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Abstract

Purpose – There is an ongoing discussion on tools that can lead to sustainable tourism, as well as attempts to implement them. In the selection of tools, the attitudes of residents – local stakeholders and their degree of acceptance of such tools should be analysed and taken into account. Some cause conflicts, and hence, the purpose of this study is the comparative analysis of three cities (Prague, Krakow and Braga).

Design/methodology/approach – Analysis of the basic types of conflicts was conducted using the division proposed by Moore. The research was conducted among residents – experts representing the tourism sector. Based on the literature review, three hypotheses were formulated. Statistical tests were used to analyse the results.

Findings – The results showed a strong impact of the conflict of information and the interests of those dependent on the degree of development of the city’s tourist function. It was established that in the process of achieving sustainable tourism, to minimize conflicts, the following are necessary: paying attention to communication and the involvement of local communities, creating attractions that benefit both residents and visitors, measuring and monitoring tourist traffic, supporting initiatives for new tourist offers and initiating discussions on development problems, and setting common goals for all residents.

Research limitations/implications – The research was conducted during the pandemic and is based on the opinions of experts indicated by the city authorities. While the attitudes of the inhabitants towards the development of tourism were recognized in earlier studies, the awareness of tourists and their readiness to accept limitations related to respecting the needs of the inhabitants were not examined. This aspect may be an interesting direction for further research. A limitation of this research is the small scope of the study, caused both by the restrictions in force during the research period (related to the COVID-19 pandemic) and also by the inability to conduct in-depth interviews with experts. It should also be noted that among the experts participating in the research were tourist entrepreneurs directly interested in rebuilding tourism after the pandemic. Due to this, their opinions may have been biased, but there is no way to prove or disprove this. However, the answers gathered were considered collectively; therefore, the opinions obtained were considered to be objective. Attempts to balance tourism so far have focused mainly on limiting the access of tourists to attractions and tourist areas and introducing (or increasing) admission fees. It is still too early to assess the effectiveness of such tools, hence the lack of scientific analyses of implemented tourism policies.

Practical implications – The role and tasks of institutions managing tourism in cities will probably also change, in particular, so-called destination management organizations. The current declarations indicate the need to respect inhabitants and take measures to limit conflicts arising in the context of the development of the tourist function. However, there is no empirical evidence of the positive results achieved.

Social implications – The results will allow the implementation of tourism balancing tools that are accepted by the local community.
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Minimizar los conflictos entre los residentes y los agentes turísticos locales como forma de lograr un turismo sostenible en Praga, Cracovia y Braga

Resumen

Objetivo: Hay un debate en curso sobre las herramientas que pueden conducir al turismo sostenible, así como los intentos de implementarlas. En la selección de herramientas, se deben analizar y tener en cuenta las actitudes de los residentes – agentes interesados locales y su grado de aceptación de dichas herramientas. Algunas provocan conflictos, de ahí que el objetivo de este artículo sea el análisis comparativo de tres ciudades (Praga, Cracovia, Braga).

Diseño/metodología/enfoque: El análisis de los tipos básicos de conflictos se realizó utilizando la división propuesta por Moore. La investigación se llevó a cabo entre residentes, expertos que representan el sector turístico. A partir de la revisión de la literatura se formularon tres hipótesis. Se utilizaron pruebas estadísticas para analizar los resultados.

Conclusiones: Los resultados mostraron un fuerte impacto del conflicto de información y los intereses de quienes dependen del grado de desarrollo de la función turística de la ciudad. Se estableció que en el proceso de lograr un turismo sostenible, para minimizar los conflictos es necesario: prestar atención a la comunicación y a la implicación de las comunidades locales, crear atractivos que beneficien tanto a los residentes como a los visitantes, medir y monitorear el tráfico turístico, apoyar iniciativas de nuevas ofertas turísticas e iniciar debates sobre los problemas de desarrollo, y establecer objetivos comunes para todos los residentes.

Originalidad/valor: La selección de las ciudades históricas y el planteamiento de un problema de investigación basado en la misma herramienta permitieron realizar una inferencia comparativa. Los resultados pueden ayudar a configurar la gestión del turismo en las ciudades y la elección de herramientas para su desarrollo sostenible.
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1. Introduction

The pandemic stimulated tourism organizations, cities and regions to perform prospective analyses, trying to find an answer to the question of the future of tourism management. It is increasingly noticed that “new” tourism must implement activities and ensure effects resulting from relations and interactions between tourists, suppliers, local authorities, residents and the broadly understood surrounding environment. The new approach to tourism, evident especially since the pandemic, draws attention to its sustainable nature, which must be considered at an economic, social and environmental level. The dilemma, however, is that there is a conflict between the first of these and the others, especially the
third aspect. Currently, the 2030 Agenda is being implemented, which is to support activities for the development of sustainable tourism. It is part of the global challenge to achieve a more sustainable world (Buhalis et al., 2023). Nowadays, attention is paid to improving the quality of a tourist destination as a way of achieving the goals of sustainable development (Mason et al., 2023).

An important challenge facing historic cities is the growing and complex competition between them for tourists and problems related to overtourism. In the era of the growing need to care for the quality of life in cities, it is necessary to identify dysfunctions resulting from tourism and recommend actions in creating the city’s tourism policy that take into account all stakeholders while at the same time maintaining a balance between the interests of various groups forming the city’s community (visitors, residents, entrepreneurs and investors), but also within each group, as points of view can be varied and even opposing.

From the perspective of 2023, there are already observable actions of the authorities of historical cities to organize tourism in a way that supports their sustainable development, understood as minimizing the sources of conflicts. This can be seen in many cities from the strategic documents that have been developed. However, local authorities are limited by legal regulations that fall within the competence of government administration or even the European Union.

In numerous publications, the concept of sustainable tourism, especially in relation to historical cities, is treated as a process, as a result of which the behaviour of tourists and local service providers does not cause losses or changes that are difficult to reverse in capacity, the surrounding environment and in social and economic relations. The process should also bring benefits to tourists and communities living in the area visited, as well as persons and institutions providing tourist services. This phenomenon is closely related to the concept of the tourism area life cycle, published as early as 1980 (Butler, 1980). This concept was based on the assumption that towns and tourist areas are subject to dynamic transformations caused by changes in the preferences and needs of tourists, the emergence of new tourist attractions or new trends in tourism itself. The assumptions of this concept have been supplemented and verified many times by numerous researchers (Buhalis, 2000; Lundtorp and Wanhill, 2001; Butler, 2006; Berry, 2006). Later, with regard to culturally valuable cities, the theory of the vicious circle of tourism emerged (Russo, 2002).

Against this background, the aim of the research is to crystallize and identify the intensity and nature of social conflicts that arise due to the direct or indirect influence of tourism, the conflict-generating nature of which is becoming an increasingly distinctive feature, especially in cities (Kowalczyk-Anioł and Włodarczyk, 2017; Zmyślny et al., 2020b, Walas et al., 2018).

An analytical tool useful in managing the universal nature of conflict is the so-called circle of conflicts (Moore, 2014), defined according to its underlying components: values and attitudes, interests, relations between the parties to the conflict, access to information and structural conditions (conflict course). This tool has so far rarely been used in relation to tourism (Zmyślny and Pliarczyk, 2020a; Walas, 2021).

The aim of presented research is to assess the level of conflicts between stakeholders in selected cities and to identify the sources of these conflicts and the problems faced by contemporary tourist destinations, seeking new concepts of tourism management. Respondents were presented with several hypothetical solutions to obtain their level of significance for minimizing conflicts, identifying their sources and achieving a sustainable tourist function of cities. The authors compare the research results for three different cities, two of which are in closer proximity (Prague–Czech Republic and Krakow–Poland) and one at a significant distance (Braga–Portugal). The article is a continuation of the authors’ long-term research on the topic of conflicts in tourist destinations.
2. Literature review

In the literature on tourism, the concept of “conflict” is usually defined as “social conflict” (e.g. Zmyślony et al., 2020), “socio-cultural conflict” (Postma and Schmuecker, 2017), “intergroup conflicts” (Chien and Ritchie, 2018), “land-use conflict” (e.g. Almeida-García et al., 2021) and “urban tourism” (Sevilla-Buitrago, 2013). Social or sociocultural conflicts are often the result of over-tourism, where conflicts between residents and tourists (also known as “host-guest conflicts”) arise (Cheung and Li, 2019). Land use conflicts are frequent in the development of coastal tourism, where the mismatch between economic and environmental interests is common (Dziedzic, 2010; e.g. Almeida-García et al., 2021; Hjalager, 2010). The conflicts result from the existence of different interest groups that generate six potential areas of conflict: tourism industry – residents, tourism industry – local authority, tourism industry – tourism industry – visitors, residents – residents – local authority (Walas, 2021). The intensified areas of conflict became the basis for the statements presented to the respondents in this study. The progressive tourist hypertrophy of many cities (overtourism) and their gentrification (Helms, 2003; Kowalczyk-Anioł, 2019; Adie et al., 2020; Mihalic and Kuscer, 2021) have become a fact. In the literature, the most frequently indicated manifestations and effects of excessive tourism, i.e. conflict-generating, are (ECM, 2018; Peeters et al., 2018): excessive concentration of tourists, pressure to increase the use of public transport, parking difficulties, increased cleaning costs, increased demand for energy and water, degradation of the cultural and natural environment, anti-social behaviour of tourists, negative aspects of the so-called night-time economy, through the accelerated development of “middlebrow partying” (Zmyślony and Pawlusifiski, 2019a), an excessive or uncontrolled increase in the number of accommodation facilities or changing of the current function of premises or buildings to accommodation, excessive commercialization of local culture, residential and commercial gentrification and social tensions (tourismophobia). In the case of the observed vicious circle, conflict also arises on a local scale between the city centre, which incurs operating costs and neighbouring districts (Manente and Pechlaner, 2006; Zmyślony, 2012). The increase in tourist traffic and investments in urban tourism have caused protests among the inhabitants of many cities, especially European ones, who see it as a source of tourism gentrification (Atkinson and Bridge, 2005) and tourism hypertrophy (Kowalczyk-Anioł, 2019; Benner, 2020; Calle-Vaquero et al., 2021). This is particularly visible where tourism has significantly deteriorated the living conditions and quality of life of local communities. As examples, the literature cites, among others, Venice, Barcelona, Dubrovnik, Amsterdam and Berlin (Colomb and Novy, 2017; Kowalczyk-Anioł and Zmyślony, 2017; Żemła, 2020; Abbasian et al., 2020), while in Poland this includes Krakow (Kruczek et al., 2019; Szromek et al., 2020), Wrocław (Fedyk et al., 2020) and Poznań (Zmyślony and Pilarczyk, 2020a). These processes contribute to the destruction of the sociocultural tissue of the city, as the inhabitants lose their identity, and their place of residence begins to be occupied by visitors, for whose needs the public space begins to be organized (Gonzalez et al., 2018).


Studies of historic districts under the pressure of tourism indicate that local governments strive to achieve a balance between the interests of all local stakeholders (Walas et al., 2018). The problem of sustainable tourism development is one of the key topics addressed in urban development planning (García-Hernández et al., 2019). However, it should be emphasized that more cooperation between the various stakeholders is needed to avoid
conflicts in modern cities (Sevilla-Buitrago, 2013; Almeida-García et al., 2021), including the exchange of experiences and solutions based on the concept of open innovation (Szmerek et al., 2022). A wide spectrum of issues is described in the monograph on urban tourism by Morrison and Coca-Stefaniak (2021).

The conflicts in the historical district of Lisbon Bairro Alto were analysed using the Progress Triangle tool, which enabled the identification of three dimensions of conflict: substance, procedure and relationship (Rego and Almeida, 2022). In the case of Krakow, an attempt to calculate the intensity of conflicts using the Moore conflict wheel before the COVID-19 pandemic was presented by Zmyślony and Kowalczyk-Anioł (2019b). The conflicts are the result of different structures in the hierarchy of values and differences in the perception of the city (Kruczek et al., 2022).

The perception by tourists of the city of Braga (Portugal) was examined, considering four factors explaining the choice of destination: destination loyalty, destination identity, competitiveness and destination image (Pereira et al., 2022; Lages et al., 2018; Remoaldo et al., 2019). The applied approach introduced a multidimensional concept of a tourist destination in the relationship between tourists and the places they visit. Surveys of local stakeholders, described in the Integrated Action Plan [Integrated Action Plan (IAP) 2022], were used to examine their views on the role of tourism and the need to make tourism more sustainable, as well as their expectations in terms of action(s).

Until the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic, Prague experienced huge problems with overtourism (Simpson, 1999; Ronca, 2019; Kadar, 2018). Commercialization of the city centre (Hoffman and Musil, 1999; Sykora, 1999), environmental damage (Deichmann, 2002) and tourist gentrification have been observed for years because of investments made for tourism. Privatization and lack of management have had a significant impact on tourism in the city (Dumbrovska, 2017). The results of research in Prague (Kacprzak, 2021) show that intensive tourist traffic is a negative phenomenon for the inhabitants, which significantly reduces the quality of their life in the city. The aim of the new strategy was to achieve sustainable tourism with an emphasis on cultural heritage and the quality of life of the residents. The implementation plan includes, among others, addressing the negative impacts of tourism, balancing tourism in the city centre and management of public spaces (Destinacni management Prahy, 2020). However, it is extremely difficult to balance idealism with pragmatism. In Prague, there have already been signs of conflicts between stakeholders concerning the implementation of sustainable tourism (CzechTourism, 2022).

Minimization of conflict areas and their sources is a real tool to lead to the recognition of destinations as sustainable. For the application of the principles of sustainable development (Sachs et al., 2022), it is important to monitor the impact of tourism on the target area. Many systems of indicators for measuring the development of sustainable tourism have been developed so far, including the European Tourism Indicators System for Sustainable Destinations (The European Tourism Indicator System. ETIS toolkit for sustainable destination management, 2016). An interesting methodological concept for selecting and assessing socio-economic indicators to assess the impact of tourism activity among the three groups involved in the tourism sector – residents, traders and visitors – was developed for Santiago de Compostela (Rama, 2022). However, the various proposals for a tourism balancing tool do not address conflicts between different stakeholder groups. Some of the proposals involve significant costs for entrepreneurs, while others, for example, limiting access to tourist zones, including by increasing fees or limiting access by car, also harm the interests of residents.

3. Material and methods

Based on a review of the latest literature and previously developed methods of researching conflicts between stakeholders (Kruczek et al., 2022), a qualitative study was designed,
which was carried out at the turn of 2021 and 2022. The subject of the research was the level of conflicts and their sources in the perception of tourism experts. The selection of residents-experts in the case of Braga and Krakow was based on the so-called Urbact Local Group (Vrabie, 2020), i.e. groups of experts appointed by the city administration to implement the local tourism policy. For Prague, the data was collected by a co-author among residents representing services with a structure similar to that in the other cities. The respondents were considered experts in the relationship between the local tourism economy and other stakeholders because they constitute teams entrusted by cities with conceptual work on strategic documents and the implementation of tools aimed at minimizing the dysfunctional role of tourism. The methodological assumption for selecting respondents was that representatives of various sectors of the local economy, who are also residents, have a comprehensive assessment of the relations between various groups of tourism stakeholders, including residents. It was assessed, based on the literature, that the selection of a broader research sample of residents might not provide objective results, being the result of the NIMBY (Not In My Back Yard) effect. It was, therefore, assumed that their opinions would be broader than the perception of residents.

The research tool was a research questionnaire consisting of a set of questions grouped into three thematic categories. One of the issues examined concerned conflicts occurring in urban destinations. The remaining ones concerned the identification of experts’ opinions on the causes of conflicts and their impact on the sustainability of urban tourism. The research questionnaire used in the study had already been used by the authors in previous studies but was nevertheless re-analysed for reliability. To analyse the reliability of the research questionnaire, the Cronbach’s alpha coefficient was used, which in the case of the study was 0.838, which allows the research tool to be considered reliable.

The research was conducted using the Computer-Assisted Web Interview technique among residents – tourism experts representing both the public (49.4%) and private (50.6%) sectors. They were both running tourism enterprises and officials dealing with the organization of tourism daily as part of local administration. All of them are involved in the process of the new tourism policy of the analysed cities.

As a result, 81 opinions were collected in the form of interviews, of which 36 experts were from Krakow, 25 from Prague and 20 from Braga. The choice of destinations from which the experts came was deliberate, as the authors intended to examine whether the perception of conflicts and problems with tourism differ in destinations located in neighbouring countries and in a distant country. The location of the destinations from which the experts came is shown in Figure 1.

A variety of indicators are used to measure the tourist load in destinations. These are constructed based on available data showing the number of accommodation establishments, the number of accommodation places, the number of tourists accommodated and the number of overnight stays in relation to the land area of the destination or the number of inhabitants. Comparative data on the analysed cities is presented in Table 1.

The data in Table 1 indicates a relatively well-developed tourist function in Krakow compared to Prague and Braga. In terms of the Schneider tourist traffic intensity index, Krakow is slightly behind Braga and Prague. According to the Charvat index, the intensity of traffic in Krakow is slightly inferior to Prague, while it is the lowest in Braga. The Defert index, which refers to the number of people staying overnight per 1 km², indicates that the values achieved in Prague are twice as high as those in Kraków and five times higher than in Braga. The accommodation density index illustrates the number of bed places per 1 km². Its value is highest in Prague and lowest in Braga. On the other hand, Braga comes first in terms of the density of the number of accommodation facilities per 1 km² (due to the registration of short-term rental facilities).

Comparing the tourist destinations selected for the study, they do not differ significantly in terms of the overall quality of life in the city. In the case of Braga, it is the highest
(8.00 ± 0.92), while it is medium in the case of Prague (7.52 ± 1.61) and the lowest in Krakow (7.22 ± 1.22). In conclusion, this difference is statistically insignificant \((p = 0.047)\).

The following research hypotheses were formulated:

- **H1.** The level of conflict increases with the development of the city’s tourist function.

- **H2.** Among residents – stakeholders in the tourism economy, the highest rate of conflict is between residents and the tourism industry and between residents and local authorities.

- **H3.** Conflicts of interest and information play the strongest role in shaping residents’ attitudes towards tourism.

4. Results

Analysis of the level of conflict between residents was conducted using a ten-point measurement scale (1–10), with the results then averaged. Comparing the averages with the statistical test made it possible to determine the distribution of the assigned ratings and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Baretje-Defert tourism function indicator</th>
<th>Schneider’s tourist traffic intensity index</th>
<th>Charvat tourist traffic intensity index</th>
<th>Defert index of the number of people staying overnight per 1 km²</th>
<th>Accommodation density index</th>
<th>Number of accommodation facilities per 100 km²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KRAKOW</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>312.2</td>
<td>688.6</td>
<td>7,307</td>
<td>94.6</td>
<td>82.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRAGUE</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>358.4</td>
<td>759.1</td>
<td>15,917</td>
<td>183.2</td>
<td>160.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRAGA</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>330.1</td>
<td>352.4</td>
<td>3,530</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>311.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Own study base on calculations on data from the Central Statistical Office of Poland, Czech Republic, Portugal and estimates)
then to estimate the significance level of the differences between the average values from the three destinations. The results of the analysis of the ratings distribution indicate a lack of normal distribution. Therefore, for pairwise comparisons between destinations, the Mann–Whitney test was used for two samples of independent groups, while for comparisons of all three destinations simultaneously, the Kruskal–Wallis analysis of variance (ANOVA) test was used for multiple samples of independent groups. Mean values were supplemented with standard deviation. Detailed results are presented in Table 2.

In general (in all three destinations together), the highest level of conflict is observed in the relationship residents vs local government (5.42 ± 2.39) and tourism industry vs residents (5.25 ± 2.27) and the lowest in the relationship tourists vs tourists (2.91 ± 1.65). However, when analyzing this phenomenon broken down into the three destinations studied, it is evident that there are both differences in the level of conflict between destinations and that the general level of these conflicts is different. This is particularly visible in the ratings indicated by the representatives of Braga compared to the results observed in the other destinations, which is not surprising due to the less developed tourist function of the city compared to the other two.

The table presents the results of the calculations and shows that there is a high similarity between the indications of the experts from Krakow and Prague. The averaged indications of experts from these cities do not differ statistically significantly (p < 0.05); differences are observed only in the intensity of individual conflicts.

In the case of Krakow, the highest level of conflict is observed in the case of the relationships: residents vs local government (6.72 ± 2.04), tourists vs residents (6.42 ± 2.39) and tourism industry vs residents (6.31 ± 1.72). In the case of Prague, these are: tourism industry vs residents (5.68 ± 1.86), tourism industry vs local government (5.41 ± 2.36), residents vs local government (5.18 ± 2.04) and tourists vs residents (5.18 ± 2.11).

In the case of Braga, the indicated problems are like those in the other two destinations, but the assessments of the level of conflict are much lower and do not differ significantly from each other. The experts from Braga pointed to conflicts in relationships such as residents vs local government (3.21 ± 1.72), tourism industry vs tourism industry (2.89 ± 1.76), tourism industry vs local government (2.74 ± 1.69) and tourism industry vs residents (2.74 ± 1.69). It is also worth noting that while the comparison of the average ratings of the experts from Krakow and Prague is statistically insignificant (p > 0.05), the comparisons between Braga and Prague and Braga and Krakow are statistically significant (p < 0.05). This difference already positively verifies H1 and H2. A graphical comparison of the test results is shown in Figure 2.

When analyzing the basic forms of conflicts between stakeholders, the division proposed by Moore (Moore, 2014) was used in the form of the so-called conflict wheel, which is an

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2</th>
<th>Level of conflicts in three destinations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of conflict (1–10) Av ± SD</td>
<td>tourism industry vs residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>5.25 ± 2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krakow</td>
<td>6.31 ± 1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prague</td>
<td>5.68 ± 1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braga</td>
<td>2.74 ± 1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P(ANOVA)</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P(Krakow-Prague)</td>
<td>0.369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P(Krakow-Braga)</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P(Braga-Prague)</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own study. Explanations: Av: average, SD: standard deviation.
interesting and useful analytical tool for managing the universal nature of conflict. In the method, Moore relied on such components as values and attitudes, interests, relations between the parties to the conflict, access to information and structural conditions.

Using Moore’s wheel, respondents were confronted with statements that were modified and adapted to relate to the areas of several conflicts: conflict of information, relationship conflict, conflict of values, conflict of interest and structural conflict.

In accordance with the adopted research methodology, average assessments of sources of conflict in individual destinations were obtained and are presented in Table 3. The experts from Krakow pointed primarily to a conflict of interest (8.06 ± 1.59). They see a situation where a certain group of stakeholders sees themselves as stronger and more privileged than others. It is worth noting, however, that the other reasons are also rated very highly, considering the ratings from the other destinations. Representatives from Prague decided that the conflicts may be caused by information conflict (6.76 ± 2.14) and structural conflict (6.48 ± 2.09). Therefore, they believe that stakeholders rely on incorrect information, which is why they do not know the real situation or are unable to assess it properly. In turn, in Braga, it was recognized that the sources of conflict in this city are primarily a conflict of information (5.79 ± 2.39) and conflict of interest (5.68 ± 2.03), i.e. similarly to Prague, they believe that residents rely on incorrect information or incorrectly interpret the information they have, or similarly to Krakow – one group of residents sees itself as both privileged and stronger. The results positively verify H3.

The experts least often pointed to a conflict of relations between residents, i.e. a negative emotional attitude giving rise to a tendency to retaliate. An interesting fact is also how highly individual sources of conflict are rated in Krakow (7.20 ± 1.59), while they are much lower in
Table 3  Identification of conflict sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of conflicts between stakeholders</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Krakow</th>
<th>Prague</th>
<th>Braga</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information conflict</td>
<td>6.72 ± 2.41</td>
<td>7.20 ± 2.48</td>
<td>6.76 ± 2.14</td>
<td>5.79 ± 2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship’s conflict</td>
<td>6.43 ± 2.35</td>
<td>7.49 ± 2.02</td>
<td>6.38 ± 1.96</td>
<td>4.53 ± 2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values conflict</td>
<td>6.78 ± 2.01</td>
<td>7.71 ± 1.49</td>
<td>6.67 ± 1.83</td>
<td>5.26 ± 2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure conflict</td>
<td>6.43 ± 2.02</td>
<td>7.18 ± 1.64</td>
<td>6.48 ± 2.09</td>
<td>5.05 ± 1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest conflict</td>
<td>6.89 ± 2.02</td>
<td>8.06 ± 1.59</td>
<td>6.10 ± 1.61</td>
<td>5.68 ± 2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The overall level of all ratings (Av ± SD)</td>
<td>6.72 ± 2.02</td>
<td>7.20 ± 1.59</td>
<td>6.76 ± 1.61</td>
<td>5.79 ± 2.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own study

Braga (5.79 ± 2.03). Again, the ratings recorded among the experts from Prague turn out to be the most balanced (6.76 ± 1.61). At the same time, all sources of conflict in Krakow were rated higher than any source in Prague and Braga, which may indicate the complexity of conflicts in Krakow, resulting from all the above-mentioned sources, but most of all from conflict of interest.

The key problematic areas were also identified for the studied tourist destinations. The results of this analysis are presented in Table 4. Again, the highest scores are observed among the experts from Krakow, and it is among experts from this city that most results at the level of eight or more are identified, i.e. as many as four. These are: depopulation of buildings in the district (8.41 ± 1.96), excessive noise on the street (8.29 ± 1.85), problems with short-term rental of flats (8.18 ± 2.05) and noise at night (8.24 ± 1.69). The smallest problems in Krakow are air pollution (5.42 ± 2.48) and no local infrastructure (shops, etc.) (5.65 ± 2.28).

In turn, residents and tourists from Prague face problems with short-term rental of flats (8.90 ± 1.65), high rent (8.50 ± 1.57) and depopulation of buildings in the district (7.90 ± 2.20). In turn, the problem of high water usage (5.30 ± 1.75) is extremely rarely observed there. Braga, in this respect, is characterized by similar but also slightly different problems. The highest-rated problem in Braga is the lack of parking spaces (7.68 ± 2.14) and high rent (7.58 ± 1.71), while the lowest scores were noted for no local infrastructure (shops, etc.) (3.47 ± 1.61) and safety issues (fights and shouting) (3.89 ± 1.82).

Table 4  Identification of the areas of conflict in urban destinations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key problems</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Krakow</th>
<th>Prague</th>
<th>Braga</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of parking spaces</td>
<td>7.27 ± 2.36</td>
<td>7.47 ± 2.33</td>
<td>6.57 ± 2.54</td>
<td>↑ 7.68 ± 2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic congestion</td>
<td>7.05 ± 2.07</td>
<td>7.71 ± 1.64</td>
<td>6.38 ± 2.50</td>
<td>↑ 6.63 ± 2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High rent</td>
<td>↑ 7.86 ± 1.92</td>
<td>7.65 ± 2.17</td>
<td>↑ 8.50 ± 1.57</td>
<td>↑ 7.58 ± 1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowded public transport</td>
<td>5.89 ± 2.31</td>
<td>6.18 ± 2.43</td>
<td>6.40 ± 2.11</td>
<td>4.84 ± 2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High land purchase prices</td>
<td>7.51 ± 2.08</td>
<td>7.94 ± 2.17</td>
<td>7.50 ± 1.82</td>
<td>6.74 ± 2.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air pollution</td>
<td>↓ 5.42 ± 2.48</td>
<td>↓ 6.00 ± 2.70</td>
<td>4.90 ± 2.20</td>
<td>4.95 ± 2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste pollution (rubbish)</td>
<td>6.16 ± 2.28</td>
<td>6.41 ± 2.13</td>
<td>6.70 ± 2.18</td>
<td>5.16 ± 2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High prices for services and goods in shops</td>
<td>6.22 ± 2.37</td>
<td>6.76 ± 2.15</td>
<td>6.90 ± 2.29</td>
<td>4.53 ± 2.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excessive noise on the street</td>
<td>7.18 ± 2.35</td>
<td>↑ 8.29 ± 1.85</td>
<td>7.50 ± 2.14</td>
<td>4.84 ± 1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems with short-term rental of flats</td>
<td>↑ 8.00 ± 2.16</td>
<td>↑ 8.18 ± 2.05</td>
<td>↑ 8.90 ± 1.65</td>
<td>6.74 ± 2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depopulation of buildings in the district</td>
<td>7.40 ± 2.51</td>
<td>↑ 8.41 ± 1.96</td>
<td>↑ 7.90 ± 2.20</td>
<td>5.05 ± 2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High water usage</td>
<td>5.67 ± 1.92</td>
<td>6.12 ± 1.84</td>
<td>↓ 5.30 ± 1.75</td>
<td>5.26 ± 2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excessive number of places to drink alcohol</td>
<td>6.66 ± 2.54</td>
<td>7.65 ± 2.33</td>
<td>6.90 ± 2.29</td>
<td>4.63 ± 2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety issues (fights, shouting)</td>
<td>5.78 ± 2.20</td>
<td>6.71 ± 1.77</td>
<td>↓ 6.00 ± 2.15</td>
<td>↓ 3.89 ± 1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise at night</td>
<td>7.23 ± 2.23</td>
<td>↑ 8.24 ± 1.69</td>
<td>7.50 ± 1.93</td>
<td>5.16 ± 2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No local infrastructure (shops, etc.)</td>
<td>↓ 5.18 ± 2.47</td>
<td>↓ 5.65 ± 2.28</td>
<td>↓ 6.00 ± 2.75</td>
<td>↓ 3.47 ± 1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism gentrification (shops, etc.)</td>
<td>6.47 ± 2.42</td>
<td>7.47 ± 1.99</td>
<td>6.80 ± 2.38</td>
<td>4.32 ± 1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The overall level of all ratings (Av ± SD)</td>
<td>6.65 ± 2.42</td>
<td>7.22 ± 2.25</td>
<td>6.86 ± 2.35</td>
<td>5.38 ± 2.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own study
The experts were offered a hypothetical set of solutions to minimize conflicts, which ultimately leads to sustainable tourism, especially after the occurrence of COVID-19. Their intention was to assess the effectiveness of the solutions, and the researchers assigned them to the sources of conflict (Table 5). A closed range of possible solutions identified in the studied cities and based on a literature review was used. Among all experts, the following solutions were rated the highest: communication and involvement of local communities (8.97 ± 1.42), creating attractions that benefit both residents and visitors (8.81 ± 1.70), measurement and monitoring of tourism (8.61 ± 1.76), supporting initiatives for new tourist offers, even niche ones (8.61 ± 1.56), encouraging visitors to explore the city outside the historical centre and outside the city (8.56 ± 1.96), initiating discussions about development problems and establishing common goals for all stakeholders (8.56 ± 1.62). All proposed solutions are presented in Table 5.

The authors believe that it is worth noting that some tools if introduced, would be detrimental to the economic interests of residents and the perceived quality of life (e.g. limiting the development of services in the historical zone, restrictions on the night opening hours of gastronomy establishments or entry restrictions to the city centre). The degree of acceptance of the economy of values remains unresolved.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of solution</th>
<th>Severity level</th>
<th>Sources of conflicts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication and involve local communities</td>
<td>8.97 ± 1.42</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of attractions that benefit both residents and visitors</td>
<td>8.81 ± 1.70</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measuring and monitoring of tourism</td>
<td>8.61 ± 1.76</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting the initiative of new tourist offers, even niche ones</td>
<td>8.61 ± 1.56</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging the visitors to explore the city outside the historical centre and outside the city</td>
<td>8.56 ± 1.96</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiating discussions about development problems and establishing common goals for all stakeholders</td>
<td>8.56 ± 1.62</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introducing campaigns to make tourists aware of the rights of residents, providing information on local laws, customs and culture norms</td>
<td>8.44 ± 1.75</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introducing registration rules for short-term letting as a business activity</td>
<td>8.17 ± 1.87</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensify the tourist promotion of the city to “recover” tourists</td>
<td>8.11 ± 2.03</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated on-line booking systems for tourist attractions and cultural institutions</td>
<td>7.97 ± 2.16</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Striving for a consensus of residents and local service providers in terms of development through tourism consisting in the acceptance by stakeholders of the possibility of giving up part of one’s own benefits for the benefit of the city’s common values, with planned sustainable development of the local economy</td>
<td>7.77 ± 1.77</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating or strengthen tourism management through local DMO</td>
<td>7.69 ± 1.81</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating mobile applications with alternative attractions</td>
<td>7.61 ± 2.07</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introducing a voluntary, free quality certificate of quality for service providers of sustainable development (ecological, sanitary, service, etc.)</td>
<td>7.49 ± 1.90</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of preferential tax conditions for service activities maintaining local identity in the city center</td>
<td>7.03 ± 2.60</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limiting the development of certain types of services in the historical/tourist zone</td>
<td>6.99 ± 2.46</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limiting the existing short-term rental</td>
<td>6.73 ± 2.54</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce the number of new accommodation facilities in the center</td>
<td>6.14 ± 2.73</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduce restrictions of the night opening hours of gastronomy</td>
<td>5.80 ± 2.71</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase entry restrictions to the city center</td>
<td>5.72 ± 2.56</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charge higher local taxes for service providers using the cultural heritage of the city</td>
<td>5.01 ± 2.72</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own study
5. Discussion

Recent research on attitudes based on the Doxey index shows that three archetypes of residents should be distinguished: advocates of the positive impacts of tourism, demanders of sustainable tourism and boycotters of further tourism developments (Schonherr et al., 2023). This means that conflicts are inevitable, and solutions implemented to balance tourism can only minimize them. Research into conflicts measured using the Moore wheel was conducted in two cities in Poland, namely, Krakow and Poznan (Zmyšlony et al., 2020b). The authors state that the dynamics of value-related conflicts are difficult to resolve as it requires the negotiation and compromise. The conflicts referring to interest, data or relationship dimensions are much easier to resolve (Zmyšlony et al., 2020b, p. 17). This means that the implementation of sustainable management principles should focus on those areas where the chances of reducing conflict are significant. Such a conclusion is also confirmed by this research, which proves that conflicts are strongly localized, resulting from both the social structure of the inhabitants and relations with the local authorities. This thesis can be confirmed by the fact that selected conflicts were more distinct in Krakow than in Prague, while the latter city was affected by severe overtourism. It is rightly noted that discussions about overtourism and its sources will return (Kamata, 2022; Schonherr et al., 2023) and that understanding the attitudes of the city’s stakeholders will remain the basis for effective strategies but will also be a challenge. It can also be expected that many historical urban destinations will go from overtourism, through undertourism back to overtourism. We have a situation where, on the one hand, efforts are being made to achieve a balance in tourism, while on the other hand, residents representing the tourism industry are striving to make up for pandemic losses.

We do not yet know in which direction changes in the management of the tourism economy will go, although the already emphasized changes relate to the sphere of legal regulations limiting tourist traffic. However, the question is whether this will gain social acceptance, including among residents, some of whom articulate their vision of cities in accordance with the principle of NIMBY. As a consequence of the analysed phenomena, new postulated descriptions have appeared, such as responsible (which refers to the way in which visitors, residents and small businesses interact with a destination), intelligent (implementing innovative and inclusive solutions in tourism, using human capital to develop the sector, prosperity and a better quality of life for its residents, offering personalized service through valorization of local values while respecting and involving local communities) or creative tourism (offers visitors the opportunity to develop their creative potential through active participation in courses and learning experiences that are characteristic of the destination). While the observation of tourist behaviour and experience shows features that characterize these new concepts (Richard, 2021; Coca-Stefaniak, 2021), their management seems to be more difficult and intensified by conflicts between stakeholders.

From the perspective of 2023, it is worth noting that many cities are already making decisions aimed at regulating incoming tourism, although some of them are not in the interest of residents, limit their access to heritage, communication zones and even limit economic activity. Whether this will result in another area of conflict is unknown and requires updated new empirical research.

6. Conclusions

It should be noted that in achieving the cognitive objective, the level of conflicts between the stakeholders of three European tourist destinations was assessed, and while the assessment of the two Central European destinations is similar, the assessment of the level of conflicts in the destination from the Iberian Peninsula is significantly lower.

Two pairs of relationships constituted areas of conflict. These include the relations of residents vs local government and tourism industry vs residents. It was in these lists that the
experts saw the greatest conflicts, the sources of which were most often conflicts of interest and conflicts of information. The analysis showed that the key problems faced by contemporary tourism in at least two out of the three destinations studied are problems with short-term rental of flats, high rent and depopulation of buildings in the district (Figure 3).

A comparison of the results between the selected destinations was also made, two of which came from two neighbouring Central European countries, while the third was located at a significant distance from them (on the Iberian Peninsula). The analysis of the results confirmed significant differences between the observed conflict level in the tourist destination from the Iberian Peninsula and the destinations from Central Europe and at the same time, insignificant differences between the results from the neighbouring Central European destinations. Similar conclusions were drawn after analyzing the problems faced by the stakeholders in these destinations. The experts from Prague and Krakow pointed to similar problems, while the experts from Braga partly agreed with them but also pointed to other problems.

The role and tasks of institutions managing tourism in cities will probably also change, in particular, so-called destination management organizations (DMOs). The current declarations indicate the need to respect inhabitants and take measures to limit conflicts arising in the context of the development of the tourist function. However, there is no empirical evidence of the positive results achieved.

7. Limitations and future research trends

The research was conducted during the pandemic and is based on the opinions of experts indicated by the city authorities. While the attitudes of the inhabitants towards the development of tourism were recognized in earlier studies, the awareness of tourists and their readiness to accept limitations related to respecting the needs of the inhabitants were not examined. This aspect may be an interesting direction for further research. A limitation of this research is the small scope of the study, caused both by the restrictions in force

---

**Figure 3** Summary of the results of research on the level of conflicts in individual destinations

- **Prague (Czech Republic)**
  - Problems:
    - Problems with short-term rental of flats
    - High rent
    - Depopulation of buildings in the district
    - Noise at night
    - Excessive noise on the street
    - High land purchase prices
  - The main sources of conflicts:
    - Information conflict (5.79)
    - Interest conflict (5.68)

- **Braga (Portugal)**
  - Problems:
    - Lack of parking spaces
    - High rent
  - The main sources of conflicts:
    - Information conflict (5.79)
    - Interest conflict (5.68)

- **Krakow (Poland)**
  - Problems:
    - Depopulation of buildings in the district
    - Excessive noise on the street
    - Noise at night
    - Problems with short-term rental of flats
    - High land purchase prices
    - Traffic congestion
    - Excessive number of places to drink alcohol
    - High rent
    - Lack of parking spaces
    - Tourism gentrification
  - The main source of conflicts:
    - Interest conflict (8.06)

Source: Own study
during the research period (related to the COVID-19 pandemic) and also by the inability to conduct in-depth interviews with experts. It should also be noted that among the experts participating in the research were tourist entrepreneurs directly interested in rebuilding tourism after the pandemic. Due to this, their opinions may have been biased, but there is no way to prove or disprove this. However, the answers gathered were considered collectively; therefore, the opinions obtained were considered to be objective. Attempts to balance tourism so far have focused mainly on limiting the access of tourists to attractions and tourist areas and introducing (or increasing) admission fees. It is still too early to assess the effectiveness of such tools, hence the lack of scientific analyses of implemented tourism policies. This will be an important challenge in the near future. In particular, further research should focus on how inhabitants perceive the introduced changes, and paradoxically, how these changes limit their rights. All the indications are that the observed phenomenon of overtourism in historical cities will return very soon.

CRediT author statement

Bartłomiej Walas: Conceptualization, Methodology, Supervision, Writing-Original draft preparation, Writing-Reviewing and Editing, Validation.

Adam R. Szromek: Resources, Formal analysis, Visualization, Investigation, Data curation, Software, Writing-Original draft preparation.

Zygmunt Kruczek: Validation, Writing-Original draft preparation, Writing-Reviewing and Editing.

Miroslav Rončák: Resources, Writing-Original draft preparation.

All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

References


Vrabie, A. (2020), Tourism Friendly Cities - Local Community and Tourists Together for Urban Sustainability, Baseline study, Urbact III.


Further reading


Overtourism? Understanding and Managing Urban Tourism Growth beyond Perceptions, Executive Summary (2018), UNWTO.


Walas, B. (2019), “Turystyczny najem krótkoterminowy w ocenie interesariuszy lokalnych, biuletyn KPZK PAN komitet przestrzennego zagospodarowania kraju polskiej akademii nauk, zeszyt 275”.


Author affiliations

Bartłomiej Walas is based at the Faculty of Tourism and Recreation, University College of Tourism and Ecology in Sucha Beskidzka, Sucha Beskidzka, Poland.

Adam R. Szromek is based at the Faculty of Organization and Management, Silesian University of Technology, Gliwice, Poland.

Zygmunt Kruczek is based at the Faculty of Tourism and Recreation, Institute of Tourism, University School of Physical Education in Krakow, Kraków, Poland.

Miroslav Rončák is based at the Department of Recreation and Leisure Studies, Faculty of Physical Culture, Palacky University Olomouc, Olomouc, Czech Republic.

Corresponding author

Bartłomiej Walas can be contacted at: bwalas@onet.eu

For instructions on how to order reprints of this article, please visit our website: www.emeraldgrouppublishing.com/licensing/reprints.htm
Or contact us for further details: permissions@emeraldinsight.com