistent problems confronting contemporary modern societies” (Grin, Rotmans, & Schot, 2010, p. 1). A transformation is achieved by displacing entrenched forms of governance, to enable innovation and lead to fundamental, presumably positive changes in the

nature of socio-economic systems (Folke et al., 2004).

While societal transformation can happen spontaneously, for example due to technological developments (e.g. the advent of Airbnb or online tour operators within the tourism sector), there is a strand of work that seeks to purposely stimulate the advent of sustainability transitions. Through transition management they seek to achieve “a shift in the dominant ‘rules of the game’, a transformation of established technologies and societal practices, movement from one dynamic equilibrium to another – typically stretching over several generations (25–50 years)” (Meadowcroft, 2009, p. 324). Economic, technological and institutional barriers ingrained in the current system need to be overcome, not least the tendency to only address sector specific ‘manageable’ problems by means of formalised policymaking processes (Loorbach & Rotmans, 2010). Within policymaking processes, powerful actors, who are part of and depend on the existing system, are likely to be “adverse to disruptive and swift transitions” (Loorbach, Frantzeskaki, & Lijns Huffenreuter, 2015, p. 50). In addition, decisions are often based on discussions and compromises between stakeholders who are influenced as much by their own values and perspectives as they are by rational scientific information (Pelling & Manuel-Navarrete, 2011).

To achieve systemic change, it is therefore necessary to appreciate “the sedimented patterns in which actors are embedded and the structures that they take for granted (e.g. rules and routines)” (Geels, 2010, p. 507), but also ways to integrate “excluded groups, as well as those with counter or critical perspectives” (Genus & Coles, 2008, p. 1443). Geels (2010, p. 507) argues that this sets multi-level transition management apart from other innovative approaches, such as actor-network theory, that have already been taken up in tourism research (e.g. Duim, Ren, & Jóhannesson, 2012; Markard et al., 2012).

Transition management implies multi-actor processes with involvement and interaction of a wide variety of stakeholders from within and outside of the system. The idea is that all state and non-state actors manage or at least influence some part of the system and that they “co-produce and coordinate policies in an interactive and evolutionary manner” (Kemp, Loorbach, & Rotmans, 2007, p. 5). The focus lies in creating spaces where stakeholders can search for, learn from and experiment with solutions to accelerate transitions and then try to relate these to existing dynamics, making use of the complexity in society, rather than directly control it (Wittmayer et al., 2018). At the same time, transitions require some form of coordination through policymaking and institutional support, while a shared understanding by frontrunner business stakeholders also enables a more rapid and more dynamic development of transitions (Frantzeskaki, Loorbach, & Meadowcroft, 2012; Markard et al., 2012). For these reasons, a multi-level governance structure has been suggested, which incorporates activities on four levels (Table 1).

Starting at a strategic level, an initial transition arena is created by bringing together a relatively small group of frontrunners. This sets up long-term goals, based upon system-wide analysis of the problem and the issues that need to be overcome to achieve these goals. The transition team then identifies potential contributors to the transition (regime and

Table 1
Multi-level governance structure for transition management.

Governance Level	Main activities
Strategic	Creation of a transition arena consisting of a small network of frontrunners, system analysis, formulation of long-term goals, problem structuring
Tactical	Transition agendas, images, transition paths and coalitions are developed
Operation	Actors are mobilised, experiments executed and solutions implemented
Reflexive	Monitoring, assessing and evaluating policies and ongoing change

Source: (Kemp et al., 2007):

niche-actors), who are brought together in coalitions to create a shared discourse, agenda and potential transition paths towards systemic change. Contributors are given the freedom to translate the joint discourses in their own way and for their own daily environments. They are stimulated to engage their formal and informal networks to come up with new ideas and work on radical experiments: “iconic projects with a high level of risk that can make a potentially large innovative contribution to a transition process” (Loorbach, 2010, p. 176). The ideas, thoughts and innovations that come out of experiments and discussions on the micro level are fed back to all contributors so that they can relate them to existing policies and ambitions in their organisations and activate other actors, and thus contribute to systemic change (Wittmayer et al., 2018).

Simultaneously, “the coexistence of more hierarchical levels in socioeconomic systems implies an unavoidable coexistence of conflicting values” (Giampietro, 1994, p. 617). On the individual stakeholder level, a lack of time, knowledge and resources, as well as conflicts of priorities and interests, all contribute to social dilemmas that hinder systems-oriented solutions (Melissen, Koens, Brinkman, & Smit, 2016). On the one hand, ensuring the long-term success of transition management initiatives implies that “achieving coherence, consistency and congruence across complex policy mixes will need to receive much more explicit attention from practitioners and analysts” (Kern & Howlett, 2009, p. 404). On the other, care needs to be taken not to dilute the ability of stakeholders to generate innovative ideas because they do not align with converging transition pathways. In fact, a common understanding does not imply that stakeholders are expected or even need to agree with each other. Efforts to redesigning our socioeconomic systems require a participatory approach but do not necessarily benefit from being consensual in nature (cf. Fry, 2009). Differences of opinion and discussions could actually lead to richer insights, more innovative solutions and better cooperation (Sennett, 2013). Ultimately, an explicit desire for coherence, consistency and congruence may therefore make it more difficult to achieve a transition, particularly if this desire is equated with a need for consensus among stakeholders. Instead, it may be more useful to allow stakeholders to disagree, as long as they remain respectful, reflective, and willing to engage with others. Such ‘dignified disagreements’ stimulate divergent thinking patterns, which may be key to allow all stakeholders to contribute to and benefit from the required sustainability transitions.

In recent years, the focus of transition management has very much switched to the city level instead of the national or even global level. Cities are dynamic and multifaceted, with a great number of different actors, but most of them are located in a small geographical and relational space and this could make it the appropriate level to initiate transitions (Bulkeley, Broto, Hodson, & Marvin, 2010; Loorbach, Wittmayer, Shiroyama, Fujino, & Mizuguchi, 2016). However, despite its apparent and significant impact on sustainable city development, the role of tourism and hospitality has so far rarely been addressed within this burgeoning body of literature. Beyond the predicted further increase in mobility and travel, this impact is set to become even more significant with the continued and ever-growing influence of the rise of the so-called experience economy (Smit et al., 2018), increasingly shaping cities as creative spaces and stimulating a focus on shared experiences between residents and visitors (Russo & Richards, 2016).

The fact that tourism and residential functions of cities are becoming more and more entwined, not only increases the social, environmental and economic impact of tourism on city development. It also provides opportunities for new and innovative solutions for destination design, based on concepts and ideas related to tourism and hospitality (Markusen, 2014). Whereas tourism and hospitality businesses have historically focused on creating environments in which visitors feel welcome, knowledge, insights and expertise linked to these sectors can also be used to make a neighbourhood or the city as a whole more welcoming and inclusive for all stakeholders: for instance by applying concepts and ideas such as sustainable experience design, placemaking and

hostmanship. By exchanging ideas and collaborating with representatives of local communities and neighbourhoods, the tourism sector – both academics and practitioners – could very well assist policymakers, urban planners and other city stakeholders to successfully deal with issues that, at first sight, appear to lie outside of the realm of tourism, such as loneliness, social cohesion, increasing inequality and environmental degradation (Melissen & Sauer, 2019). In fact, urban tourism could represent an interesting and promising context for applying the multi-level governance structure for transition management suggested by Kemp et al. (2007) and prove a fruitful transition arena for initiating sustainability transitions in (communities and neighbourhoods in) cities.

The remainder of this paper therefore aims to contribute to this burgeoning set of literature by outlining a conceptual framework for sustainable urban tourism design and development that could assist in staging the types of collaborative reflections and reflective conversations with and about the situation at hand (cf. Schön, 1983). This allows it to support system analyses, problem structuring as well as development of transition agendas and pathways within the context of setting in motion a sustainability transition at city level.

4. Towards a Smart City Hospitality Framework

4.1. Introducing smart city hospitality

For urban tourism to be able to serve as a fruitful transition arena for sustainable urban development, it is not only important that urban planners and decision- and policymakers take more note of the role of tourism and hospitality, but also that tourism stakeholders widen their perspective. Rather than ignoring or narrowly focusing on minimising their short-term impact on the locality, the aim needs to be to improve the long-term value of tourism for the city as a whole. To achieve this, a greater common understanding of the potential role and impact of tourism is required. Within urban planning literature, such a perspective has been related to that of a ‘smart city’, which can be defined as a city where “investments in human and social capital and traditional (transport) and modern (ICT) communication infrastructure fuel sustainable economic growth and a high quality of life, with a wise management of natural resources, through participatory governance” (Caragliu, Del Bo, & Nijkamp, 2011, p. 6).

However, realising truly smart cities and turning urban tourism into a transition arena is anything but a sinecure. Tensions between the perspectives and interests of residents, tourists, the local tourism industry, the local non-tourism industry and city decision- and policymakers are key to truly understanding issues like overtourism and the impact of the sharing economy: topics that have come to dominate the debate on urban tourism (Koens et al., 2018; Russo & Scarnato, 2017; Stylidis, Belhassen, & Shani, 2015). Therefore, for urban tourism to serve as a fruitful transition arena, urban tourism governance needs to be based on reconceptualising the role of tourism within urban societies and explicitly acknowledging and addressing these tensions. The Smart City Hospitality (SCITHOS) Framework (Fig. 1) acknowledges these tensions and provides such a theorisation through representing the core topics, and their interdependencies, that should serve as the reference point for system analysis, formulation of long-term goals and problem structuring within the context of applying a transition management approach to sustainable urban tourism development. By serving as the foundation for systematic process-based analysis of sustainable urban tourism development through collaborative reflections by relevant stakeholders, it could play a key role in destination design efforts and at all four levels of (setting up) the multi-level governance structure for transition management as suggested by Kemp et al. (2007).

The rationale for this framework is to provide a solid foundation for merging the concepts of *sustainable development* and *city hospitality* within discussions on and decision- and policymaking in relation to sustainable urban tourism development. Whereas the sustainable



Fig. 1. Smart city hospitality framework.

development dimension of the framework focuses on environmentally responsible and equitable economic development of the city – the environmental, social and economic aspects of sustainable development –, the city hospitality dimension focuses on the need for the city to act as a good ‘host’ to all its ‘guests’ (i.e. residents, tourists, businesses, NGOs, and the like) in realising this ambition. Placing resilience at the centre of the framework then highlights the temporal aspects of both dimensions, and their interdependencies.

4.2. City hospitality as the first cornerstone

The first step in shaping the city hospitality concept as a cornerstone for urban tourism analyses, goal-setting, envisioning transition paths, executing experiments, and the like, is to explicitly include *liveability* and *experience quality* as two of the core topics in this framework.

However, in collaborative reflections, and subsequent decision-making, based on applying the SCITHOS Framework, it is important to realise that, these days, liveability has, unfortunately, turned into a rather fuzzy concept in literature and application on the ground, mostly as a result of using it as an all-encompassing blanket term to represent the presumed hospitableness of the city as a whole (Lloyd, Fullagar, & Reid, 2016). A wide range of liveability indices has emerged that supposedly can assist in benchmarking cities. Most of these indices focus on quantifiable and aggregated data such as crime rates, urban design and business conditions. Ironically, these indices linked to and perspectives on liveability take little to no account of the actual quality of ‘daily life’ experiences of residents and other stakeholders, nor of activities and interactions that add to vibrancy and social life (Vine, 2012). As such, they are of little use to determine the actual quality of the city for its users.

Simultaneously, especially in the literature and on the ground applications within the leisure, tourism and hospitality domains, experience quality is usually described exclusively from the perspective of the visitor and ignored by urban planning departments and urban decision- and policymakers (Russo, 2002). From the perspective of applying a destination design approach to sustainable urban tourism development, this is not a constructive interpretation of the experience quality concept. Real life in a city is more than a collection of ‘tourist bubbles’

(Füller & Michel, 2014) as cities represent “spaces with multiple dynamic functions” (Beritelli & Laesser, 2017, p. 195). In real life, leisure activities and services in a city are not the exclusive terrain of tourists. These activities and services form an integral part of the quality of life for non-tourists as well. Consequently, cities need to focus on their quality as the provider of these experiences to *all* their ‘users’, including residents.

What is more, addressing the quality level of the city as a provider of these experiences moves beyond commercial leisure, tourism and hospitality services and also needs to address the quality of other types of leisure activities and services, such as sports, children playing and going for a walk. The quality of these experiences is very much influenced by the quality of the city in terms of its natural environment, its facilities and infrastructure, as well as a range of other non-tourism specific aspects, such as providing a sense of security, ensuring courtesy of other city users and value for money (Soler & Gemar, 2017).

In order to assist stakeholders of sustainable urban tourism development in moving beyond the contentious boundaries between tourists and residents, between tourism and non-tourism, the SCITHOS Framework defines liveability as the quality (level) of the city as a place to live and work for residents *and* other stakeholders who make use of the city for these purposes (e.g. commuters, local business owners *and* visitors). Experience quality is defined as the quality of the city as a provider of experiences that fulfil visitors’ *and* residents’ and other stakeholders’ experience needs and wishes from a leisure perspective (cf. Smit, 2016).

By defining liveability and experience quality this way, stakeholders are assisted in accounting for the fact that, in essence, residents, tourism and non-tourism business owners and employees, commuters, visitors, and the like, all make use of the same services, yet they differ in the way that they use and appreciate these services. Urban tourism (decision- and policymaking) influences these services, as well as the way they are used and appreciated by these different users. For instance, urban tourism can (re)define places as places of interest, which could very well enrich the quality of life of residents by improving these places from an experience quality perspective. Simultaneously, urban tourism can also lead to an increase of “transient populations with little commitment to the locality, cultural conflict and concern for security and personal safety”, which can inhibit social interactions and actually negatively impact the liveability of a city or a neighbourhood (Ife, Ife, & Tesoriero, 2006, p. 100). Obviously, urban tourism can also generate other tensions, such as overcrowding and traffic and parking problems. The impact of tourism is generally perceived more negatively when tourists ‘consume’ a destination with little knowledge or interest, when they disrupt the routines of residents (e.g. by blocking pavements, being rude or noisy), but also when their presence increases the cost of living (Koens et al., 2018). In other words, if tourists are unwilling or unable to reciprocate the hostmanship of the city and its (temporary) residents or if their presence disturbs or dilutes the city’s ability to properly host its residents at a price that is perceived as reasonable for the quality provided, urban tourism could decrease liveability of a city.

Once again, though, a binary distinction between guests and hosts would be unhelpful in addressing these tensions. In fact, it would probably be impossible to assign one, fixed label to a number of parties involved. Just consider the increasing numbers of students and professionals (i.e. global nomads) living in cities for several months, or residents seeking out leisure activities within their own locality (i.e. proximity tourism) (Diaz-Soria, 2017; Mordue, 2007). While inhabitants may contribute to the attractiveness of the city to visitors, in turn, those same visitors contribute to its upliftment, conviviality, sociality and vitalisation of social life. Especially from a destination design and transition management perspective, it is therefore more useful to purposely focus on the joint responsibility of all different providers and users of a city’s services for creating the environment that hosts all of them (Smith & Zatori, 2016). Rather than making a binary and fixed distinction between hosts and guests, all stakeholders are seen as both (temporary) hosts and guests. These roles are “mutually constitutive of

each other and thus relational and shifting” (Dikeç, 2002, p. 239).

What is more, acknowledging and accepting the constitutive, relational and shifting nature of these roles implies that it would be logical and reasonable for all of these stakeholders to have a say in shaping the development of the environment that hosts all of them. Simply put: one cannot expect someone to take responsibility without delegating authority to him or her.

For fully gauging these tensions and this joint responsibility and authority in collaboratively reflecting on sustainable urban tourism development, the city hospitality dimension of the SCITHOS Framework therefore incorporates a third core topic: *smart hospitality*. It is defined as the level to which various stakeholders are stimulated and enabled to take on their responsibility in jointly shaping the city’s urban tourism system. By using the Cittaslow movement as inspiration and the design futuring concept (Fry, 2009) and the multi-level governance structure for transition management (Kemp et al., 2007) as points of reference, this third topic focuses attention on purposely creating a shared “systematic consciousness and coordination among local stakeholders” in relation to sustainable urban tourism development (Hatipoglu, 2015; Presenza, Abbate, & Micera, 2015, p. 485; Šegota, Mihalić, & Kušcer, 2017).

For properly addressing the topic of smart hospitality, the interpretation of ‘smart’ during collaborative reflections on sustainable urban tourism development needs to move well beyond its technological interpretation and (mis)use in a significant portion of current literature and policymaking dedicated to urban tourism governance. As such, the SCITHOS Framework differs strongly from most other approaches that claim to address ‘smartness’ but actually simply focus on greater development, commercialisation and consumption of digital technologies and infrastructure within the context of (ambitions to realise) citizen involvement in discussions on shaping urban futures. Instead, the inclusion of *smart hospitality* as a core topic in this framework implies that ‘complementary digitally mediated and face-to-face processes that respect local knowledge systems’ (Sadoway & Shekhar, 2014) are vital to but not sufficient for stimulating and enabling stakeholders to fulfil their role in the transition arena and move beyond consensus-seeking approaches (cf. Fry, 2009). These processes are only helpful if they actually increase the ability of stakeholders to mobilise and influence the direction of governance, ensure stakeholders’ perspectives are better integrated into transition agendas, assist in developing coalitions, mobilise key actors, contribute to executing experiments, and the like. In other words, and crucially, they should *not* serve as a means for “attitudinal change” (Fry, 2009, p. 11) and to subjectify citizens’ initiatives to existing, oftentimes growth-oriented, narratives (Wise, 2016) but assist in truly accounting for the different perspectives and interests of and delegating authority to stakeholders as a prerequisite for shaping sustainable urban (tourism) futures.

4.3. Sustainable development and resilience as additional cornerstones

As discussed earlier, if urban tourism development is to serve as a fruitful transition arena for initiating sustainability transitions in (communities and neighbourhoods in) cities, shaping urban tourism futures needs to acknowledge and account for the role of tourism within a wider process of change (cf. Aall, 2014; Brundtland & Khalid, 1987; Destatte, 2010). The potential impact of tourism on this wider process of change, the process towards realising sustainable development, has already been discussed extensively in the tourism literature commonly using a people, planet, profit framework (e.g. Bramwell, 2015; Buckley, 2012). As such, these concepts will be only discussed in brief and in relation to the SCITHOS Framework. They are addressed in this framework by incorporating *natural viability*, *economic wealth*, *equitability* and *resilience* as additional core topics to ensure that these topics are incorporated in collaborative reflections on shaping viable urban tourism futures.

Natural viability is defined as the ability of the natural (eco)system,

locally and globally, to support the needs and wishes of current and future generations (cf. Brundtland & Khalid, 1987). It is useful to note that the relationships between tourism and environmental issues are most evident when tourists compete for resources with local stakeholders (e.g. through water use) or where they put additional strain on the city system (e.g. through waste, congestion, noise) and thus directly affect short-term liveability and experience quality. More global and long-term issues, such as climate change or micro plastics, may be less top-of-mind among stakeholders, but can also prove to be disastrous for shaping ‘positive’ long-term futures of the city and its tourism (Gössling et al., 2012). Simultaneously, tourism itself is directly responsible for a significant contribution to some of these global and long-term issues, with CO₂ emissions linked to tourist travel as the most widely known and obvious example (Peeters & Eijgelaar, 2014). Therefore, it is essential to include both these interdependencies and this long-term perspective in collaborative reflections based on the city hospitality dimension of the SCITHOS Framework.

The same applies to the economic and social components of sustainable development. Economic wealth relates to the value of all the assets of worth owned by individuals, communities, companies or government, locally and globally (cf. Balaguer & Cantavella-Jordá, 2002). Obviously, economic wealth of a city influences its liveability and experience quality, for instance through its ability to finance construction and maintenance of facilities and infrastructure. In turn, tourism can contribute to creating (long-term) economic wealth of the city as a whole directly, by generating income at city level – for instance through tourist taxes – and indirectly, by generating income at individual resident level – for instance through providing employment (for employees) and generating revenues (for business owners). What is more, these impacts are closely linked to the overall quality of life of city residents and thus to the social component of sustainable development, also from a fair distribution of wealth perspective.

The social component is represented as equitability; a measure for the fair distribution of economic wealth and other costs and benefits between different groups and stakeholders (cf. Brundtland & Khalid, 1987; McElduff, Peel, Ritchie, & Lloyd, 2016). For instance, the tourism sector employs a relatively high number of women and people with relatively low levels of education, which could be argued to contribute to improving the quality of life of these vulnerable groups of city residents. Simultaneously, to put it mildly, this specific sector of the economy is not known for providing optimal working conditions for its employees and this could be argued to represent a negative impact of tourism on the social component of sustainable development, and overtourism can be argued to only increase this problem (Walmsley, 2017).

The complexities and ambiguities involved with urban tourism – including their impact on issues that are traditionally seen as ‘beyond the scope of tourism’, as well as the predicted continuing increase in visitor numbers, imply that it is also key that decision- and policymaking in relation to tourism contributes to cities’ long-term ability to deal with new and/or changing issues that impede on the sustainability transition of the city. This continuing “ability of urban systems to adapt and thrive in changing circumstances” has earlier been described as resilience (Buijs et al., 2016, p. 2), which stands at the core of the SCITHOS Framework. Resilience and sustainability are commonly considered as complementary in the thinking about destination design and it “has often been suggested that [...] for cities to be sustainable they must be resilient” (Redman, 2014, p. 36). In the tourism discourse, the combination of sustainability and resilience has received relatively little attention, although multiple authors have argued for further research theorisation on the matter (e.g. Cheer et al., 2019; Innerhofer, Fontanari, & Pechlaner, 2018; Luthe & Wyss, 2014).

A full and detailed discussion on all (highly situational) interdependencies between urban tourism and the overall process towards sustainable development at a local, regional or global level is beyond the scope of this paper. However, as indicated earlier, such a ‘situated and

circumstantially reactive' discussion (Fry, 2009, p. 10) needs to be incorporated in collaborative reflections by involved stakeholders within the context of destination design efforts, especially when aiming to actually create transition arenas based on sustainable urban tourism development. These reflections need to address all relevant short-term and direct impacts of tourism as well as its long-term and indirect impacts.

5. Discussion and conclusions

Together, these core topics and their interdependencies shape the SCITHOS Framework. The choice for the specific wording used in the definitions of the three dimensions of sustainable development, resilience and the three core topics linked to city hospitality, is dictated by the specific purpose of the SCITHOS Framework. This purpose is to provide a solid foundation for collaborative reflections – by all relevant stakeholders – that support destination design efforts and initiatives from the perspective of a transition management approach to sustainable urban tourism development. To serve this purpose, these reflections need to move beyond a 'traditional' triple-bottom-line approach to discussing and analysing the relationships between (urban) tourism and the wider process towards realising sustainable (urban) development (Aall, 2014).

To illustrate how applying the SCITHOS Framework could assist in doing so, consider the choice to frame the social component of sustainable development as equitability and defining it in terms of a fair distribution of all costs and benefits associated with urban tourism futures. This particular perspective should assist those involved in destination design efforts in ensuring that urban tourism analyses, goal-setting, envisioning transition paths, executing experiments, and the like – in other words, the actions that actually shape cities' futures – move well beyond discussions and decision-making based on aggregated data. Through highlighting the direct links between equitability and all other core topics included in the SCITHOS framework, it not only stimulates collaborative reflections on how economic and other costs and benefits are distributed fairly among specific groups of residents, visitors, tourism and non-tourism business owners, and the like, both in the short-term and in the long-term. It could also assist in purposely shaping transition agendas and experiments aimed at ensuring that benefits that tourism can bring, both in terms of quality of life and experience quality, actually reach groups that would otherwise be excluded from these benefits. Inclusion of (the relationships with) smart hospitality highlights the relevance of bringing together a group of frontrunners with specific characteristics, for instance in terms of their ability to engage these various groups and to stimulate and assist them in translating the transition arena's joint discourses in their own way and for their own daily environments. Simultaneously, the links to natural viability and resilience highlight the relevance of ensuring that new ideas and radical experiments not only focus on 'fighting' short-term unequal distribution of quality of life and experience quality benefits but also on their impact on resolving short-term and long-term environmental issues.

In some instances and under some circumstances, it might suffice to simply use the SCITHOS Framework as a (visual) reminder for addressing all relevant aspects in brainstorming sessions, agenda setting, and the like, in small scale destination design initiatives aimed at experimenting with sustainable urban tourism futures, for instance at neighbourhood level. However, it could also be used as the basis for in-depth analysis of scenarios and their impacts on a city level through applying a participatory design approach to tourism experience design (Tussyadiah, 2014) that moves well beyond focusing on 'tourist bubbles' and, instead, treats tourism as one of the functions of the destination

(Beritelli & Laesser, 2017) that impacts all of its users, not just tourists.

An example of how the latter could be shaped, is the JPI-Urban Europe project entitled SCITHOS (www.scithos.eu), in which the SCITHOS Framework has been developed and, consequently, used as the foundation for setting up serious game-playing sessions with relevant stakeholders in six European cities, supported by quantitative system dynamics analyses of alternative strategies for sustainable urban tourism development. These serious game-playing sessions combine a board game that is able to represent the actual situation 'on the ground' in cities, as well as potential interventions to change this situation, with real-time in-depth quantitative analyses of the impact of these interventions through calculating the resulting 'scores' for all core topics included in the SCITHOS Framework, as well as the relevant variables that determine these overall scores. For instance, during game-play, players can not only monitor the changes in liveability of the city as a whole as a result of their joint decision-making but also how these scores may vary across different types of residents and different areas within the city, as well as how aspects such as crowdedness and house prices have impacted these various scores. In this way the game allows for more specific discussions on the impacts of tourism that may lead to perceptions of overtourism.

As such, these serious game-playing sessions allow for the types of reflective conversations with the situation at hand as suggested by Schön (1983) that, as explained by Cross (2011), are crucial to applying a design thinking approach to problem solving. Applying the SCITHOS Framework in this way allows for applying constructive methods (Tussyadiah, 2014) within the context of truly participatory destination design efforts based on combining techniques such as flexible modelling, storyboarding and (quantitative) simulation (Martin & Hanington, 2012). A full and in-depth evaluation of the approach applied in the SCITHOS project, including the impact of using the SCITHOS Framework as the foundation for collaborative reflections, is executed at the time of writing this paper. However, it would be fair to say that preliminary results – including direct feedback from participants in all six cities – indicate that application of the SCITHOS Framework in this way provides a useful reference point for an interactive process in which participants are stimulated and supported to not only collaboratively reflect on the current situation but also its true complexity, as well as the intended and unintended implications of a range of possible interventions.

Based on these first experiences with applying the SCITHOS Framework as a foundation for collaborative informed reflections on overtourism, both with respect to the situation at hand and the implications of potential interventions, the authors of this paper feel it could contribute to further exploring and strengthening the contribution of design-oriented thinking to destination management and governance. A framework such as the SCITHOS Framework could prove helpful in making 'crucial judgements about actions that could increase or decrease futuring potential', as Fry (2009, p.12) expresses it so eloquently. In other words, if we are to deepen our understanding of how tourism destinations work, particularly in relation to one of society's most urgent challenges, i.e. realising a transition towards a sustainable society, these types of frameworks could prove useful in making optimal use of the potential of design thinking in shaping solutions. Therefore, the SCITHOS Framework has been designed as a means to purposely direct collaborative reflections towards creating 'an interactive process based on posing a problem frame and exploring its implications in 'moves' that investigate the arising solution possibilities' (Cross, 2011, p. 23). Applying the SCITHOS Framework allows for shaping destination futures that, as Cross puts it, 'talk back' to the 'designers' through highlighting the complexities involved and all consequences of potential actions, also those not intended.

With respect to the particular conceptual framework presented in this paper, i.e. the SCITHOS Framework, application in various destination design circumstances and combining it with particular design methods might very well require further refinement or even adjustments. In addition, the framework has been developed with application of the framework as part of serious-gaming workshops within a Western European context in mind, and may thus not automatically be applicable in other settings and for cities in other regions. Even in a Western European context, its ability to support citizen participation and resilient design will depend on the openness of key stakeholders to engage with such processes and follow through on any potential outcomes and design decisions. However, the train of thought presented in this paper and experiences so far give rise to optimism about its potential to contribute to further development of the destination design concept, associated tools and methods, as well as sustainable destination development 'on the ground', especially in relation to a transition management perspective on destination development driven by design thinking principles.

Funding source

This work is part of the research programme JPI Urban Europe - ERANET Cofund Smart Cities and Communities with project number 5619886, which is (partly) financed by the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO).

References

- Aall, C. (2014). Sustainable tourism in practice: Promoting or perverting the quest for a sustainable development? *Sustainability*, 6(5), 2562–2583. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su6052562>.
- Ashworth, G., & 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>
- Balaguer, J., & Cantavella-Jordá, M. (2002). Tourism as a long-run economic growth factor: The Spanish case. *Applied Economics*, 34(7), 877–884. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00036840110058923>.
- Beritelli, P., & Laesser, C. (2017). The dynamics of destinations and tourism development. In D. R. Fesenmaier, & Z. Xiang (Eds.), *Design science in tourism: Foundations of destination management* (pp. 195–214). Cham: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-42773-7_13.
- Bramwell, B. (2011). Governance, the state and sustainable tourism: A political economy approach. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 19(4–5), 459–477. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2011.576765>.
- Bramwell, B. (2015). Theoretical activity in sustainable tourism research. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 54, 204–218. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2015.07.005>.
- Brundtland, G. H., & Khalid, M. (1987). *Our common future*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Buckley, R. (2012). Sustainable tourism: Research and reality. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 39(2), 528–546. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2012.02.003>.
- Buijs, A. E., Mattijssen, T. J., Van der Jagt, A. P., Ambrose-Oji, B., Andersson, E., Elands, B. H., et al. (2016). Active citizenship for urban green infrastructure: Fostering the diversity and dynamics of citizen contributions through mosaic governance. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, 22, 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2017.01.002>.
- Bulkeç, H., Broto, V. C., Hodson, M., & Marvin, S. (2010). *Cities and low carbon transitions*. Oxford: Routledge.
- Caragliu, A., Del Bo, C., & Nijkamp, P. (2011). Smart cities in Europe. *Journal of Urban Technology*, 18(2), 65–82. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10630732.2011.601117>.
- Cheer, J. M., Milano, C., & Novelli, M. (2019). Tourism and community resilience in the anthropocene: Accentuating temporal overtourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2019.1578363>.
- Cross, N. (2011). *Design thinking: Understanding how designers think and work*. Oxford and York, NY: Berg Publishers.
- Destatte, P. (2010). Foresight: A major tool in tackling sustainable development. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 77(9), 1575–1587. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2010.07.005>.
- Diaz-Soria, I. (2017). Being a tourist as a chosen experience in a proximity destination. *Tourism Geographies*, 19(1), 96–117. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616688.2016.1214976>.
- Dikeç, M. (2002). Pera peras poros: Longings for spaces of hospitality. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 19(1–2), 227–247.
- van der Duim, R., Ren, C., & Jóhannesson, G. T. (Eds.). (2012). *Actor-network theory and tourism: Ordering, materiality and multiplicity* (1st ed.). London: Routledge.
- Edwards, D., Griffin, T., & Hayllar, B. (2008). Urban tourism research: Developing an agenda. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 35(4), 1032–1052.
- Fainstein, S. S. (2010). *The just city*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Folke, C., Carpenter, S., Walker, B., Scheffer, M., Elmqvist, T., Gunderson, L., et al. (2004). Regime shifts, resilience, and biodiversity in ecosystem management. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics*, 35, 557–581.
- Frantzeskaki, N., Loorbach, D., & Meadowcroft, J. (2012). Governing societal transitions to sustainability. *International Journal of Sustainable Development*, 15(1–2), 19–36.
- Fry, T. (2009). *Design futuring: Sustainability, ethics and new practice*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Füller, H., & Michel, B. (2014). 'Stop Being a tourist!' New dynamics of urban tourism in Berlin-Kreuzberg. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 38(4), 1304–1318. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2427.12124>.
- Geels, F. W. (2010). Ontologies, socio-technical transitions (to sustainability), and the multi-level perspective. *Research Policy*, 39(4), 495–510.
- Genus, A., & Coles, A.-M. (2008). Rethinking the multi-level perspective of technological transitions. *Research Policy*, 37(9), 1436–1445. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2008.05.006>.
- Giampietro, M. (1994). Using hierarchy theory to explore the concept of sustainable development. *Futures*, 26(6), 616–625. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0016-3287\(94\)90033-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0016-3287(94)90033-7).
- Gillard, R., Gouldson, A., Paavola, J., & Van Alstine, J. (2016). Transformational responses to climate change: Beyond a systems perspective of social change in mitigation and adaptation: Transformational responses to climate change. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climatic Change*, 7(2), 251–265. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wcc.384>.
- Gössling, S., Hall, C. M., Ekström, F., Engeset, A. B., & Aall, C. (2012). Transition management: A tool for implementing sustainable tourism scenarios? *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 20(6), 899–916. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2012.699062>.
- Grin, J., Rotmans, J., & Schot, J. (2010). *Transitions to sustainable development: New directions in the study of long term transformative change*. London: Routledge.
- Hall, C. M. (2006). Tourism urbanization and global environmental change. In S. Gössling, & C. M. Hall (Eds.), *Tourism and global environmental change: Ecological, economic, social and political interrelationships* (pp. 142–156). London: Routledge.
- 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>.
- Hatipoglu, B. (2015). "Cittaslow": Quality of life and visitor experiences. *Tourism Planning & Development*, 12(1), 20–36. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21568316.2014.960601>.
- Hughes, N. (2018). 'Tourists go home': Anti-tourism industry protest in Barcelona. *Social Movement Studies*, 17(4), 471–477. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14742837.2018.1468244>.
- Ife, J. W., Ife, J., & Tesoriero, F. (2006). *Community development: Community-based alternatives in an age of globalisation*. Pearson Education Australia.
- Innerhofer, E., Fontanari, M., & Pechlaner, H. (Eds.). (2018). *Destination resilience: Challenges and opportunities for destination management and governance*. London: Routledge.
- Jamal, T., & Watt, E. M. (2011). Climate change pedagogy and performative action: Toward community-based destination governance. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 19(4–5), 571–588. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2011.575227>.
- Kemp, R., Loorbach, D., & Rotmans, J. (2007). Transition management as a model for managing processes of co-evolution towards sustainable development. *The International Journal of Sustainable Development and World Ecology*, 14(1), 78–91.
- Kern, F., & Howlett, M. (2009). Implementing transition management as policy reforms: A case study of the Dutch energy sector. *Policy Sciences*, 42(4), 391. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11077-009-9099-x>.
- 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., Postma, A., & Papp, B. (2019). Management strategies for overtourism: From adaptation to system change. In H. Pechlaner, E. Innerhofer, & G. Erschbamer (Eds.), *Overtourism, tourism management and solutions*. London: Routledge.
- Koens, K., & Thomas, R. (2016). "You know that's a rip-off": Policies and practices surrounding micro-enterprises and poverty alleviation in South African township tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 24(12), 1641–1654. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2016.1145230>.
- Kuščer, K., & Mihalčić, T. (2019). Residents' attitudes towards overtourism from the perspective of tourism impacts and cooperation: The case of Ljubljana. *Sustainability*, 11(6), 1823. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11061823>.
- Lloyd, K., Fullagar, S., & Reid, S. (2016). Where is the 'social' in constructions of 'liveability'? Exploring community: Social interaction and social cohesion in changing urban environments. *Urban Policy and Research*, 34(4), 343–355. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08111146.2015.1118374>.
- Loorbach, D. (2010). Transition management for sustainable development: A prescriptive, complexity-based governance framework. *Governance*, 23(1), 161–183. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0491.2009.01471.x>.
- Loorbach, D., Frantzeskaki, N., & Lijnis Hufenreuter, R. (2015). Transition management: Taking stock from governance experimentation. *The Journal of Corporate Citizenship*, 2015(58), 48–66. <https://doi.org/10.9774/GLEAF.4700.2015.ju.00008>.
- Loorbach, D., & Rotmans, J. (2010). The practice of transition management: Examples and lessons from four distinct cases. *Futures*, 42(3), 237–246. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2009.11.009>.
- Loorbach, D., Wittmayer, J. M., Shirokawa, H., Fujino, J., & Mizuguchi, S. (Eds.). (2016). *Governance of urban sustainability transitions: European and Asian experiences*. Heidelberg: Springer.
- Luthe, T., & Wyss, R. (2014). Assessing and planning resilience in tourism. *Tourism Management*, 44, 161–163. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2014.03.011>.

- Markard, J., Raven, R., & Truffer, B. (2012). Sustainability transitions: An emerging field of research and its prospects. *Research Policy*, 41(6), 955–967.
- Markusen, A. (2014). Creative cities: A 10-year research agenda. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 36(sup2), 567–589. <https://doi.org/10.1111/juaf.12146>.
- Martin, B., & Hanington, B. (2012). *Universal methods of design: 100 ways to research complex problems, develop innovative ideas, and design effective solutions*. Rockport Publishers.
- Matoga, L., & Pawłowska, A. (2016). Off-the-beaten-track tourism: A new trend in the tourism development in historical European cities. A case study of the city of Krakow, Poland. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 0(0), 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2016.1212822>.
- McElduff, L., Peel, D., Ritchie, H., & Lloyd, M. G. (2016). The octagon values model: Community resilience and coastal regeneration. *Urban, Planning and Transport Research*, 4(1), 1–25. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21650020.2015.1124735>.
- Meadowcroft, J. (2009). What about the politics? Sustainable development, transition management, and long term energy transitions. *Policy Sciences*, 42(4), 323. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11077-009-9097-z>.
- Melissen, F., Koens, K., Brinkman, M., & Smit, B. (2016). Sustainable development in the accommodation sector: A social dilemma perspective. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 20, 141–150. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2016.07.008>.
- Melissen, F., & Sauer, L. (2019). *Improving sustainability in the hospitality industry*. Routledge.
- Milano, C. (2018). Overtourism, social unrest and tourismophobia. A controversial debate. *PASOS : Revista de Turismo y Patrimonio Cultural*, 16(3), 551–564.
- Mordue, T. (2007). Tourism, urban governance and public space. *Leisure Studies*, 26(4), 447–462. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02614360601121413>.
- Næss, P., & Vogel, N. (2012). Sustainable urban development and the multi-level transition perspective. *Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions*, 4, 36–50.
- Nieuwland, S., & van Melik, R. (2018). Regulating Airbnb: How cities deal with perceived negative externalities of short-term rentals. *Current Issues in Tourism*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2018.1504899>
- Paavola, J., Gouldson, A., & Klůváňková-Oravská, T. (2009). Interplay of actors, scales, frameworks and regimes in the governance of biodiversity. *Environmental Policy and Governance*, 19(3), 148–158. <https://doi.org/10.1002/eet.505>.
- Parker, S. (1999). Collaboration on tourism policy making: Environmental and commercial sustainability on Bonaire, NA. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 7(3–4), 240–259. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669589908667338>.
- Pasquinelli, C. (2017). Tourism connectivity and spatial complexity: A widening bi-dimensional arena of urban tourism research. In N. Bellini, & C. Pasquinelli (Eds.), *Tourism in the city* (pp. 29–50). Cham: Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-26877-4_2.
- Paton, K., McCall, V., & Mooney, G. (2016). Place revisited: Class, stigma and urban restructuring in the case of Glasgow's commonwealth games. *The Sociological Review*, 65(4), 578–594. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-954X.12423>.
- Peeters, P. M., & Eijgelaar, E. (2014). Tourism's climate mitigation dilemma: Flying between rich and poor countries. *Tourism Management*, 40, 15–26. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2013.05.001>.
- Pelling, M., & Manuel-Navarrete, D. (2011). From resilience to transformation: The adaptive cycle in two Mexican urban centers. *Ecology and Society*, 16(2), 11.
- Postma, A., & Schmuecker, D. (2017). Understanding and overcoming negative impacts of tourism in city destinations: Conceptual model and strategic framework. *Journal of Tourism Futures*, 3(2), 144–156. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JTF-04-2017-0022>.
- Presenza, A., Abbate, T., & Micera, R. (2015). The Cittaslow movement: Opportunities and challenges for the governance of tourism destinations. *Tourism Planning & Development*, 12(4), 479–488. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21568316.2015.1037929>.
- Redman, C. L. (2014). Should sustainability and resilience be combined or remain distinct pursuits? *Ecology and Society*, 19(2).
- Rogerson, R. J. (2016). Re-defining temporal notions of event legacy: Lessons from Glasgow's Commonwealth Games. *Annals of Leisure Research*, 19(4), 497–518. <https://doi.org/10.1080/11745398.2016.1151367>.
- Ruault, J.-F. (2017). Beyond tourism-based economic development: City-regions and transient custom. *Regional Studies*, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00343404.2017.1364842>.
- Ruhanen, L., Weiler, B., Moyle, B. D., & McLennan, C. J. (2015). Trends and patterns in sustainable tourism research: A 25-year bibliometric analysis. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 23(4), 517–535. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2014.978790>.
- Russo, A. P. (2002). The “vicious circle” of tourism development in heritage cities. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 29(1), 165–182. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383\(01\)00029-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383(01)00029-9).
- Russo, A. P., & Richards, G. (Eds.). (2016). *Reinventing the local in tourism: Producing, consuming and negotiating place*. Bristol Buffalo Toronto: Channel View Publications.
- Russo, A. P., & Scarnato, A. (2017). “Barcelona in common”: A new urban regime for the 21st-century tourist city? *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 40(4), 455–474. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07352166.2017.1373023>.
- Sadoway, D., & Shekhar, S. (2014). (Re)prioritizing citizens in smart cities governance: Examples of smart citizenship from urban India. *Journal of Community Informatics*, 10(3).
- Santarius, T., Walnum, H. J., & Aall, C. (2016). Conclusions: Respecting rebounds for sustainability reasons. In C. Aall, T. Santarius, & H. J. Walnum (Eds.), *Rethinking climate and energy policies* (pp. 287–293). London: Springer.
- Schön, D. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Scuttari, A., Volgger, M., & Pechlaner, H. (2016). Transition management towards sustainable mobility in Alpine destinations: Realities and realpolitik in Italy's South Tyrol region. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 24(3), 463–483. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2015.1136634>.
- Šegota, T., Mihalić, T., & Kuščer, K. (2017). The impact of residents' informedness and involvement on their perceptions of tourism impacts: The case of Bled. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*, 6(3), 196–206. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdmm.2016.03.007>.
- Sennett, R. (1992). *The fall of public man*. London: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Sennett, R. (2013). *Together: The rituals, pleasures and politics of cooperation*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Seraphin, H., Sheeran, P., & Pilato, M. (2018). Over-tourism and the fall of Venice as a destination. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*, 9, 374–376. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdmm.2018.01.011>.
- Smit, B. (2016). Customer experience by design. In *Proceedings of 2nd global tourism & hospitality conference*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong Polytechnic.
- 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>.
- Smith, M., & Zatori, A. (2016). Re-thinking host-guest relationships in the context of urban ethnic tourism. In A. P. Russo, & D. G. Richards (Eds.), *Reinventing the local in tourism: Producing, consuming and negotiating place* (pp. 129–150). Bristol: Channel View Publications.
- Soler, I. P., & Gemar, G. (2017). A measure of tourist experience quality: The case of inland tourism in Malaga. *Total Quality Management and Business Excellence*, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14783363.2017.1372185>.
- Styliadis, D., Belhassen, Y., & Shani, A. (2015). Three tales of a city: Stakeholders' images of Eilat as a tourist destination. *Journal of Travel Research*, 54(6), 702–716.
- 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*. Quito: United Nations Conference on housing and sustainable urban development (Habitat III).
- UNWTO. (2018). *Overtourism? Understanding and managing urban tourism growth beyond perceptions*. Madrid: UNWTO.
- UNWTO. (2019). *Overtourism? Understanding and managing urban tourism growth beyond perceptions, ume 2*. Case Studies. Madrid: UNWTO.
- Vine, D. (2012). *The neglected dimension of community liveability: Impact on social connectedness and active ageing in higher density accommodation (Thesis)*. Queensland University of Technology.
- Waligo, V. M., Clarke, J., & Hawkins, R. (2013). Implementing sustainable tourism: A multi-stakeholder involvement management framework. *Tourism Management*, 36, 342–353. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2012.10.008>.
- Walmsley, A. (2017). Overtourism and underemployment: A modern labour market dilemma. In *Conference proceedings: Responsible tourism in destinations 13: Tackling overtourism - local responses*. Reykjavik.
- Wise, N. (2016). Outlining triple bottom line contexts in urban tourism regeneration. *Cities*, 53, 30–34. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2016.01.003>.
- Wittmayer, J. M., Steenbergen, F. van, Frantzeskaki, N., & Bach, M. (2018). Transition management: Guiding principles and applications. In N. Frantzeskaki, K. Hölscher, M. Bach, & F. Avelino (Eds.), *Co-creating sustainable urban futures* (pp. 81–101). Cham: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-69273-9_4.
- WTTC. (2017). *Coping with success: Managing overcrowding in tourism destinations*. London: WTTC (World Travel and Tourism Council).



Ko Koens is Senior Lecturer at Breda University of Applied Sciences, and research fellow at the University of Johannesburg and the Dutch 'Centre of Expertise Leisure Hospitality' (CELTH). His main interests are overtourism, slum tourism and city hospitality design. Ko has co-authored the UNWTO Report 'Overtourism? Understanding and managing urban tourism growth beyond perceptions' and edited the books 'Slum Tourism: Poverty, Power and Ethics' and 'Tourism and Geographies of Inequality: The New Global Slumming Phenomenon'. He is project leader of Smart City Hospitality (SCITHOS; JPI Urban Europe 2016–2019). Ko would love to hear from you to look for future collaboration opportunities.



Frans Melissen is Breda University of Applied Sciences' Professor of Sustainable Experience Design. He has a background in engineering design and organizational psychology. His research focuses on the link between sustainable development and human behavior. He has authored a range of academic papers and is also (co-)author of the books *Co-creating experiences in Events*, *Tourism and Hospitality* and *Improving Sustainability in the Hospitality Industry*. Frans is the scientific director of Smart City Hospitality (SCITHOS; JPI Urban Europe 2016–2019), which focuses on assisting cities in generating context-specific strategies for mitigating negative impacts from urban tourism while maintaining positive impacts.



Igor Mayer (1965) is a professor (lector) of Applied Games, Innovation & Society at Breda University of Applied Sciences, the Netherlands. He is also a Hai Tian (Sea Sky) scholar in Dalian University of Technology (DUT), Dalian, China. His pending research line has the title “Playful Organisations & Learning Systems”. Over the years and in various partnerships, he has initiated, managed and participated in a large number of serious gaming-related research and development projects, about which he published many academic journal articles.



Carlo Aall took his PhD at the University of Aalborg in 2002. He has worked as a researcher at Western Norway Research Institute in Sogndal (Norway) since 1990. From 2012 to 2014 he acted as a visiting professor in Sustainable Development at Aarhus University Herning, Denmark, and from 2016 onwards he has acted as professor in Sustainable Development at the Western Norway University of Applied Sciences (HVL). Carlo has worked with a number of large research projects on sustainable development, sustainable mobility, sustainable tourism and climate policy funded by the Norwegian Research Council as well as international EU financed projects.