# Resident Perceptions of New Urban Tourism: A Neglected Geography of Prejudice

Peter Dirksmeier* and Ilse Helbrecht
*Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Geographisches Institut*

## Abstract

Research on urban tourism has focused on the search for alternative, authentic, lively, and mundane urban neighbourhoods by visitors. This so-called new urban tourism is characterised by the increasing quest by tourists for contact with mundane life in ordinary residential quarters. The intrusion of new urban tourism into day-to-day life also affects residents' perceptions of visitors, which are prone to become stereotypes and prejudices rather than just perceptions. The paper offers a review of the urban residents' perceptions research literature through the lens of the new urban tourism phenomenon, aligning it with wider geographies of prejudices. Consequently, the paper argues that an understanding of residents' attitudes towards the new urban tourism phenomenon offers a framework through which geographies of prejudices subtly at work in these resident/visitors encounters can be more deeply researched.

## Introduction

Since Ashworth stated a "rural bias" (1989, p. 33) in his landmark paper on urban tourism, geographical research on urban tourism has flourished in recent years (e.g. Maitland & Newman 2009a; Selby 2012; Pappalepore et al. 2014). Turning away from the inner city as a classical destination area of urban tourism (Jansen-Verbeke 1986; Murphy 1992) towards gentrified, former working-class neighbourhoods without any classic touristic offers beside 'authentic' everyday life, "changing patterns of urban tourism" (Novy & Huning 2009, p. 88) can be recently observed, which are named "new urban tourism" (Füller & Michel 2014), a term originally used by Roche (1992) to entitle "a very significant sector and force in the economic regeneration or micro-modernisation of old industrial cities in western society" (Roche 1992, p. 563). Meanwhile, deeply embedded into global mobilities (Maitland & Newman 2009b, p. 1), this new urban tourism is characterised as the search for alternative, authentic, lively, and mundane (Maitland 2010) urban places "off the beaten track" (Maitland & Newman 2009a) in cities. However, such a pattern of urban tourism is hardly "new"; first indications were explored by tourism geographies as early as the 1970s, in Germany, for instance, in the neighbourhood of Schwabing in Munich (Meier 1972, p. 59), but the current quantitative dimension puts the phenomenon on the agenda of urban and tourism geographies again.

The geography of new urban tourism is characterised by increasing contacts between residents and tourists due to the active quest by visitors for 'typical' mundane experiences in everyday spaces of the visited city. New urban tourists look for physical encounters with the local population in ordinary, mostly gentrified neighbourhoods (Pappalepore et al. 2010). These lived "spaces are always contingent, created through the myriad encounters of both residents and visitors" (Selby 2012, p. 237) and could create convivial juxtapositions (Maitland 2008, p. 15). However, these frequent contacts are a far cry from always being conflict free. Residents who see in new urban tourists the scapegoats for gentrification and other annoyances in the neighbourhood like noise, dirt, or crowded bars, cafés, and public transport, are, in some

cities, on the increase as the discourse in Berlin, for instance, has recently shown (Hung 2012; Novy 2013; Füller & Michel 2014). These closer contacts between new urban tourists and residents influence resident perceptions of urban tourism, which are hitherto commonly positive around the world (e.g. Gu & Ryan 2008; Nawijn & Mitas 2012).

Concerning the situation in mostly gentrified boroughs influenced by new urban tourism in specific world tourism cities like Berlin, there is only a fine line between residents' attitudes towards the intruders of their residential areas and prejudices. Since the first work on this issue, the residents' perceptions of the tourists in that case tend to be intermingled with ethnic and national stereotypes (Boissevain & Serracino Inglott 1979, Amir & Ben-Ari 1985). The review of the urban residents' perceptions research literature through the lens of the new urban tourism phenomenon offers, therefore, the possibility to scrutinise existing ethnic, cultural, and class prejudices (Valentine & Harris 2014) relating to a fast-growing economic sector (Maitland & Newman 2009b) and its protagonists. In the next section, we begin with an overview of some key issues in new urban tourism research turning then our attention to resident perceptions research in urban areas. The paper goes on to explore how these resident perceptions may change under the impression of a growing new urban tourism. Understanding residents' attitudes towards urban tourism in a broader way offers a framework through which to research the occurring performances (Edensor 2007) in the context of tourist encounters (Hollinshead 2004; Gibson 2010) in cities (Selby 2012) more deeply.

## New urban tourism: encounters that matter

New urban tourism could be denoted as specific varieties of practice. New urban tourism is characterised by the complement or substitution of ordinary touristic activities like sightseeing or museum visits for encounters with ordinary, mundane, city life (Maitland & Newman 2009b) that "catalyses entanglements of people, places and identities" (Gibson 2010, p. 521) in the visited neighbourhoods. These "new tourist areas in cities" (Maitland 2008, p. 15) are marked by the coincidence of imaginations, objects and performances (Haldrup & Larsen 2006), which are named "[h]ybrid performances […] (that) both have effects and produce affects" (Haldrup & Larsen 2006, p. 286). The resulting atmospheres of these "new tourism area(s)" (Pappalepore et al. 2010, p. 218) are created by these performances and the material features of the place like independent shops, bars, and cafés, fancy people or cultural diversity (Pappalepore et al. 2010). The residents in these quarters are often globally oriented people using cosmopolitanism for their own identity constructs and lifestyles (Rofe 2003). They are part of the tourist product (Deery et al. 2012) as well as the material qualities of the gentrified area. Simultaneously, the tourists co-create the symbolic value that could be gained by visiting these specific gentrified places of new tourist areas in cities (Haldrup & Larsen 2010).

Mundane encounters between locals and visitors constitute an important part of the current vogue of urban travels. Originally embedded in the elitist and cosmopolitan frame of the fin de siècle metropolitan hotel lobby where the bourgeois traveller and the bourgeois citizen met (McNeill 2008), these encounters usually take place in ordinary public places like cafés, bars, and clubs in the neighbourhood today. New urban tourism "is imbricated with the mundane and quotidian […] (as well as) with habitual, unreflexive performances" (Edensor 2007, p. 211). Thus, concerning the recent "mobility turn" (Sheller & Urry 2006, p. 208) in the social sciences, it becomes more difficult to differentiate between a purely "touristic" activity and other more mundane behaviour, as Pappalepore et al. (2014, p. 228) emphasise in view of new urban tourism. "[T]he tourism microgeographies of world cities have the potential to challenge traditional views of tourism consumption by blurring the boundaries between tourists, day visitors and residents." The boundary between residents and tourists blurs in cities

(MacCannell 2002). As Ashworth and Page (2011, p.7) put it, "[t]he assumption that we can distinguish, isolate and examine a distinctive urban tourist must be questioned." An important aspect is the fact that many people travel for the purpose of visiting friends and relatives who live in cities sometimes across the globe. These visits give residents the opportunity to use their city like a tourist and, simultaneously, give visitors the opportunity to feel like being at home. Larson (2008, p. 28) calls this phenomenon closely linked with new urban tourism "inhabiting tourism". In their empirical study of Spitalfields, London, Pappalepore et al. (2010) found inhabiting tourism in the form of an 'as if' behaviour as an important characteristic of tourism in this part of the "world tourism city" (Maitland & Newman 2009a). Here, "a reciprocal transgression takes place where tourists play the role of Londoners, and Londoners the role of tourists" (Pappalepore et al. 2010, p. 224-225). New urban tourism is embedded in differentiated forms of mobility like "lifestyle mobilities" (Cohen et al. 2015, p. 156), multilocality (Jordan 2009), migration, or travel that shape the framework condition of urban neighbourhoods. (New) Urban tourists are not "types of people" (Edensor 2000, p. 322), but performers who could be characterised by temporary varying practices of touristic attributes (Edensor 2000). Urban tourism appears like a transient performance on a stage (Adler 1989) rather than being a particular social role category for a limited period of time. These conceptual difficulties of defining tourists (Cohen 1974; McCabe 2005) result in an orientation of geographical urban tourism research towards non-representational, affectual, and performative approaches (Edensor 2007; Selby 2012), which intersect with work on the "cosmopolitan turn" (Valentine 2008, p. 324) in contemporary cities. Thus, urban tourists are just strangers among strangers and residents' perceptions of new urban tourists fall in line with work on "visions of the good city [that] are mobilised to provide a normative justification for claims that urban inhabitants ought to (…) welcome strangers from elsewhere" (Iveson 2006, p. 81).

### Resident perceptions of urban tourism – stereotypes at work?

The detected global growth of new urban tourism (Maitland & Newman 2009b) has not led to a similar increase in resident perceptions studies across all disciplines which aim to uncover the attitudes of locals towards the intrusion of the tourism industry into mundane neighbourhoods. Existing resident perception studies of urban tourism predominantly deal with inner-city tourism far away from the neighbourhoods where most people live. The opinions and appraisals of locals of the often conflicting change in urban economies, infrastructures, and social structure in consequence of the growth of the tourism industry are at the centre of these investigations. Such resident perception studies exist for European cities (Murphy 1981; Glasson 1994; Ryan & Montgomery 1994; Gilbert & Clark 1997; Simpson 1999; Snaith & Haily 1999; Upchurch & Teivane 2000; Andriotis & Vaughan 2003; Haley et al. 2005; Vargas-Sánchez et al. 2009; Ren 2010; Nawijn & Mitas 2012), Asian cities (Liu et al. 1987; Mok et al. 1991; Mansfeld 1992; Teo 1994; Gu & Ryan 2008; Aref 2010), cities in the Pacific Rim (Ross 1992; King et al. 1993; Bastias-Perez & Var 1995; Lawson et al. 1998; Gursoy et al. 2010) as well as for cities in the Americas (Thomason et al. 1979; Belisle & Hoy 1980; Um & Crompton 1987; Schlüter & Var 1988; Madrigal 1993).

These residents' perception studies in urban contexts stretch across a long period of time, from the late 1970s until today, and they include widely different types of cities, from touristic historical cities to global cities, which makes the drawing of general conclusions difficult due to the disparity of the empirical object. However, four different factors could be identified that influence the attitudes towards urban tourists by the host population across the diverse perception studies. These aspects are first an individual economic dependency of the resident on tourism (e.g. Mansfeld 1992; Snaith & Haley 1999; Aref 2010), second, the distance

between residents' homes and touristic sites in the city (e.g. Belisle & Hoy 1980; Um & Crompton 1987; Andereck et al. 2005; Jurowski & Gursoy 2005), third, the period of living in the respective city (e.g. Mok et al. 1991; Snaith & Haley 1999; Haley et al. 2005), and fourth, higher education that leads to more critical views of tourism impacts (e.g. Andriotis & Vaughan 2003) as well as well-educated people in gentrified quarters of world tourism cities like London also relish frequent encounters with visitors due to their cosmopolitan identity (Rofe 2003) and attitude (Pappalepore et al. 2010).

Despite this broad range of empirical outcomes, theoretical explanations are sparse. The two main theoretical approaches to explain the empirical evidence of different residents' perceptions are the "social exchange theory" (SET) (Ap 1992), which stresses the economic asymmetry of tourist–resident barters, and contact theory (Allport 1954) that emphasises possible positive impacts of contacts between different groups. However, Pettigrew and Tropp show in their meta-analytical approach to contact theory that especially in touristic settings positive contact effects on prejudices are significantly lesser than in all other examined settings (Pettigrew & Tropp 2006). Furthermore, particularly the utilitarian SET, characterised as "a frame of reference within which many theories–some micro and some more macro–can speak to one another" (Emerson 1976, p. 336) that assumes positive valuations due to positive exchange outcomes, has received critiques because of this simplistic basic assumption (Haley et al. 2005).

Concerning resident perceptions of new urban tourism, the two theoretical approaches of SET and contact theory come to contradictory explanations. In line with SET, Gu and Ryan (2008) argue that positive attitudes towards new urban tourists change if burdens of tourism in the neighbourhood rise, especially the burdens of pollution or nightly noise. These "local implications of [...] [new urban] tourism" (Picard 2003, p. 108), like frequent encounters between tourists and locals or the conversion of local infrastructures according to the needs of tourists, could force negative attitudes towards this social development among residents (Simpson 1999). Following SET and contact theory, increasing contacts between both groups imply rather positive attitudes towards out-groups. Pursuant to empirical results of new urban tourism studies, this conjecture is either of limited validity, as demonstrated for SET by Gu and Ryan (2008), or inconsistent for contact theory where contacts can foster negative attitudes (Füller & Michel 2014), but lack of contacts can also yield such opinions (Weaver & Lawton 2001).

What is missing here is a research agenda that scrutinises attitudes towards new urban tourism in these "new tourist areas in cities" (Maitland 2008, p. 16), which represent "spaces (…) more heterogenous than homogenous, suggesting tourists are just as likely to encounter non–touristic social performances" (Rickly-Boyd et al. 2014, p. 80–81). Hence, the sketched outcomes of urban perception studies suggest that clear boundaries between tourists and residents or tourist and everyday performances could be drawn. Exactly this is questioned in newer work on new urban tourism (e.g. Pappalepore et al. 2010; 2014). For urban tourism geographies, it seems advisable to be responsive to this fact by developing appropriate theoretical frameworks of research beyond SET and contact theory that is responsive to the intricate situation in new tourism areas in cities. Thus, in the remainder the paper turns to the insights of geographies of prejudices (Valentine 2010) in order to discuss possible readings of perception studies in the light of these research experiences.

*Neglected geographies of prejudices*

Existing hostile attitudes towards perceptible 'others' are facts of society and present themselves frequently as stereotypes, meaning "as category-based generalizations that link category members to typical attributes" (Corell et al. 2010, p. 46). These stereotypes and prejudices could

be presumed even to be present in entangled local–tourist relationships. One important insight of geographical work on prejudices is the spatialisation of these negative attitudes (Dirksmeier 2014, p. 840; Valentine & Harris 2014, p. 86). Prejudices often come "as place-related phobias" (Valentine & Harris 2014, p. 86) depending on the occurrence of prejudiced groups in specific spaces. In the resident's perception studies mentioned above, such resulting kinds of prejudices among residents due to the presence of urban tourists, in particular urban places, are widespread, including increasing criminality due to the simple presence of tourists (e.g. Schlüter & Var 1988; Mok et al. 1991; Ross 1992; Glasson 1994; Bastias-Perez & Var 1995; Gilbert & Clark 1997), drug abuse by tourists (e.g. Schlüter & Var 1988; Mok et al. 1991), scarcity of recreation spaces for locals (Mansfeld 1992), scarcity of transportation infrastructure (Glasson 1994; Lawson et al. 1998) or seasonal groceries (Boissevain & Serracino Inglott 1979), exertion of influence on municipal political decisions (Madrigal 1993), increasing gentrification (Füller & Michel 2014), or better service experiences for tourists with the intention of overcharging them (Teo 1994). The most vigorous aspect of new urban tourism in a spatial perspective is the intrusion of touristic performances into specific living environments that leads to the abstraction "tourism/tourist" taking on a different complexion. The new urban tourist becomes an intricate social figure that could be a friend or a resident, a business traveller seeking variety during her trip in the quarter, a student, or a relative of a resident etc. whose performances in the neighbourhood make personal attributions for abstract or perceived changes in these living environments possible. The performances of new urban tourists, be they visitors from abroad or even residents themselves, function as a source of visible difference in terms of consuming practices and behaviour. Thus, the strange performing tourists may become the scapegoats for perceived evils.

Prejudice indicates "an attitude toward and general appraisal of a specific out-group" (Dirksmeier 2014, p. 839) that is composed of a cognitive component, such as the belief in information about an out-group; an affective component, such as reluctance, and a conative component, such as the disposition to act negatively towards an out-group (Dovidio et al. 2010). Prejudices are embedded in a complex system of mutual valuations (Gursoy et al. 2010) "as a somewhat panoramic ideological system that pertains to groups and to group relations" (Hollinshead 2004, p. 263), whereas the importance of the identities of the 'different' individuals for being prejudiced (Valentine 2010) is but one of many factors. The system of mutual valuations is not stable and especially for tourist/resident relationships influenced by both personal experiences and local or national stereotypes as Pi–Sunyer (1989, p. 189) puts it.

"I will argue that the attitudes that residents hold respecting tourists are in part founded on direct experience, but are also strongly mediated by images and stereotypes concerning different types of visitors."

A well-known outcome in newer theories of prejudice stresses this ambivalence of negative attitudes derived from personal and media experiences and fits well to the argument of Pi-Sunyers (1989) concerning relationships in the wider context of tourism. Prejudices are usually a compound of positive and negative valuations of specific out-groups like new urban tourists, temporary migrants, or lifestyle mobiles, which both underline cultural, social, or economic differences between the involved groups. More positive directed prejudices are in this case a façade and a means for a continuous assumption of such differences between peer groups (Brown 2010). This incongruity of valuations constitutes "the intersectional nature of prejudices" (Valentine et al. 2014, p. 410).

Purely economic explanations of deprecating attitudes towards new urban tourists and other forms of mobility like SET are rather one-dimensional and overlook the intersectional character

and complexity of such rejections. Observable denials of neighbourhood change like those expressed in various residents' perception studies from the 1970s until now or currently expressed in gentrified quarters of, for instance, Berlin (Hung 2012; Novy 2013) should be viewed as the result of an intersection of various attitudes and prejudices towards, for example lower classes (Valentine & Harris 2014), gender relations (Valentine et al. 2014), or ethnic stereotypes (Dirksmeier 2014), which arise in the context of an increasing global mobility. Such a more holistic synopsis of attitudinal concepts towards specific performances is desirable for three reasons. First, from a scientific viewpoint, an appreciation of the phenomenon of stereotypical residents' perceptions is only achievable by a broad combination of social and cultural opinions and worldviews rather than focusing on reciprocity. The entanglement of visitors and residents in the new urban tourism phenomenon with its blurred boundaries between the protagonists and their performances requires an appropriate theoretical ground that is able to conceptualise different motives of action and manifestations of attitudes towards the contingent 'other'. Second, from an applied viewpoint, an understanding of the motives and reasons for negative attitudes towards specific segments of the urban population that is suspected to be "different" in terms of performances and length of stay could be used to work against these hostile local attitudes as low levels of local stereotypes are important factors for tourists' satisfaction and the willingness to visit again (Andriotis & Vaughan 2003, p. 173). And third, a regional perspective is able to take the spatialisation of prejudiced attitudes towards new urban tourists into account, which vary from city to city according to particular local problems. In Berlin, for instance, rising rents and living costs due to economic prosperity lead to hostility against tourists and temporary migrants like oversea students etc., who are blamed for these structural problems of a fast-growing city (Hung 2012; Novy 2013). Thus, in local contexts like Berlin, it becomes necessary to differentiate between issues that are directly associated with a growing tourism industry and problems that exist detached from any tourism development. Considering these arguments, a research agenda for new urban tourism beyond contact theory and SET based on the insights of 'geographies of prejudice' (Valentine 2010; Dirksmeier 2014) seems desirable that includes the possibility to differentiate between the agents and performances involved and their multifarious motives, attitudes, and stereotypes that seem to be responsible for negative outcomes towards perceived 'others' in gentrified quarters like in Berlin (Hung 2012; Novy 2013).

## Conclusion

As outlined in this paper, one main characteristic of new urban tourism is the quest for mundane encounters with locals in mostly gentrified neighbourhoods (Maitland 2008), which are "off the beaten track" (Maitland & Newman 2009a). Due to this tendency of new urban tourists to visit mundane gentrified quarters instead of the city centre, traditional strategies for coping with quantities of visitors perceived as annoying, like avoidance of particular places or times of activities (Ap & Crompton 1993, p. 49), are failing in a mobile age (Sheller & Urry 2006). Increased mobilities foster a differentiation and "throwntogetherness" (Massey 2005, p. 141) of groups in cities composed of new urban tourists, visiting friends, students, long-term residents, lifestyle mobiles, or other temporary migrants.

The paper proposes an expansion of residents' perception studies with 'geographies of prejudice' (Valentine 2010) that deals with emerging stereotypes and prejudices in situations of encounter (Valentine 2008). Increasing reservations about people performing like tourists who visit mundane residential quarters in addition to or instead of the classic touristic destinations of a city could be researched with the theoretical insights of this strand of literature, which is deeply embedded in the mobility turn (Sheller & Urry 2006). This work on "the nexus

between spatial and social mobility" (Faist 2013, p. 1637) assumes fluid borders between seemingly stable categories like tourist, visitor, resident, or student abroad. It could be aligned with social scientific work on difference "in which experiences of prejudice and discrimination have been explored through the lens of gender, race, disability, sexual orientation, age, and religion/belief" (Valentine & Harris 2014, p. 84). To understand hostile residents' attitudes as prejudices and stereotypes rather than as simple 'perceptions' allows for researching the complex conditions of their emergence in cosmopolitan cities (Valentine 2008), which in the case of new urban tourism reach far beyond the rather narrow realms of reciprocity, contact, or distance. And without this deeper understanding of processes of stereotyping and prejudice-building through new urban tourism, an effective counterstrategy will hardly be possible.

## Short Biographies

Peter Dirksmeier's research combines social geography with the insights from wider urban studies. He has published or co-published papers in this area of research in journals like Urban Affairs Review, Visual Studies, Urban Studies, or Erdkunde. Together with Ilse Helbrecht, he co-edited the anthology *New Urbanism*: *Life, Work and Space in the New Downtown* published by Ashgate. His current research focuses on social aspects of urban cohabitation like tourism, prejudices, changing role categories, or affects. Before joining the Geography Department at Humboldt-University, his current University, he worked at Bremen University. Dirksmeier holds a Diploma in Geography from University of Cologne, a doctoral degree from University of Bremen, and a postdoctoral qualification (habilitation) from Humboldt-University.

Ilse Helbrecht is a full Professor of Cultural and Social Geography and Director of the Georg Simmel-Centre for Metropolitan Studies at Humboldt-University, Berlin. She studied geography, sociology and public law at the University of Munster (Germany) and holds a diploma (BA and MA) in geography (Germany), a PhD (Dr. phil.) and habilitation (Dr. phil. habil.) from the Technical University of Munich. Her research focuses on urban governance, urban cultural geography, and European housing markets. Her research is mostly based on qualitative fieldwork in Europe and Canada. She has authored or co-authored 6 books and co-edited 3 collections. And her current work focuses on geographies of displacement, touristification and rights to the city in Berlin.

## Note

* Correspondence address: PD Dr. Peter Dirksmeier, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Geographisches Institut, Department of Geography, Unter den Linden 6, 10099 Berlin, Germany. E-mail: peter.dirksmeier@geo.hu-berlin.de

## References

Adler, J. (1989). Travel as performed art. *American Journal of Sociology* 94(6), pp. 1366–1391.

Allport, G. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Addison-Wesley: Reading, MA.

Amir, Y. and Ben-Ari, R. (1985). International tourism, ethnic contact, and attitude change. *Journal of Social Issues* 41(3), pp. 105–115.

Andereck, K. L., Valentine, K. M., Knopf, R. C. and Vogt, C. A. (2005). Residents' perceptions of community tourism impacts. *Annals of Tourism Research* 32(4), pp. 1056–1076.

Andriotis, K. and Vaughan, R. D. (2003). Urban residents' attitudes toward tourism development: the case of Crete. *Journal of Travel Research* 42(2), pp. 172–185.

Ap, J. (1992). Residents' perceptions on tourism impacts. *Annals of Tourism Research* 19(4), pp. 665–690.

Ap, J. and Crompton, J. L. (1993). Residents' strategies for responding to tourism impacts. *Journal of Travel Research* 32(1), pp. 47–50.

Aref, F. (2010). Residents' attitudes towards tourism impacts: a case study of Shiraz, Iran. *Tourism Analysis* 15(2), pp. 253–261.

Ashworth, G. J. (1989). Urban tourism: an imbalance in attention. *Progress in Tourism, Recreation and Hospitality Management* 1(1), pp. 33–54.

Ashworth, G. J. and Page, S. J. (2011). Urban tourism research: recent progress and current paradoxes. *Tourism Management* 32(1), pp. 1–15.

Bastias-Perez, P. and Var, T. (1995). Perceived impacts of tourism by residents. *Annals of Tourism Research* 22(1), pp. 208–210.

Belisle, F. J. and Hoy, D. R. (1980). The perceived impact of tourism by residents. a case study in Santa Marta, Colombia. *Annals of Tourism Research* 7(1), pp. 83–101.

Boissevain, J. and Serracino Inglott, P. (1979). Tourism in Malta. In: de Kadt, E. (ed) *Tourism – passport to development? Perspectives on the social and cultural effects of tourism in developing countries*. Oxford University Press: Oxford, pp. 265–284.

Brown, R. (2010). *Prejudice. Its Social Psychology*. Wiley-Blackwell: Oxford.

Cohen, E. (1974). Who is a tourist?: A conceptual clarification. *The Sociological Review* 22(4), pp. 527–555.

Cohen, S. A., Duncan, T. and Thulemark, M. (2015). Lifestyle mobilities: the crossroads of travel, leisure and migration. *Mobilities* 10(1), pp. 155–172.

Correll, J., Judd, C. M., Park, B. and Wittenbrink, B. (2010). Measuring prejudice, stereotypes and discrimination. In: Dovidio, J. F., Hewstone, M., Glick, P. and Esses, V. M. (eds) *The Sage handbook of prejudice, stereotyping and discrimination*. Sage: London, pp. 45–62.

Deery, M., Jago, L. and Fredline, L. (2012). Rethinking social impacts of tourism research: a new research agenda. *Tourism Management* 33(1), pp. 64–73.

Dirksmeier, P. (2014). Are urbanites more permissive? Germany's urban geography of prejudice. *Urban Affairs Review* 50(6), pp. 835–863.

Dovidio, J. F., Hewstone, M., Glick, P. and Esses, V. M. (2010). Prejudice, stereotyping and discrimination: theoretical and empirical overview. In: Dovidio, J. F., Hewstone, M., Glick, P. and Esses, V. M. (eds) *The Sage handbook of prejudice, stereotyping and discrimination*. Sage: London, pp. 3–28.

Edensor, T. (2000). Staging tourism. Tourists as performers. *Annals of Tourism Research* 27(2), pp. 322–344.

Edensor, T. (2007). Mundane mobilities, performances and spaces of tourism. *Social & Cultural Geography* 8(2), pp. 199–215.

Emerson, R. M. (1976). Social exchange theory. *Annual Review of Sociology* 2, pp. 335–362.

Faist, T. (2013). The mobility turn: a new paradigm for the social sciences? *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 36(11), pp. 1637–1646.

Füller, H. and Michel, B. (2014). 'Stop being a tourist!' New dynamics of urban tourism in Berlin-Kreuzberg. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 38(4), pp. 1304–1318.

Gibson, C. (2010). Geographies of tourism: (un)ethical encounters. *Progress in Human Geography* 34(4), pp. 521–527.

Gilbert, D. and Clark, M. (1997). An exploratory examination of urban tourism impact, with reference to residents attitudes, in the cities of Canterbury and Guildford. *Cities* 14(6), pp. 343–352.

Glasson, J. (1994). Oxford: a heritage city under pressure. Visitors, impacts and management responses. *Tourism Management* 15(2), pp. 137–144.

Gu, H. and Ryan, C. (2008). Place attachment, identity and community impacts of tourism – the case of Beijing Hutong. *Tourism Management* 29(4), pp. 637–647.

Gursoy, D., Chi, C. G. and Dyer, P. (2010). Locals' attitudes toward mass and alternative tourism: the case of Sunshine Coast, Australia. *Journal of Travel Research* 49(3), pp. 381–394.

Haldrup, M. and Larsen, J. (2006). Material cultures of tourism. *Leisure Studies* 25(3), pp. 275–289.

Haldrup, M. and Larsen, J. (2010). *Tourism, performance and the everyday. Consuming the Orient*. Routledge: London.

Haley, A. J., Snaith, T. and Miller, G. (2005). The social impacts of tourism. a case study of Bath, UK. *Annals of Tourism Research* 32(3), pp. 647–668.

Hollinshead, K. (2004). Encounters in tourism. In: Williams, S. (ed) *Tourism. Critical concepts in the social sciences. Volume II: the experience of tourism*. Routledge: London, pp. 259–277.

Hung, J. (2012). Berlin's housing bubble and the backlash against hipster tourists. *The Guardian* 18. September 2012.

Iveson, K. (2006). Strangers in the Cosmopolis. In: Binnie, J., Holloway, J., Millington, S. and Young, C. (eds) *Cosmopolitan urbanism*. Routledge: London, pp. 70–86.

Jansen-Verbeke, M. (1986). Inner-city tourism: resources, tourists and promoters. *Annals of Tourism Research* 13(1), pp. 79–100.

Jordan, B. (2009). Living a distributed life: multilocality and working at a distance. In: Meerwarth, T. L., Gluesing, J. C. and Jordan, B. (eds) *Mobile work, mobile lives: cultural accounts of lived experiences*. Blackwell: Oxford, pp.28–55.

Jurowski, C. and Gursoy, D. (2005). Distance effects on residents' attitudes toward tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research* 31(2), pp. 296–312.

King, B., Pizam, A. and Milman, A. (1993). Social impacts of tourism. Host perceptions. *Annals of Tourism Research* 20(4), pp. 650–665.

Lawson, R. W., Williams, J., Young, T. and Cossens, J. (1998). A comparison of residents' attitudes towards tourism in 10 New Zealand destinations. *Tourism Management* 19(3), pp. 247–256.

Liu, J. C., Sheldon, P. J. and Var, T. (1987). Resident perception of the environmental impacts of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research* 14(1), pp. 17–37.

MacCannell, D. (2002). The ego factor in tourism. *Journal of Consumer Research* 29(1), pp. 146–151.

Madrigal, R. (1993). A tale of tourism in two cities. *Annals of Tourism Research* 20(2), pp. 336–353.

Maitland, R. (2008). Conviviality and everyday life: the appeal of new areas of London for visitors. *International Journal of Tourism Research* 10(1), pp. 15–25.

Maitland, R. (2010). Everyday life as a creative experience in cities. *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research* 4(3), pp. 176–185.

Maitland, R. and Newman, P. (Eds). (2009a). *World tourism cities. Developing tourism off the beaten track*. Routledge: London.

Maitland, R. and Newman, P. (2009b). Developing world tourism cities. In: Maitland, R. and Newman, P. (eds) . Routledge: World tourism cities. Developing tourism off the beaten track. London, pp. 1–21.

Mansfeld, Y. (1992). Group-differentiated perceptions of social impacts related to tourism development. *The Professional Geographer* 44(4), pp. 377–392.

Massey, D. (2005). *For space*. Sage: London.

McCabe, S. (2005). 'Who is a tourist?' A critical review. *Tourist Studies* 5(1), pp. 85–106.

McNeill, D. (2008). The hotel and the city. *Progress in Human Geography* 32(3), pp. 383–398.

Meier, J. (1972). München als Fremdenverkehrs-Stadt. Geographische Aspekte des Freizeitverhaltens in einer Großstadt. *Mitteilungen der Geographischen Gesellschaft in München* 57, pp. 51–91.

Mok, C., Slater, B. and Cheung, V. (1991). Residents' attitudes towards tourism in Hong Kong. *International Journal of Hospitality Management* 10(3), pp. 289–293.

Murphy, P. E. (1981). Community attitudes to tourism. A comparative analysis. *International Journal of Tourism Management* 2(3), pp. 189–195.

Murphy, P. E. (1992). Urban tourism and visitor behaviour. *American Behavioral Scientist* 36(2), pp. 200–211.

Nawijn, J. and Mitas, O. (2012). Resident attitudes to tourism and their effect on subjective well-being: the case of Palma de Mallorca. *Journal of Travel Research* 51(5), pp. 531–541.

Novy, J. (2013). "Berlin does not love you". Notes on Berlin's "tourism controversy" and its discontents. In: Bernt, M., Grell, B. and Holm, A. (eds) *The Berlin reader. A compendium on urban change and activism*. Transcript: Bielefeld, pp. 223–237.

Novy, J. and Huning, S. (2009). New tourism (areas) in the 'New Berlin'. In: Maitland, R. and Newman, P. (eds) *World tourism cities. Developing tourism off the beaten track*. Routledge: London, pp. 87–108.

Pappalepore, I., Maitland, R. and Smith, A. (2010). Exploring urban creativity: visitor experiences of Spitalfields, London. *Tourism, Culture & Communication* 10(3), pp. 217–230.

Pappalepore, I., Maitland, R. and Smith, A. (2014). Prosuming creative urban areas. Evidence from East London. *Annals of Tourism Research* 44, pp. 227–240.

Pettigrew, T. F. and Tropp, L. R. (2006). A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 90(5), pp. 751–783.

Picard, M. (2003). Touristification and balinization in a time of reformasi. *Indonesia and the Malay World* 31(89), pp. 108–118.

Pi-Sunyer, O. (1989). Changing perceptions of tourism and tourists in a Catalan resort town. In: Smith, V. L. (ed) *Hosts and guests. The anthropology of tourism*. University of Pennsylvania Press: Philadelphia, pp. 187–199.

Ren, C. (2010). Beyond hosts and guests: translating the concept of cultural misconception. *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research* 4(4), pp. 287–298.

Rickly-Boyd, J. M., Knudsen, D. C., Braverman, L. C. and Metro-Roland, M. M. (2014). *Tourism, performance, and place. A geographic perspective*. Ashgate: Farnham.

Roche, M. (1992). Mega-events and micro-modernization: on the sociology of the new urban tourism. *British Journal of Sociology* 43(4), pp. 563–600.

Rofe, M. W. (2003). 'I want to be global': Theorising the gentrifying class as an emergent élite global community. *Urban Studies* 40(12), pp. 2511–2526.

Ross, G. F. (1992). Resident perceptions of the impact of tourism on an Australian city. *Journal of Travel Research* 30(3), pp. 13–17.

Ryan, C. and Montgomery, D. (1994). The attitudes of Bakewell residents to tourism and issues in community responsive tourism. *Tourism Management* 15(5), pp. 358–369.

Schlüter, R. and Var, T. (1988). Resident attitudes toward tourism in Argentina. *Annals of Tourism Research* 15(3), pp. 442–445.

Selby, M. (2012). Geographies of tourism and the city. In: Wilson, J. (ed) *The Routledge handbook of tourism geographies*. Routledge: London, pp. 232–239.

Sheller, M. and Urry, J. (2006). The new mobilities paradigm. *Environment and Planning A* 38(2), pp. 207–226.

Simpson, F. (1999). Tourist impact in the historic centre of Prague: resident and visitor perceptions of the historic built environment. *Geographical Journal* 165(2), pp. 173–183.

Snaith, T. and Haley, A. J. (1999). Residents' opinions of tourism development in the historic city of York, England. *Tourism Management* 20(5), pp. 595–603.

Teo, P. (1994). Assessing socio-cultural impacts: the case of Singapore. *Tourism Management* 15(2), pp. 126–136.

Thomason, P., Crompton, J. L. and Kamp, B. D. (1979). A study of the attitudes of impacted groups within a host community toward prolonged stay tourist visitors. *Journal of Travel Research* 17(3), pp. 2–6.

Um, S. and Crompton, J. L. (1987). Measuring resident's attachment levels in a host community. *Journal of Travel Research* 26(1), pp. 27–29.

Upchurch, R. S. and Teivane, U. (2000). Resident perceptions of tourism development in Riga, Latvia. *Tourism Management* 21(5), pp. 499–507.

Valentine, G. (2008). Living with difference: reflections on geographies of encounter. *Progress in Human Geography* 32(3), pp. 323–337.

Valentine, G. (2010). Prejudice: rethinking geographies of oppression. *Social & Cultural Geography* 11(6), pp. 519–537.

Valentine, G. and Harris, C. (2014). Strivers vs. skivers: class prejudice and the demonization of dependency in everyday life. *Geoforum* 53, pp. 84–92.

Valentine, G., Jackson, L. and Mayblin, L. (2014). Ways of seeing: sexism – the forgotten prejudice? *Gender, Place and Culture* 21(4), pp. 401–414.

Vargas-Sánchez, A., de los Ángeles Plaza-Mejia, M. and Porras-Bueno, N. (2009). Understanding residents' attitudes toward the development of industrial tourism in a former mining community. *Journal of Travel Research* 47(3), pp. 373–387.

Weaver, D. B. and Lawton, L. J. (2001). Resident perceptions in the urban-rural fringe. *Annals of Tourism Research* 28(2), pp. 439–458.