EXTENDED ABSTRACT

DECODING THE SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GENTRIFICATION AND TOURISTIFICATION

Natalia L. Marenzana
Universidad Nacional del Comahue
marenzananatalia@gmail.com
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8621-3602

Daiana Gallardo
Universidad Nacional del Comahue
daiana.bel.gallardo@ gmail.com

Luis David Villaverde
Universidad Nacional del Comahue
dvillaverde2002ar@gmail.com

Martín Herrero
Universidad Nacional del Comahue
economiamartinherrero@gmail.com
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0562-1941

Micaela Srur
micaelasrur8@gmail.com

María de la Paloma Martínez
Universidad Nacional del Comahue
mfpaloma@gmail.com

1. INTRODUCTION

The article aims to clarify the differences and similarities between the concepts of touristification (T) and gentrification (G) by identifying their origins, specific characteristics, and how they differ in their impact on tourist destinations. Both phenomena are complex and have significant impacts on urban spaces and communities. Gentrification has been studied and debated for over 60 years, while touristification is a more recent term from the late 1990s. While they both involve changes to the socio-spatial fabric of cities, they differ in their underlying dynamics and results. Understanding both the commonalities and differences provides valuable insight into broader processes of urban transformation and potential consequences.

Proposes to structure a comparative analysis around categories like the origin of the terms, initial theoretical definitions, new resident/visitor profiles, space conception, demographic changes, commercial structures, gentrifying/touristifying agents, social fabric, territorial configuration, architectural rehabilitation, public space, and characterization of each phenomenon.

Clarifying the differences between touristification and gentrification is important as there is sometimes lack of clarity in writing on this topic, leading to questions from conference attendees. The comparative analysis aims to provide more clarity.

2. METHODOLOGY

The paper takes a qualitative, theoretical approach to analyzing and comparing the concepts of gentrification and touristification. It uses a triangulation of theoretical sources, drawing on over 50 authors who have studied these topics, including seminal works from the 1960s onwards. As part of the literature review, the paper analyzed academic works such as journal articles, books, thesis and other publications covering gentrification and touristification. It searches databases like Google Scholar, Scielo, Dialnet and Researchgate to locate relevant sources. The analysis also incorporates primary sources like interviews conducted with two experts in the field: Dr. Iban Díaz Parra from the University of Seville and Dr. Adrián Hernández Cordero from the Autonomous University of Mexico. These interviews were part of an international conference on gentrification and tourism held in April 2023.

The information obtained from the literature and interviews is organized into a matrix comparing different dimensions and variables of gentrification and touristification. This allows for an in-depth comparative analysis to identify similarities and differences between the concepts.

3. ANALYSIS OF RESULTS: SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GENTRIFICATION AND TOURISM

The similarities between the concepts of gentrification and touristification are multifaceted and reveal commonalities in their impact on urban spaces and communities. Both phenomena share the following similarities:

- Displacement of Local Residents: involve the displacement of local residents from central areas of the city. In the case of gentrification, lower-income residents are often replaced by higher-income residents, while in touristification, residents are displaced by temporary tourists. This displacement can lead to changes in the social fabric and demographic composition of the affected areas.
- Increased Cost of Living: Both processes contribute to an increase in the cost of living for local residents. Gentrification often leads to rising property values and rents, making it difficult for lower-income groups to afford to live in the area. Similarly, touristification can drive up prices to meet the demand of tourists, resulting in a higher cost of living for local residents.
- Urban Regeneration and Rehabilitation: both involve urban regeneration and the rehabilitation of dilapidated areas. These processes often result in reinvestment in infrastructure and improvements to buildings, leading to the revitalization of previously neglected urban spaces.
- Changes in Commercial Structures: Both phenomena bring about changes in the commercial structures of the affected areas. Local shops and services may be

replaced by higher-end retail and services catering to wealthier residents or tourists. This transformation of commercial spaces reflects the economic shifts associated with gentrification and touristification.

- Influence of Public Policies and Private Sector Investment: G and T are influenced by public policies and private sector investment aimed at attracting wealthier residents or tourists. These policies and investments can shape the trajectory of urban development and contribute to the transformation of urban spaces.

In summary, the similarities between G and T underscore the complex and multifaceted nature of these urban phenomena, highlighting common patterns of displacement, economic shifts, and urban transformation.

The differences between the concepts of G and T are significant and reflect distinct processes of urban transformation and social change. The key differences between gentrification and touristification are as follows:

- Permanent vs. Temporary Population: Gentrification involves the permanent replacement of lower-income residents by higher-income residents, leading to a long-term change in the residential population of an area. In contrast, touristification results in the replacement of permanent residents by temporary tourists, with the area transitioning from residential to temporary tourist accommodation.

- Metropolitan Habitus vs. Diverse Tourist Habitus: Gentrified residents often exhibit a metropolitan habitus, reflecting a particular urban lifestyle and cultural orientation. In contrast, tourists are diverse and do not share a single habitus, as they come from various backgrounds and cultures. This difference in habitus shapes the social dynamics and cultural composition of the affected areas.

- Conception of Space: In gentrification, spaces are conceived primarily for residential use, reflecting the focus on creating livable neighborhoods for new residents. In contrast, touristification conceives spaces as primarily for business and consumption, catering to the needs and desires of tourists rather than permanent residents.

- Class Replacement vs. Depopulation: Gentrification often leads to the replacement of lower-income residents by higher-income residents, resulting in class upgrading and changes in the social composition of the area. On the other hand, touristification leads to depopulation rather than class change, as the area becomes dominated by temporary tourists rather than permanent residents.

- Commercial Structures: In gentrification, commercial changes still cater to the needs of residents, with new retail and services reflecting the preferences of the incoming higher-income population. In contrast, touristification leads to the replacement of local shops and services with businesses that cater primarily to tourists, reflecting the shift in economic activities towards meeting tourist demand.

These differences highlight the distinct nature of G and T, emphasizing the varying roles of permanent residents and temporary tourists in shaping urban spaces and communities. Understanding these differences is crucial for comprehensively analyzing the impacts of these processes on urban environments.

4. CONCLUSIONS

Gentrification and touristification are complex, multifaceted phenomena that have significant impacts on urban spaces and communities. While they share some similarities, they are ultimately different processes with distinct causes and effects.

Gentrification has been studied for over 60 years while touristification emerged as a concept more recently, around 28 years ago. This shows different levels of theoretical development and understanding between the two terms.

Some key similarities include producing displacement of residents from city centers to other areas and stimulating urban regeneration and architectural rehabilitation. However, there are important differences. In gentrification the new residents permanently integrate into the local community, while touristification brings temporary visitors who consume the space. Gentrification maintains residential use while touristification transforms dwellings into tourist accommodations.

The main causes are also different - gentrification is driven by higher-income residents and public policies, while touristification can be induced by tourist habits/market forces as well as local government action.

Both phenomena have mixed impacts, stimulating economic growth but also potentially displacing communities, increasing inequality, and jeopardizing housing affordability.

Careful policymaking and community involvement is needed to ensure the benefits are shared and negative impacts addressed. A balanced, inclusive approach to urban development is recommended. In conclusion, while related, gentrification and touristification should not be seen as synonymous or interchangeable concepts given their diverse origins, characteristics and consequences. Understanding both similarities and differences is important for analyzing transformations in cities.