

***Relations between Gentrification, Hospitality and Tourism:
Illustrating Change in Amsterdam***

Timo Derriks, HZ University of Applied Sciences, Netherlands

The IAFOR International Conference on the City 2017
Official Conference Proceedings

Abstract

Working class areas close to city centres can transform into middle and higher-class areas, referring gentrification. Wealthier residents move into these areas since there is a new interest in urban living and because these neighbourhoods offer cheaper accommodations. Residents interested in settling within these cheaper neighbourhoods can still benefit from urban facilities, services, and closeness to the city centre as well as to relatives. As a consequence, investments in these areas can be made, which might result in improved housing, retail, services, facilities and neighbourhood image, but also in possible displacement of original residents and entrepreneurs because costs of living may rise. The hospitality sector plays a key role in producing and reproducing the vibe of a particular neighbourhood, therewith contributing to the appeal and image of a certain district. The sector is a space in which food, beverage, music, decoration and atmosphere are agencies of tastes and lifestyles. The cultural diversity existing in a neighbourhood, reflected in a variation of residents and businesses, can attract visitors and new residents, but eventually tourists. These tourists could increasingly pay a visit to these neighbourhoods, as fostered by promotion, and even settle there and become a resident. This longitudinal study compares possible signs of gentrification in two Amsterdam neighbourhoods. Resulting from interviews and observations in 2010, 2015 and 2017, change in these two districts is illustrated and discussed.

Key words: gentrification, hospitality, tourism, longitudinal study

Introduction

Inner city neighbourhoods are constantly changing. While different people come and go to live in these neighbourhoods, their facilities and services could also change. Changing consumption spaces, as hospitality establishments for example, could influence the neighbourhood's image and start attracting not only new residents but also visitors. The objective of this study is to explore how change in two neighbourhoods in Amsterdam can be illustrated in a way that relates gentrification to hospitality and tourism. In doing so, it will first introduce gentrification, briefly touching on its drivers and consequences, followed by a discussion of theories relating gentrification to hospitality and tourism. An exploratory, longitudinal study has been designed and executed to show change over time. In doing so, it takes data collected during a research in 2011 as baseline and add data from 2015 and 2017. Data collected in 2011 show gentrification characteristics for two neighbourhoods, data in 2015 show how it has changed ever since, whereas data collected in 2017 also focused on the integration of tourism.

Gentrification

Although there are many views, perspectives and definitions on gentrification, it can be understood as the social upgrading of poorer inner-city neighbourhoods. In this study, Sullivan (2007) is followed, who defines gentrification as a process by which wealthier residents move into poorer neighbourhoods in sufficient numbers to change the identities of neighbourhoods as well as their social class compositions. The incoming of mid- and higher classes into former working class areas downtown result in transformations of cheap and bad maintained (rented) houses and facilities into expensive, comfortable (owned) houses (Van Dijk, 2004). There are certain dimensions that appear throughout different gentrification definitions. When considering the types of neighbourhoods that have the potential to be gentrified it is agreed they have to be central city neighbourhoods, populated by low-income households. Considering the process of gentrification, Freeman (2005) argues that the arrival of gentry should be first, followed by an increase in investment second. Geurtz (2006) indicates that groups entering a neighbourhood with a potential to gentrify have higher cultural capital rather than economic capital; they are not investors, but students and artists. Later, traditional groups of the middle class will also enter the area, from which most persons are still relatively young. Besides students and artists, incomers are mostly yups, single earners, and couples without kids: They all want to work in the city since that meets their lifestyles, but they also want to be close to their jobs in IT, cultural and media sectors. The term 'lifestyle' comes into play since residents want to live somewhere that matches their way of living (van Dijk, 2004). These groups trigger the gentrification process and are the ones that maintain the process (Geurtz, 2006).

Changing neighbourhoods

Looking at the characteristics of the gentrifiers, it is clear that they are of a higher socioeconomic status and more likely to be white (Freeman, 2005). The process of neighbourhood change associated with gentrification and revitalization is more related to displacement but it are the ones who move into a neighbourhood that appear to be more important in explaining the change (Freeman, 2005). The large differences

between in movers and original residents influences the development within the neighbourhood. From the seventies on several studies examined the characteristics of the households that moved into gentrifying areas. Geographically, it can be said most gentrifiers have lived in the same city already; they move from another area in the city to a neighbourhood that has gentrification potential. The composition of the household often differs from the conventional lower and middle class family regarding the official state and the amount of family members as gentrifiers are often childless (van Dijk, 2004). Original residents can welcome gentrification since it can result in improved services and facilities of the area. When a historically poor neighbourhood is gentrifying it generally results in improvements of municipal services and increase in the number of retail establishments (Sullivan, 2007). However, it is argued that the improvements and increases should not be at the cost of diversity, as generating and embracing this diversity would be the key to make neighbourhoods successful again. For this reason, it is important original residents are not displaced but stay in the area so they will contribute, together with the gentrifiers, to a diverse composition (Bosscher, 2007). The improvements noticed in gentrifying neighbourhoods are attracting residents and investors, but also visitors and increasingly; scholars. Perhaps researching gentrification is indeed just an excuse to hang out in cool neighbourhoods to drink lattes (Slater, 2006). Slater (2006) does, however, remarks a change of scholars' research directions from first being about rent increases, working-class displacement and landlord harassment to now street-level spectacles, gadgets, trendy bars and cafés, social diversity and stores selling funky clothes.

Although the term gentrification still remains a bit of a bad word, the image of hip, cool and art tribes taking over the cafés, cycle paths and art galleries of formerly disinvested neighbourhoods that once lacked creativity is now seen as the sign of future for cities around the globe and represents a healthy economic position (Slater, 2006). In addition, the media buzz surrounding gentrifying neighbourhoods brings large numbers of visitors (Zukin, 2008). Resulting is that traditional retail businesses might become replaced by larger chain stores since these can pay the higher rental prices resulting from increased neighbourhood popularity. Consumption spaces therefore change in parallel to gentrification processes (Zukin, 2008), whereas traditional cities in general are increasingly witnessing the importance for their city to be an entertaining consumption space. The entertainment sector in cities is defined as a sector that combines tourism, restaurants, hotels, conventions and related economic activities (Lloyd and Clark, 2001). While many of gentrifying areas do lack tourist hotel accommodation and major visitor attractions they do contain urban heritage and consumption experiences not provided by mainstream city venues (Smith, 2007) but just as the retail sector, gentrification could cause a change of entertainment as well.

Changing entertainment

For a city to be attractive, hotels, bars, and restaurants have to be sufficiently diversified and offer value for money (Russo & van der Borg, 2002). The commercial hospitality sector could be identified as being a vital place in which taste and lifestyle are produced and consumed through food and drink, ambience, service style, and music and décor (Bell, 2007). Just as shops, public spaces and music venues are important, it is believed restaurants, bars and cafés are a key player in producing and reproducing the 'feel' or 'buzz' of a particular destination and in keeping the specific

area ‘hip’, and with that effectively incorporating food, drink and entertainment into urban culture (Bell, 2007). Eating out has become a central part of city’s experience economy could be replaced by ‘foodainment’ to emphasize it entails so much more than just eating, just as ‘drinkainment’ refers to the production of themed bars and pubs as well as other ‘drinking experiences’. In Bell’s eyes *‘both foodainment and drinkainment have become cornerstones of the urban regeneration script, which increasingly emphasizes the value of the night-time and visitor economies to cities seeking to improve their fortunes’* (Bell, 2007:13). The hospitality industry could easily be linked to new urban living. Urban residents occupying jobs in post-Fordist sectors have a regained interest in urban living (Smith, 2007) and see the city more than just a destination for work; particularly the young workers believe the city is a desirable place to live and play.

The influx of young gentrifiers in working-class and ethnic districts can result in changes of the local supply of the hospitality industry: the changes might eventually result in the production of new landscapes of trendy consumption. Gentrifiers are not much interested in local schools and churches, but more with recreation opportunities and consumption in hip restaurants, shops, bars and boutiques situated in restructured urban neighbourhoods (Lloyd & Clark, 2001). The people attracted to these districts follow a lifestyle where work and ideas, as well as friendships are pursued in bars, restaurants, clubs, venues, and galleries (Montgomery, 1995). New hospitality spaces are developed in efforts to meet this demand. While places to eat and drink play central roles in the production of new city living forms associated with district revitalization, they also stimulate forms of cultural tourism, including for example ‘party tourism’ or ‘alco-tourism’ (Bell, 2007). City center living is increasingly packaged and sold in terms of access to consumption, cultural, and leisure amenities, not only to residents but also to visitors. Eating and drinking have become important components of regenerating neighbourhoods but could also make these places new ‘gastro-tourism’ destinations (Bell, 2007). Already in 1991, Zukin also saw the parallel between the processes of gentrification and the rise of nouvelle cuisine, as she argued then that gastronomy suggests a consumption organization quite similar in structure to the ‘deep palate’ of gentrification. According to her, it seems new urban communities are formed on the basis of consumption practices while earlier they were formed on old divisions of ethnicity or social class (Zukin, 2008).

Not only new retail sectors but also hospitality establishments can be too expensive for long-time residents and are meant for the gentrifiers’ tastes. Original residents could not patronize the developments and even may feel resentment toward them (Sullivan, 2007). Earlier providers of food and drink like downtown cafeterias, might be chased out (Bell, 2007). The reimaging of places as landscapes of consumption may thus lead to displacing small businesses and low-rent residents (Shaw et al., 2004). In relating this to tourism, Shaw, Bagwell and Karmowska (2004) point to Disneyfied ‘Latin Quarters’ and in which its visitors might be more wealthy than the local population. The tourist consumption spaces in these quarters might contribute then to tensions between host and visitor differences in race, ethnical background and social classes, instead of being a local impulse.

Tourism gentrification

Maintaining mixed social, economic and temporal activities in gentrifying or gentrified neighbourhoods requires a detailed understanding in terms of what does and does not work, and how local amenities and quality of life should be protected (Smith, 2007). Whereas the hospitality industry can be seen as an important basic condition for the livability for residents, it could also attract visitors and tourists. Since eating and drinking out has increased the last years and hospitality businesses are often considered to be a second living room, a visit to a hospitality establishments often forms a part of a day of shopping, or for instance cultural and urban tourism. The process of middle-class neighbourhoods transforming into a relatively affluent and exclusive enclave marked by a proliferation of corporate entertainment and tourism venues refers to ‘tourism gentrification’ (Gotham, 2005). The commercial upgrading changing the consumption facilities in neighbourhoods that are increasingly attracting visitors relates to commercial gentrification, therewith part of a broader process of symbolic gentrification (Gant, 2015). Agents of change in these revitalization processes are not the new middle class residents as introduced above, but the new spaces and services attracting both them and tourists. By becoming an appealing neighbourhood to visit, rental flats could be transformed into holiday apartments. In this way, tourism could be seen as an additional displacement driver as well (Gant, 2015). Gant (2015) does, however, argue that residents are moving out more because of the transformation of uses and users in their neighbourhoods and not just because of housing market dynamics only.

Tourism gentrification is not only commercial, but also residential and reflects new institutional connections between the local institutions, the real estate industry and the global economy (Gotham, 2005). Gentrification and tourism amalgamate with other consumption-oriented activities as dining out, shopping, and visiting concerts. Blurring entertainment, commercial activities and residential spaces leads to an altered relationship between culture and economics in the production and consumption of urban space (Gotham, 2005). This blurring is today even more so the case due to residents letting their apartments to house tourists. In this sense, Sheivachman (2017) argues that any conversation about how tourism works to change neighborhoods would be incomplete without exploring the impact of homesharing services, particularly Airbnb. In both Amsterdam and Barcelona, for example, there were approximately 11.000 Airbnb hosts in July 2017 (Airdna.co, 2017). Gentrification can thus be related to and studied in conjunction with hospitality and tourism. Gotham (2005) even believes that analyzing tourism gentrification provides an important opportunity for theoretical development and offers a unique perspective on tourism and urban redevelopment dynamics.

Study design

Of central focus in this study are two selected neighbourhoods in Amsterdam. The location of the two cases was important since these surroundings had to represent both the process of actual gentrifying and the other to be completely gentrified. The neighbourhood that is gentrifying and in that sense being highly dynamic within the last decade is the ‘Indische Buurt’ (IB) located in the eastern part of the city. The area’s western part is mainly witnessing gentrification processes compared to the eastern part. Specific streets of interest in IB are the Javastraat and its surrounding

ones. The completely gentrified neighbourhood to study is the ‘Oude Pijp’ (OP), located in the southern part of Amsterdam. Streets of interest in OP are the Albert Cuypstraat and the Ferdinand Bolstraat. The selection of these cases was not random but involved discussions with the spatial planning department of Amsterdam, resulting in a shortlist of several neighbourhoods that were either completely gentrified or being dynamic at this moment.

In the author’s 2011 study, the original focus was on perceptions of ethnic hospitality entrepreneurs about their changing neighbourhoods. By means of snowballing, handpicking and contacting many entrepreneurs, data was collected by means of interviewing fourteen ethnic hospitality entrepreneurs, nine Dutch hospitality entrepreneurs, five non-hospitality entrepreneurs, and five non-business interviewees (e.g. governmental actors), all related to these two districts. Questions ranged from asking about hospitality concepts to thoughts about other entrepreneurs, market changes, and the neighbourhood in general. Observations and collecting numbers by the city’s statistics office were also included in data collection and analysis. Four years later, in 2015, a student acting as assistant researcher updated the numbers by more recent statistics, observed the neighbourhoods after careful instructions, and interviewed six randomly chosen people on the streets. Two years later, another student acting as research assistant included tourism concepts as offers and branding to her observations, desk research, and interviewing of 14 businesses, 14 residents, and 14 tourists in the two districts.

Insights and relationships

Analysis focused on the perceptions and changes and compared findings over the years. It is by no means the intent to generalize about what is happening within the two selected districts. Instead, thoughts, opinions, observations and possible relations between gentrification, hospitality and tourism are explored and insights shared as interpreted by the author. First, a fact sheet per district has been created showing selected numbers and allowed for comparisons between 2001, 2010 and 2014 (Dienst Onderzoek & Statistiek Amsterdam, 2015). Within IB for example, non-Western foreign inhabitants decreased from 63,2% in 2001 via 55,4% in 2010 to 51,2% in 2014 whereas Western foreigners increased from 4,9% in 2001 via 12,1% in 2010 to 13,3% in 2014. Native Dutch inhabitants increased from 31,9% in 2001 via 32,5% in 2010 to 35,6% in 2014. The ownership of houses moved from 5,2% private possession in 2001 via 17,7% in 2010 to 22,3% in 2014. Public housing decreased from 77,9% in 2001 via 69,5% in 2010 to 64,2% in 2014. Houses also seem to have increased in usable surface: the amount of houses with a usable surface of 40-50 square meters decreased from 31,6% in 2001 via 27,2% in 2010 to 25,1% in 2014. The amount of houses surfacing 50-60 square meters decreased from 23,2% in 2001 via 22,5% in 2010 to 19,9% in 2014. Larger houses, 60-80 sqm, increased from 23,6% in 2001 via 24,7% in 2010 to 25,8% in 2014. Houses with a usable surface of 80 square meters or more increased from 13,8% in 2001 via 18,7% to 22,9% in 2014. In 2001, 11,7% of the district’s total residents were employed, a number which increased via 15,3% in 2010 to 18,3% in 2014. While there were 863 businesses registered in the district in 2001, this number increased via 1346 in 2010 to 1945 in 2014.

Looking at these same categories in the more gentrified neighbourhood OP shows the following: The amount of non-Western foreign inhabitants decreased from 25,9% in 2001 via 18,3% in 2010 to 17,0% in 2014. The amount of Western foreigners increased from 13,7% in 2001 via 21,0% in 2010 to 21,6% in 2014. Native Dutch inhabitants increased only slightly from 60,4% in 2001 via 60,7% in 2010 to 61,3% in 2014. The ownership of houses moved from 10,1% private possession in 2001 via 23,3% in 2010 to 25,6% in 2014. Public housing decreased from 32,0% in 2001 via 29,4% in 2010 to 27,4% in 2014. Similar to IB, Houses in the OP also seem to have increased in usable surface: the amount of houses with a usable surface of 40-50 square meters decreased from 23,2% in 2001 via 20,4% in 2010 to 18,9% in 2014. The amount of houses surfacing 50-60 stayed more or less the same with 19,5% in 2001 via 18,5% in 2010 to 19,1% in 2014. Larger houses, 60-80 sqm, increased from 20,2% in 2001 via 22,8% in 2010 to 24,2% in 2014. Houses with a usable surface of 80 square meters or more almost doubled, from 10,3% in 2001 via 16,0% to 19,4% in 2014. Concerning residents employed, the percentage increased from 33,1% in 2001 via 38,4 in 2010 to 38,0 in 2014. In 2010, 1582 businesses were registered in the district, a number that increased via 2228 in 2010 to 2662 in 2014.

Although comparing the two districts seems appealing, one has to bear in mind that both districts have a different historical development background and demographics, and are also different in size and their relative proximity to the city centre. Still, one could see the same patterns arise, for example concerning demographics with non-Western foreign inhabitants moving out, Western foreign inhabitants and native Dutch inhabitants moving in. Also, houses became bigger in both districts and increasingly possessed privately, at the cost of social housing. Economically, percentages of the districts' inhabitants with a job increased, just as the amount of registered businesses. Dynamics of increases and decreases seem generally higher in OP and lower in IB, possibly showing more of a faster pace of gentrification in the IB and a slow or stagnating process in the OP, both in line with case selection criteria and decision. A selection of gathered thoughts and opinions as analysed and interpreted as being relevant to show perceptions on changes within these two districts will now be shared per research period.

In 2011, reactions within the OP district aligned with the indicative numbers and confirmed the notion of a hip, vibrant and implicitly mentioned gentrified district. The IB was more seen as one district developing and becoming a more popular one. One of the interviewees described his view on the district's dynamics in 2011: “[*It is*] *Developing. A neighborhood with a lot of potential, a vibrant one, one a lot of things are going on, with a lot of energy and dynamics from both the ethnic entrepreneurs as the new entrepreneurs.*” An ethnic hospitality entrepreneur noted the shift in demographics, as indicated by statistics, concerning the inhabitants of the IB district, he believes that his guests who lived in the neighborhood increasingly consisted of native Dutch inhabitants: “*The last years mainly Moroccan and Dutch people. They visit us a lot, but there are now more Dutch guests than for instance five years ago.*” Another entrepreneur added details and shared: “*Now there are coming more young, new people, and sometimes several tourists from the hostel close by. And people who are moving into the neighborhood of course. Normal people; they are not richer or anything. I also believe we increasingly receive more students and foreigners; expats. Exchange students as well as the Science building is close to here; student housing is realized there.*” It was concluded in the study of 2011 that while ethnic hospitality

entrepreneurs in both the Indische Buurt and the Oude Pijp could and were in fact triggering gentrification processes, they were at the same time challenged when these gentrification processes accelerated and property rental prices increased as a result from the districts' raising popularity. This was interpreted as being paradoxical, because the gentrification triggered by cultural diversity did in this sense kill the same cultural diversity. If that happened already or would happen more so in the future, it would be a true shame, according to the interviewees, as it was perceived this exact supply of cultural diversity made the neighborhoods so attractive to visit and live in in the first place.

All of the respondents of the IB district who participated in the 2015 study noted that the neighbourhood of Indische Buurt was still a calmer and more quiet area than other parts of Amsterdam. Interviewees in the Oude Pijp stated that they liked the fact that they were close to main attractions in the city centre, while residents did notice that it got even more crowded in the area during last years. It was indicated in this study that perceptions existed of how both neighbourhoods grew steadily and attracted more people to visit or live there during the past several years. The multiculturality aspect of the Indische Buurt still remained evident in 2015, with still many ethnical businesses operating in the district, as Turkish grocery supermarkets and so-called exotic 'Tokos'. Although these businesses could be found in the Oude Pijp as well, it seems there is a higher offer of organic and sustainable supermarkets as well as more exclusive restaurants versus small lunch rooms and fast food providers in the IB. The Indische Buurt was mainly seen as a place for people searching a nice, quiet area near to the centre, while offering lower rental prices and bigger apartments as compared to more popular districts. Different from Indische Buurt, the Oude Pijp was perceived as a place for people who really wanted to be close to cultural entertainment offers and who searched for a vivid neighbourhood, as well as for those who are financially stable and not afraid of every day crowding.

In 2017, some things have changed and tourists did visit the IB more than a few years earlier. The district, for example, showed impressive Airbnb coverage across the area, namely a total of 694 listings as per 2016 In the OP, a significantly higher Airbnb coverage was evident, namely a total of 1,624 listings. The Indische Buurt still dominates as unique and ethnically diverse. Online coverage presents a concentration of keywords and attention getters such as 'unique', 'ethnically/culturally diverse', 'exotic', 'a cultural mix' and synonyms of such. The online blog *Amsterdamming* describes Indische Buurt as the most vibrant and ethnically diverse neighbourhood in Amsterdam East and one of the most interesting in the entire city. Unlike in the more touristic areas of Amsterdam, where action means crowds and noise, it comes from the rhythm of life of the locals themselves in the case of Indische Buurt. Interviewed local inhabitants of the Indische Buurt mentioned they did not meet a lot of tourist action if any, apart from Javastraat area, the well-known ethnically diverse street filled with shops representing cuisine from all over the world, answering to the question whether there are a lot of tourists in the district, one respondent answered: "*Hard to tell, I don't think tourists hang around much here. Apart from Javastraat maybe.*"

Across various online media platforms, the OP appears to be gaining a higher acknowledgment in terms of tourism relevance in recent years. The neighbourhood is often common to be found within various tourist oriented online platforms, marketed

as an individual destination to go to apart from the so common Amsterdam city Centre. It features in many various articles, blog posts as well as travel guides in context of a unique, hip and trendy go-to place for artsy individuals and ‘foodies’. Mainly positioned as a multicultural and hip neighbourhood, online coverage presents the suburb as highly trendy, busy and bursting area on constant development. Even tourist tours are offered, emphasizing the district of being a hot spot for amazing food and drink experiences. It seems therefore the Oude Pijp is significantly different from Indische Buurt, in all contexts, life-wise, business-wise as well as tourism-wise. Concerning whether tourists are visiting this district, one respondent argued: “[Here] it’s really international and I think that’s why it’s becoming more popular for tourists to come. They come a lot.”

Implications

The objective of this study was to explore how change in two neighbourhoods in Amsterdam could be illustrated in a way that relates gentrification to hospitality and tourism. By taking earlier research as a baseline, adding data from more recent years and integrating the tourism industry, it shared illustrations in line with earlier theoretical discussions. The study was limited in the sense of data collection since gentrification allows for a lot more possible aspects to integrate in the research instruments. Still, the results do indicate gentrification processes could be studied in a longitudinal manner by comparing statistics, thoughts and opinions from residents and other stakeholders, as well as including own observations. Comparing and interpreting data over years allows to illustrate the dynamics of a district throughout time. Including accommodation offers and online tourism branding activities could be seen as a way to study tourism as being related to the concept of gentrification. Just as stated by theory, gentrification in this study applied to (formerly) known lower class areas close to city centres becoming popular to stay and live in and did relate to hospitality and tourism. To show, one could focus on a particular hospitality establishment in the Oude Pijp: MASH. In the earlier days of gentrification but for several decades, MASH was a locally run and visited snack bar within the center of the Oude Pijp. With the area becoming more popular over the years, the entrepreneur was challenged by a new rental contract in 2009 with a rental price five times the original price. Although agreed on this contract, the owners claimed the building for their own, to be created concept in 2011, forcing the original entrepreneur to close operations. Local people protested, but after 25 years, the fast food restaurant closed and the entrepreneur did not commented in detail. With inhabitants and their lifestyle changing during those years, a new concept entitled Bar Mash was opened at the end of 2013. In 2014, this bar was promoted at a website for Amsterdam locals as being a hip and cosy bar to hang out in. With a neighborhood being increasingly visited by and promoted to tourists in the years that followed, Bar Mash is promoted, on a tourist platform informing tourists about ten things to do in Amsterdam, as a very appealing bar to pay a visit to.

Studying relations between gentrification, hospitality and tourism could be useful for urban planning practices in the sense that a more detailed understanding of drivers and consequences of gentrification allow to better plan or allow developments of certain neighbourhood characteristics over others or safeguard existing ones. Further studies in terms of data collection would welcome bigger sample and include for example also the thoughts of accommodation providers. Additional gentrification

indicators could also be integrated in the research instruments and expanded with tourism. One example of this concerns crime rates and patterns, as known in gentrification theories (see for example Atkinson, 2004). It could be interesting to show if and how crime types shift from typical neighbourhood crimes to those being more evident in the hospitality and tourism sectors. Relating tourism and hospitality theories in ways that integrate conceptualizing as part of gentrification driving forces as well as indicators of change seems promising to better understand urban district transformation processes. Further studies could also concentrate on similar processes and relations in non-urban settings, illustrating for example similar dynamics when seaside resorts are being revitalized. In these resorts, like gentrifying urban districts, the concepts, amount and prices of hospitality and tourism products and services could change in relation to changing local and visiting populations demographics and lifestyles.

Acknowledgements

Jana Kuleva and Erika Vaskyte are acknowledged for their valuable contribution in the form of online data collection as well as empirical data collection onsite in 2015 and 2017.

References

- Airdna.co (2005). Airbnb Data & Insights to Succeed in the Sharing Economy [Input ‘Amsterdam’ and ‘Barcelona’]. Retrieved from <https://www.airdna.co/>
- Atkinson R. (2004) The Evidence on the Impact of Gentrification: New Lessons for the Urban Renaissance? *International Journal of Housing Policy* 4:107 - 131.
- Bell D. (2007) The Hospitable City: Social Relations in Commercial Spaces. *Progress in Human Geography* 31:7-22.
- Bosscher C. (2007) Stimuleren van Gentrification: Een Onderzoek naar de Mogelijkheden van de Gemeentelijke Overheid om Gentrification in Oude Stadswijken te Stimuleren. *Real Estate, Amsterdam School of Real Estate, Amsterdam*.
- Freeman L. (2005) Displacement or Succession? *Urban Affairs Review* 40:463-491.
- Gant, A. (2015, August). Tourism and Commercial Gentrification. In *RC21 International Conference “The Ideal City: between myth and reality. Representations, policies, contradictions and challenges for tomorrow's urban life* (pp. 27-29).
- Geurtz C. (2006) Gentrification: Wijken en Beleid. *Bestuurskunde, Erasmus University Rotterdam*.
- Gotham, K. F. (2005). Tourism Gentrification: The Case of New Orleans' Vieux Carré (French Quarter). *Urban studies*, 42(7), 1099-1121.
- Lloyd R., Clark T.N. (2001) The City as an Entertainment Machine. *Research in Urban Sociology* 6:357-358.
- Montgomery J. (1995) The Story of Temple Bar: Creating Dublin's Cultural Quarter. *Planning Practice and Research* 10:135 - 172.
- Russo A.P., van der Borg J. (2002) Planning Considerations for Cultural Tourism: a Case Study of Four European Cities. *Tourism Management* 23:631-637.
- Shaw S., Bagwell S., Karmowska J. (2004) Ethnoscapes as Spectacle: Reimagining Multicultural Districts as New Destinations for Leisure and Tourism Consumption. *Urban Studies* 41:1983-2000.
- Slater T. (2006) The Eviction of Critical Perspectives from Gentrification Research. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 30:737-757.
- Sheivachman (2017) How Gentrification Powers New York City’s Tourism Industry: The Complicated Relationship Between Tourism and the U.S.A.’s most popular urban

destination. *Skift*. Retrieved from <https://skift.com/new-york-city-tourism-and-gentrification/>

Smith M. (2007) Tourism, Culture & Regeneration. *CABI, Wallingford*.

Sullivan D.M. (2007) Reassessing Gentrification. *Urban Affairs Review 42:583-592.*

van Dijk F. (2004) Gentrification in de Kinkerbuurt. *Social Geography, University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam. pp. 86.*

Zukin S. (2008) Consuming Authenticity. *Cultural Studies 160; 22:724-748.*

Contact email: t.derriks@hz.nl