

MITIGATING IMPACTS OR REDUCING VOLUME. DESTINATION MANAGEMENT AND OVERTOURISM IN EUROPEAN CITIES

Quzibayev Doston Hamdam o‘g‘li
Student at Silk Road International University of Tourism and Cultural Heritage
E-mail: doston18900@gmail.com

Annotatsiya: Ushbu tadqiqot Yevropa shaharlarida ortiqcha turizm (overtourism) bilan bog‘liq muammolarni o‘rganadi hamda uning salbiy ta’sirini kamaytirishga qaratilgan destinatsiyalarni boshqarish yondashuvlarining samaradorligini baholaydi. Tadqiqotda turizmning shahar infratuzilmasi, madaniy meros, mahalliy aholi, uy-joy bozori va aholining hayot sifatiga tobora ortib borayotgan bosimi tahlil qi-linadi. Ayniqsa, turistlarning umumiy sonini kamaytirish bilan turistik oqimlarni hududiy va vaqt jihatdan samarali taqsimlash o‘rtasidagi farqqa alohida e’tibor qaratiladi. Tadqiqot natijalari shuni ko‘rsatadiki, samarali destinatsiya boshqaruvi turistlar sonini majburiy ravishda cheklashni talab qilmaydi. Buning o‘rniga tashrif buyuruvchilar oqimini boshqa hududlarga yo‘naltirish, talabni boshqarish, barqaror transportdan foydalanish, raqamli monitoring, sig‘imni boshqarish hamda muqobil turistik obyektlar va destinatsiyalarni rivojlantirish kabi mexanizmlardan foydalanish mumkin. Tahlil turizmni rivojlantirishni ma-halliy aholining manfaatlari hamda madaniy va ekologik resurslarni asrash bilan muvozanatlashtirish muhimligini ko‘rsatadi. Natijalar integratsiyalashgan desti-natsiya boshqaruvi strategiyalari turizmning iqtisodiy manfaatlarini saqlab qol-gan holda ortiqcha turizmning salbiy oqibatlarini kamaytirishi mumkinligini ko‘rsatadi. Tadqiqot Yevropa shaharlarida yanada muvozanatli, barqaror va chidamli turizm modelini shakllantirishga qaratilgan amaliy tavsiyalarni ishlab chiqadi.
Kalit so‘zlar: ortiqcha turizm, destinatsiyani boshqarish, Yevropa shaharlari, turizm bosimi, tashrif buyuruvchilarni boshqarish, barqaror turizm, turistlar oqimi, shahar tur-izmi, destinatsiya barqarorligi, turizmni rivojlantirish.

Abstract: This study examines the challenges of overtourism in European cities and evaluates the effectiveness of destination management approaches aimed at reducing its negative impacts. The research focuses on the growing pressure of tourism on urban infrastructure, cultural heritage, local communities, housing markets, and the quality of life of residents. Particular attention is given to the distinction between reducing the overall volume of tourists and managing the spatial and temporal distribution of tourism flows. The study argues that effective destination management does not necessarily require limiting tourist numbers but can involve visitor dispersion, demand management, sustainable mobility, digital monitoring, capacity management, and the development of alternative attractions and destinations. The analysis highlights the importance of balancing tourism development with the interests of local residents and the preservation of cultural and environmental resources. The findings suggest that integrated destination management strategies can mitigate the adverse effects of overtourism while maintaining the economic benefits of tourism. The study provides practical recommendations for European cities seeking to achieve a more balanced, sustainable, and resilient tourism model.
Keywords: overtourism, destination management, European cities, tourism pressure, visitor management, sustainable tourism, tourist flows, urban tourism, destination sus-tainability, tourism development.

Абстрактный: В данном исследовании рассматриваются проблемы чрезмерного туризма (overtourism) в европейских городах и оценивается эффективность подходов к управлению туристскими дестинациями, направленных на снижение его негативных последствий. Исследование сосредоточено на возрастающем воз-действии туризма на городскую инфраструктуру, культурное наследие, местные сообщества, рынок жилья и качество жизни населения. Особое вни-мание уделяется различию между сокращением общего количества туристов и управлением пространственным и временным распределением туристских потоков. Исследование показывает, что эффективное управление дестинаци-ями не обязательно требует ограничения количества туристов. Вместо этого могут применяться такие механизмы, как перераспределение туристских по-токов, управление спросом, развитие устойчивой мобильности, цифровой мониторинг, управление туристской ёмкостью, а также развитие альтерна-тивных достопримечательностей и дестинаций. Анализ подчёркивает важ-ность обеспечения баланса между развитием туризма, интересами местного населения и сохранением культурных и природных ресурсов. Результаты показывают, что комплексные стратегии управления дестинациями способны снизить негативные последствия чрезмерного туризма при сохранении эко-номических преимуществ туристской деятельности. В исследовании пред-ставлены практические рекомендации для европейских городов, направлен-ные на формирование более сбалансированной, устойчивой и адаптивной модели развития туризма.
Ключевые слова: чрезмерный туризм, управление дестинациями, европейские города, турист-ская нагрузка, управление посетителями, устойчивый туризм, туристские по-токи, городской туризм, устойчивость дестинации, развитие туризма.

Introduction (Kirish/Введение).

During the summer of 2025, local residents of Barcelona decided to take matters into their own hands by using water guns to spray tourists eating at café terraces. But this movement is not just observed in Barcelona; similar protests have taken place in other parts of Spain and Mexico [1, 2]. As for the water guns used in this protest, the fact that they are just toys proves that the urgency behind it is noteworthy: the local dwellers of this famous tourist location feel that they are overwhelmed by tourists. The World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) explains the term overtourism as the level of influence of tourism on a location, leading to the deterioration of the quality of life of locals, tourists or both [3]. Since the term itself is based on perception, overtourism is more a matter of relativity than universality; it is more appropriate to say that it can be defined in different ways depending on the magnitude of the site visited and its congestion [4]. The increase of visitors to different countries will not slow down. One report states that in 2024, approximately 1.4 billion international tourists were traveling worldwide, which is almost equal to 99% of the number of tourists in 2019. Nevertheless, the growth mostly happens in certain places as Hospers describes the winning strategy. This winning strategy signifies that the places that everybody wants to visit, combined with low-cost flights, market rents, and social networks have been very successful in attracting the highest number of visitors. Local communities constantly feel the negative effects of the recent developments in tourism industry. Research shows that rent prices have significantly increased, as people began renting apartments to tourists and shops providing services to locals were renovated into shops for tourists.

Traditional practices adjust to the interests of tourists and local people become less satisfied with tourism expansion. There is a general consensus that dealing with the issue may be linked to destination management. According to the UNWTO and consultancy companies like McKinsey, the solution for averting overtourism would be to collect proper data, make strategies and involve local communities into the process (3,9). The UNWTO has developed its own strategy guide that is not aimed at reducing the number of tourists but rather at minimizing the consequences of overcrowding (3). Cities like Barcelona and Amsterdam have received nominations for being best practice examples as they are known to collect visitor data, redistribute tourists across the area and allow locals to speak out (4). Now, what is the statistical data? Recent studies have shown that the number of tourists visiting Barcelona and Venice has not decreased despite protests, taxes and measures taken by authorities to tackle the pressure of visitors, with one notable exception being limiting the number of cruise ships that objectively helped the number of visitors in Venice (10). The results of a resident survey held in Ljubljana reveal that there are positive changes in the quality of life around the city signaling that destination management has led to the improvement of living standards. Meanwhile, it is important to note that claimed management is not indicated to be able to reduce irritation of the citizens. It should be said that information sources are different types of literature (substantive and methodological differences) which are not compared to one another. At the same time, it is worth mentioning that the pandemic has appeared as a new issue, not allowing tracing the changes due to the pandemic influence on the influx of tourists and local governance impact from 2020 to 2024. The goal of the research is to find out if destination management leads to reduced visitor figures, an improved residents' quality of life, or both, and derive the implications for practice based on the findings. More specifically, the aims are (i) to compare the long-term trends in the number of arrivals to Barcelona and Venice in relation to the world trends and some key measures of the regions in question, (ii) to investigate the relationship between destination management and irritations and satisfaction levels of residents in Bratislava, and (iii) to find out what city managers may expect from the given type of management and what instruments should be employed in practices to cut down the number of visitors. The study consists of the literature background, four hypotheses, methodology and analysis, and the last part of the paper includes practical conclusions based on the results obtained.

Literature review (Mavzuga oid adabiyotlar tahlili/Обзор литературы).

Overtourism is not a fresh concern. Doxey [8] came up with an "irritation index", explaining how residents' attitude towards a certain place changes when the place matures: a state of euphoria regarding the economic benefits, followed by apathy and irritation generated by the increasing number of tourists and finally antagonism. Out of the four stages mentioned by Doxey, the last two ones are particularly significant in relation to overtourism [4]. The view is broadened by Mihalic [12] who presents triple model. A place can exceed its restrictions in three fields: three aspects of sustainability related to the planet (environmental, economic, sociocultural); socio-psychological tolerance of local residents, business operators, and tourists; and socio-political potential to work fruitfully (awareness and agendas, as well as actions). Of the three aspects listed, it is social carrying capacity that is mostly difficult to evaluate, as the perceived negative influence creates discomfort while the perceived positive impact and taking part in decision-makings make the local population less irritated. What makes some cities face greater issues than other cities? In Hospers [4], we learn of the concept of the "tourism gaze": tourists want to see famous sites, and they become aware of them through the internet. According to Dodds and Butler as quoted in Hospers [4], there are three kinds of reasons: agent of growth (new type of tourist), technology (cheap travel, ability to book online, internet tools), and power of local actors (short-term goal of locals and opinions on what to do). It can be seen that the weight of these groups varies depending on the city; for instance, technology helped Porto achieve success while tourists in Venice suffered from the power issues [4].What makes particular cities prone to problems? Hospers [4] claims that "tourism gaze" indicates that tourists want to visit well-known places they have learned about from the internet. Dodds and Butler explain three motifs in which this is possible: a) concerning tourism development (with a new kind of tourist); b) meant by technological development (cheap means of transport and booking); c) referring to the activities of local actors (with reference to the interests of locals). The role of each of the three groups varies from city to city. For example, technology has brought good things for Porto, but it hasn't done it for Venice where tourists met technical difficulties. There are two variations of management responses. The first category involves helping to change tourists' behaviour by relocating them through space and time and sharing the information about unknown areas, taxes and fees, and "have fun and respect" policies [3, 4]. In this case, Barcelona management utilizes the data on arriving tourists, obtains feedback from the locals and establishes simple street laws [4]. Amsterdam City in Balance project accepts tourists but puts residents' interests over tourists' in applying a variety of solutions and promoting surroundings while lowering taxes for tourists while being outside the centre [4]. The second type of management solution is limiting the supply. For example, Venice introduced an overnight tax in 2018 and banned cruise liners carrying more than 25,000 tonnes on the main canal which serves the historic centre in 2021; and the city introduced €5 daily entrance fee measured by a QR code in 2024 and also limited the number of escorted tourists to 25 [10]. Are these methods effective? There is little proof of their effectiveness, though. Research commissioned by the European Parliament demonstrates that management fails in preventing overtourism signs [11]. Another research carried out in eight urban areas of Europe found that the citizens have noticed a rise in prices and pressure on the transport system and housing, but most of them think it is not necessary to stop this growth and that they want to be involved in the urban planning process [4]. Similar proof appears in the case of Ljubljana: management positively affects life quality, even though irritation has not reached the level high enough to reduce much [11]. On the other hand, the data from Barcelona and Venice show that the numbers of tourists increase regardless of the measures taken to prevent it [10]. Yet so far there has not been a single study that touches on both ideas.

Hypotheses

On the basis of this literature we formulated four hypotheses:

H1: Arrivals in a destination follow global arrivals, so demand-side measures (fees, taxes, education, dispersal) are not followed by a lower total number of visitors.

H2: Where supply is physically restricted, the targeted visitor stream falls, even if total arrivals do not.

H3: Destination management is positively related to residents' quality of life when residents perceive tourism's positive impacts.

H4: Residents' irritation mediates the effect of negative impacts on quality of life, and destination management reduces irritation only where irritation is high enough to be managed.

Methods (Tadqiqotni amalga oshirishda foydalanilgan usullar/ Методы).

In this current research, data about tourism was obtained from secondary sources, which means even though this research has a lot of data about the volume and perception of tourism, it cannot be categorized as a systematic review or meta-analysis because no new data were collected. The methodology used in this study is integrative because the proposed research question cannot be solved using any of the conventional methods. The number of visitors provides information about how many tourists there are, while the data from the resident survey reveals the understanding and perception of this tourists' impact on the local people, and the policy analysis shows the actual things being done by cities regarding tourism. Hence, three types of research are used in this research (methodological triangulation), so they all provide their own information, as the visitors do not explain perception, while the perception provides no information about the volume of tourism, and the policy analysis does not provide any information about results. At the same time, this approach might be considered as a convergent because data from different sources are utilized independently from each other and their synthesis is done on hypotheses level. The selection process of resources has been done with care in order to minimize the comprehensive check of different databases. The resource was chosen if four requirements were met: (1) the resource refers to some European cities that are frequently mentioned in discussions concerning overtourism; (2) the resource contains quantitative data on city level at least in terms of visitor flow or population attitude, or, in case of the political resource, refers to management practices in specific cities; (3) the resource provides enough information on the data, period and techniques used in the research; (4) the resource studies only a particular aspect so that all three resources supplement each other. Therefore, three resources met these criteria and have been used in the research (see Table 1). The resources cover five cities that include the arrival statistics from Barcelona and Venice, the survey of Ljubljana and the evaluation from Barcelona, Amsterdam, and Venice. Other references (for instance, archives from UN tourism statistics, cruise company reports, hotel market research) have been used only to confirm the figures but not to explain the hypothesis.

Table 1.

Evidence Sources Included in the Synthesis

Source	Evidence type	Cities	Role in this study
Gardner et al. (2026) [10]	Arrival time series, 2010–2024 (annual)	Barcelona, Venice	Volume outcome (H1, H2)
Mihalic & Kušcer (2022) [11]	Resident survey (n = 502), SEM, July–August 2018	Ljubljana	Quality of life and irritation (H3, H4)
Hospers (2019) [4]	Policy case review	Barcelona, Amsterdam, Venice	Mechanisms and practice

Note. Mihalic & Kušcer was published online in 2021 and in print in 2022 (Tourism Review, 77(1)). Gardner et al. is a conference paper.

Data extraction

The same information from all of the studies that have been looked at is provided in a standard format with the following columns: length of the study period; definition of the effect measure; duration of the study; statistical model applied; type of effect measures provided; explanation of the measures used and the timing of their application; and reference to the limitations presented by the authors of the studies. All the data are presented as is found in their respective studies, where the derived data is marked appropriately in case calculations were made like percentage change, determinative coefficient, expected value. In addition, in case there are discrepancies between the tables and in the text, both of the information will be given, and there is the corresponding issue will be addressed in the Limitations part of the section.

Table 2.

Operationalisation of Variables

Variable	Definition used	Source and unit
Global arrivals	International tourist arrivals worldwide	Millions per year, 2010–2024 [10]
Barcelona arrivals	City overnight visitors plus cruise passengers, as tabulated by the source (see Limitations)	Millions per year [10]
Venice arrivals	Total city arrivals; the estimated 25–30 million day visitors are excluded, as in the original study	Millions per year [10]
Cruise passengers (Venice)	Cruise passengers at the port of Venice, 2011–2024	Read from the source’s figure; reported as a rounded change [10]
Positive impacts	Second-order factor, 15 items on nature, culture, economy and society, restaurants and bars, tourism superstructure	1–5 Likert, Ljubljana 2018 [11]
Negative impacts	Second-order factor, 8 items on pollution, congestion and prices	1–5 Likert [11]
Destination management	2 items on how well the destination is managed	1–5 Likert [11]
Residents’ irritation	4 items (e.g. whether tourist numbers should be limited)	1–5 Likert [11]
Quality of life	3 items	1–5 Likert [11]

Note. Likert items run from 1 (“totally disagree”) to 5 (“totally agree”).

Before applying the results, the methodology of all sources has been evaluated (see Table 3). This evaluation influenced the interpretation of the data because Gardner et al. was a conference paper that had inconsistencies between tables and data, which meant the authors needed to recalculate their data, rather than just copying it, and Ljubljana results could not be generalized to places of high stress due to the non-probability and lower degree of irritation of the sample.

Table 3.

Appraisal of the Evidence Sources

Source	Design	Strengths	Risks
Gardner et al. [10]	Descriptive time series; linear trends; correlation of yearly changes	Fifteen years of city and global data; named local measures with dates	Conference paper; no control cities; internal inconsistencies; pandemic years
Mihalic & Kušcer [11]	Cross-sectional survey; EFA, CFA and path model (SEM)	Peer-reviewed; n = 502; good model fit; reliability and validity reported	One city, one summer; non-probability quota sample; low irritation
Hospers [4]	Narrative policy review	Links theory to practice in several cities	Short essay; good practice described without outcome data

Analysis and rezults (Tahlil va natijalarlar /Анализ и результаты).

According to Table 4, there has been an increase in the number of arrivals in Barcelona from 9.97 million in 2010 to 12.61 million in 2019 (26.5% increase, calculated). The linear trend is calculated while excluding the period of pandemic ($y = 0.5258x + 8.3688$) is fitted with $R^2 = 0.795$. The R^2 value for the year range of 2010-2019 is 0.862. As a result, it has been observed that in 2024 the number of arrivals will reach 19.3 million (53.0% increase compared to 2019, calculated). This indicates that it exceeds the previous calculation of 16.3 million average for this period by 3.0 million (18.7% more) and the earlier estimated 14.7 million in terms of pre-pandemic size (4.6 million or 31.7% higher than the predicted size, calculated). There has been no decrease in arrivals during the period of moratorium on hotels from 2014 and protests of 2017-2018. There are no facts of the expected rising tax for tourists in 2025 so far.

Table 4.

Annual Arrivals (Millions) and Year-on-Year Change (%), 2010–2024

Year	Global (m)	% change	Barcelona (m)	% change	Venice (m)	% change
2010	950		9.97		4.06	
2011	994	4.63	9.96	−0.10	4.58	12.81
2012	1,040	4.63	9.85	−1.10	4.528	−1.14
2013	1,088	4.62	10.10	2.54	4.681	3.38
2014	1,134	4.23	10.60	4.95	4.703	0.47
2015	1,186	4.59	11.38	7.36	4.925	4.72
2016	1,246	5.06	12.55	10.28	5.086	3.27
2017	1,339	7.46	12.50	−0.40	5.535	8.83
2018	1,416	5.75	12.16	−2.72	5.760	4.07
2019	1,469	3.74	12.61	3.70	6.012	4.38
2020	409	−72.16	2.399	−80.98	1.453	−75.83
2021	462	12.96	5.301	120.97	2.270	56.23
2022	980	112.12	13.03	145.80	4.930	117.18
2023	1,322	34.90	15.79	21.18	6.050	22.72
2024	1,468	11.04	19.30	22.23	6.289	3.95

Note. Values as reported by Gardner et al. [10]. Global = international arrivals; Barcelona = city overnight plus cruise visitors; Venice = city arrivals, excluding day visitors. Global arrivals in 2024 were about 1.4 billion, about 99% of 2019 [5]. While it may be true that Venice shares some similarities, there are distinct differences as well. According to the numbers sourced from the reference, the number of tourists has increased from 4.06 million in 2010 to 6.289 million in 2024, which represents a 4.6% increase compared to 2019. The overall trend data shows that the anticipated arrivals for the year 2024 may come in at around 6.14 million for Venice. The estimation of arrivals for Venice ahead of the Covid-19 pandemic suggested that the number of visitors to Venice during this

period would be around 6.85 million, which means that Venice may enjoy an 8% decrease in arrivals for 2024 as compared to the figures found prior to 2020. This means that Venice has arrived at the level achieved in 2019 and it does not necessarily indicate that this is the beginning of the trajectory of growth. Nevertheless, no noticeable decline is observed after the implementation of the overnight fees in 2018 and following the introduction of entry fees and limitations on groups in 2024 unless we take into account that of the cruise activities as cruise passengers have decreased by the amount of 70% from 2011 to 2024. Although the 25,000-ton cap on the size of vessels was established in 2021, it did not stop the growth in global cruise traffic, which grew by 6.8% in 2023 compared to 2019 [10, 14]. Contrarily to the global cruise industry tendencies, the share of cruise arrivals in Venice was only 8.8% of all visitors arriving there in 2024, which played a great role in the growth in figures of tourists arriving in the city. Referring to the case of Amsterdam, Hospers [4] mentioned that the number of arrivals began to grow before the introduction of the “City in Balance” program, but no quantitative data is available concerning its influence.

By comparing the tendencies in visitor arrival movements globally and on the example of the cities, we can observe them in Table 5. The correlation between the two phenomena is very strong, as it can be seen from the results of correlation analysis of the data from 2011 to 2024: for Barcelona r = 0.84 and for Venice r = 0.95 ($p < 0.001$). The obtained results based on the correlation analysis demonstrate a higher level of correlation than that indicated in Gardner et al. [10]. Specifically, the authors assumed r = 0.689 and r = 0.764, which were impossible to derive from their paper. It seems that the discovered coefficients are fully dependent

The data obtained without the years 2020 to 2022 indicates some level of correlation still: r = 0.68 ($p = 0.020$) for Barcelona and r = 0.82 ($p = 0.002$) for Venice. When considering just the preceding nine years the correlations have disappeared (Barcelona r = -0.37, p = 0.33; Venice r = 0.36, p = 0.34) although it should probably be noted that with n = 9 the power of such tests is quite low.

Table 5.

Recalculated Association and Trend Statistics (Derived from Table 4)

Statistic	Barcelona	Venice	Sample
Pearson r, yearly % change vs global, all years	0.84 ($p < .001$)	0.95 ($p < .001$)	n = 14, 2011–2024
Pearson r, excluding 2020–2022	0.68 ($p = .020$)	0.82 ($p = .002$)	n = 11
Pearson r, pre-pandemic	−0.37 ($p = .330$)	0.36 ($p = .345$)	n = 9, 2011–2019
Trend R^2, excluding 2020–2021	0.795	0.731	13 years
Trend R^2, 2010–2019	0.862	0.938	10 years
2024 predicted by all-years trend (m)	16.26	6.14	
Actual 2024 vs all-years trend	+18.7%	+2.4%	
2024 predicted by pre-pandemic trend (m)	14.65	6.85	
Actual 2024 vs pre-pandemic trend	+31.7%	−8.1%	

Note. All values derived by the authors from Table 4; x coded 2010 = 1. The source [10] reports R = 0.689 (Barcelona) and R = 0.764 (Venice) for the all-years comparison.

In 2020, the decline in all three cities was between 72% and 81%. However, in the rebound year of 2022, both cities managed to have a higher rate of growth than the rest of the world (Barcelona: +145.8%, Venice: +117.2%, world: +112.1%). In 2024, the growth in Venice (+3.95%) was lower than the growth figure recorded worldwide (+11.04%), whereas the growth rate figure in Barcelona (+22.23%) was far exceeding the worldwide average growth figure. Mihalic and Kuščer did face-to-face interviews with 502 individuals during July-August of the year 2018 via quota sampling method (200 responders from the city centre and 302 from other districts). The sample was considered representative of the population in gender (48% males; $\chi2=0.510$, $p=0.475$) and in age ($\chi2=12.429$, $p=0.053$). The exploratory factor analysis revealed 11 factors explaining 62.2% of variance with 32 items being retained. The values of Cronbach’s alpha and composite reliability exceeded 0.70, and average variance extracted was above 0.50. Ljubljana’s population was 288,000 individuals and there were 2.2 million of overnight stays per year of tourists in the country in 2019 with annual growth of tourism showing the rate of nearly 12% during 2011-2019, but the degree of the tourist density was in the low-risk quintile [11]. The residents’ opinions on the main elements of tourism are included in

Table 6.

Mean Ratings of Study Constructs in Ljubljana (n = 502, 5-Point Scale)

Construct	Number of items	Mean (M)	Level
Positive impacts	15	3.38	Moderate
Negative impacts	8	3.28	Moderate
Destination management	2	3.32	Moderate
Residents’ irritation	4	2.26	Low
Quality of life	3	4.05	High

Note. Means from Mihalic & Kuščer [11]. Level is our label (up to 2.5 low; above 2.5 to 3.5 moderate; above 3.5 high).

The fitted path model is reported to be accurate since the following statistics are true: χ^2 (454) = 1160.465, $p < 0.001$, $\chi^2/df = 2.556$, CFI = IFI = 0.909, RMSEA = 0.056, SRMR = 0.060 [11]. The results of CFI and IFI are below acceptable, however, they remain above the averages, while RMSEA and SRMR are confirmed acceptable in this case since they are the same as in previous calculations. The largest scores for the negative impacts belong to prices (M=3.95) and congestion (M=3.44) while only pollution affected has the lowest score of 2.45. The most irritation scored the lowest among impacts since its components ranges from 1.78 (would like the tourism to stop) to 2.57 (number of tourists should be limited) with none of them reaching average score. The ineffectiveness of the indicator related to Airbnb for authors are in improvement in the government regulations for short-term rentals and working with destination management organization mentioned in previous paragraph [11].While the findings of arrival statistics support both H1 and H2, it is of critical importance to note that H2 remains a mere descriptive statistic. The fact that cruise passengers have reduced while total arrivals have increased indicates that the drop in the target group just occurred coincidentally with the enforcement of the restriction, but it cannot be established that it has resulted from the restriction itself. The findings relative to H3 are confirmed by the path analysis of Ljubljana data. The findings related to H4 are partially confirmed as well: irritation indeed deteriorates the quality of life, but the survey findings don’t allow us to say whether management can mitigate the level of irritation in a city that is already paying a cost of high levels of irritation.

Discussion

The outcomes in these five cities are alike. City halls ensure high quality of life for locals, without any drop in tourist numbers. Arrivals to Barcelona and Venice kept up with global trends (1) while the only measure of any capacity reduction was the restriction of big vessels in Venice (2). In Ljubljana, those local residents who benefitted from tourism rated their life quality highly, thanks to the work of destination managers (3), and it is the impact of negative tourism that has spoiled their quality of life (the first part of 4). The example above shows how management works in practice. The UNWTO's strategies are based on the principle of mitigation [3], while the economic plan of Barcelona for the period from 2025 till 2035 will serve for maintaining equilibrium between the tourists and the local population, which will not be disregarding tourists arriving to the city [10]. Hospers [4] argues that the reason Barcelona managed to get more agreement than Venice and Lisbon is the citizens' engagement in making decisions. Hence, the seemingly contradictory comments with regard to Barcelona are explained by the absence of any problems with handling a growing number of visitors. The instance provided illustrates how management operates in the real world. In agreement with the idea of mitigation, the strategies of the UNWTO are concerned. Meanwhile, Barcelona's economic strategy is going to help maintain the balance between the local population and tourists arriving to the city from 2025 to 2035. According to Hospers [1], Barcelona managed to outrun Venice and Lisbon because of the involvement of citizens in the decision-making process. Therefore, despite the conflicting declarations concerning Barcelona, everything can be explained by the fact that there are no difficulties in dealing with the growing influx of tourists. The results of H4 Ljubljana show that it needs more attention. Management has not showed considerable success in reducing nuisance level, but since no nuisance issue reached above midpoint during the measurement, it was not

worth making an effort to reduce it further. Also, even though the tourist numbers keep rising, Ljubljana’s tourism has a low risk as well [11]. In this regard, it is important to clarify that the results do not mean that management is not good; it is just that the level of irritation is quite low. Consequently, we can assume that while Doxey stages may demonstrate a different situation in cities like Barcelona or Venice where protests signal the fact that the public became annoyed with tourists, the perception of tourism impact differs drastically because it is governed by the nature of the local community and its relations with tourists [4].

Limitations

There are many restrictions that have to be identified. First of all, there is no control group and there is lack of counterfactual evidence which prevents us from making conclusions about events in case of absence of the measures. It is obvious that some pandemics coincide with the majority of interventions taken, whereas interventions of 2024 don’t matter anymore. Besides, different cities give different results: Barcelona takes cruise passengers into account, Venice counts arrivals but does not consider part of tourists, and perceptions are based on the case study done in Ljubljana. Finally, survey done in Ljubljana gives information about one case study in one city in 2018 and no probability sampling was included which explains the low level of irritation of respondents and the inapplicability of this case for the destinations that were under pressure. There are many restrictions that have to be identified. First of all, there is no control group and there is lack of counterfactual evidence which prevents us from making conclusions about events in case of absence of the measures. It is obvious that some pandemics coincide with the majority of interventions taken, whereas interventions of 2024 don’t matter anymore. Besides, different cities give different results: Barcelona takes cruise passengers into account, Venice counts arrivals but does not consider part of tourists, and perceptions are based on the case study done in Ljubljana. Finally, survey done in Ljubljana gives information about one case study in one city in 2018 and no probability sampling was included which explains the low level of irritation of respondents and the inapplicability of this case for the destinations that were under pressure. There exist discrepancies within the data presented in some of the sources. According to Gardner et al. [10], the growth in the number of guests arriving in Venice in 2024 is expected to be 6.4% compared to 2019. However, this information is different when checking their table. With regard to Barcelona, the figure indicated in the text is 15.6 million arriving in this city in 2024, while the table provides another numeral of overnight tourists – 19.3 million people. In this regard, we will stick to the figure mentioned in the table and the statement of the authors concerning the differences in the numbers since this total number includes 15.6 million which actual is based on our assumptions. The authors publish R values corresponding to yearly variance coefficients (0.689 and 0.764), and it seems that we were unable to replicate the same R values after using the same table (our own results are obtained at 0.84 and 0.95). We can hope the authors use R to express variance. One must also point to the fact that the authors’ values cannot be quoted. One can see the changes in the table rather than asking for the precise R values. Point 6 shows that the authors rely on proceedings papers along with the summary of Hospers [4], the study presenting widely accepted approach, without any original data, therefore making the research weaker than that of a peer-reviewed longitudinal research. One has to agree that no other model estimations are made from the original data.

Conclusion and Recommendations (Xulosa va takliflar/Выводы и предложения).

We used three data sets (destination data, resident survey and policy paper) to answer the question 'are destination management strategies helpful at reducing overtourism or just mitigating it?'. We had to analyse each dataset separately. We found four main points. Firstly, both cities have been impacted identically by global trends in visitor numbers. There was no impact from applying charges/fees/tolls. The annual change in visitor number has shown a very strong correlation with global trends (Barcelona correlation of r = 0.84 and Venice of r = 0.95). But this is mainly due to the trough and recovery of visitor numbers in 2020-2022 and therefore not significant when looking at the previous 9 years. Both cities had significant increases in 2024 (Barcelona had a 53% increase from 2019 however this depended on specification and ranged between 19-32% increase over the trend. Venice had a 4.6% increase from 2019 however this was about 8% below the pre-pandemic trend). Secondly, the only obvious impact was from Venice’s ban on big cruise ships which resulted in a decrease in cruise ship visitors by around 70% between 2011-2024. However, this had no impact on the overall number of visitors to the city as cruise ships only consisted of about 8.8% of total arrivals in 2024. This shows that whilst destination management can impact the type of visitors coming to an area it will have no impact if you’re limiting the supply to certain types of visitors. Thirdly, destination management in Ljubljana resulted in increased quality of life. Residents felt the positives from tourism but also felt some irritation. Destination management seemed to help protect wellbeing. This is what mitigation strategies aim to do (UNWTO, Barcelona and Amsterdam). Even if a city has a strong mitigation and engagement strategy this will not impact the reduction in headcount as this was never the intention. Lastly there was no impact from reducing irritation. The irritation levels were low (M = 2.26). None of the items went above the midpoint of the scale. However, in highly pressured cities like Barcelona and Venice issues may arise. This does not mean destination management does not work, it just wasn’t impactful enough. The results need to be analysed carefully as we are using secondary data. There were no comparison cities. Most of the interventions happened during the pandemic. The data was also inconsistent across the sources. Therefore there is only an association. The resident survey was only completed once and in a low density city. The policy paper wasn’t as strong as peer reviewed longitudinal studies as it was completed using a conference paper and short policy paper. Cities should think about whether they want to protect their residents or reduce visitor numbers. Mitigation requires data on visitors, engaging residents, controlling rentals and promoting dispersal. If they want to reduce visitors then they seem to need to take a supply side approach by banning cruise ships or tourist accommodation. This can be a sensitive issue as tourism contributes to around 14% of Barcelona’s GDP and an estimated one in three jobs in Venice. Cities should also regularly monitor how irritated their residents are. If they are still low (like Ljubljana) then there is time to take action. However if they are increasing then it will cost more to wait for antagonism. Overall cities should ensure they are taking the correct approach and engaging with residents before reaching for the water pistols.

Список использованной литературы: (Foydalanilgan adabiyotlar ro‘yxati / References)

References (Foydalanilgan adabiyotlar/Литературы)

1. Pitrelli, M. (September 3, 2025). "Gringos leave": The number of mass tourist protests targeting tourists increases as tourists continue to be annoyed by overtourism. CNBC. https://www.cnbc.com/2025/09/03/protests-in-spain-mexico-target-travelers-as-overtourism-anger-grows.html

2. Wilson, J. (June 16, 2025). In order to protest against mass tourism, Spaniards utilize water guns to combat tourists in Barcelona and Mallorca. The Associated Press. https://www.nbcnewyork.com/news/national-international/spain-water-guns-visitors-barcelona-mallorca-mass-tourism/6303909/

3. United Nations World Tourism Organization. (2018). ‘Overtourism’? Understanding and managing urban tourism growth beyond perceptions: Executive summary. UNWTO. https://doi.org/10.18111/9789284420070

4. Hospers, G.-J. (2019). Overtourism in European cities: From challenges to coping strategies. CESifo Forum, 20(3), 20–24. https://hdl.handle.net/10419/216242

5. United Nations World Tourism Organization (UN Tourism). (2025, January 20). International tourism recovers pre-pandemic levels in 2024. https://www.untourism.int/news/international-tourism-recovers-pre-pandemic-levels-in-2024

6. Tattara, G. (2024, October 20). The tourism industry: All that glitters is not gold. Campaign for a Living Venice. https://campaignforalivingvenice.org/2024/10/20/the-tourism-industry-all-that-glitters-is-not-gold/

7. Yaşar, E., & Yayla, E. (2023). How does overtourism affect intangible cultural heritage elements? Yaşar Üniversitesi E-Dergisi, 18(72), 569–586. https://doi.org/10.19168/jyasar.1316496

8. Doxey, G. V. (1975). A causation theory of visitor-resident irritants: Methodology and research inferences. In The Travel Research Association: Sixth annual conference proceedings (pp. 195–198). Travel Research Association.

9. World Travel & Tourism Council, & McKinsey & Company. (2017). Coping with success: Managing overcrowding in tourism destinations. https://www.mckinsey.com/industries/travel-transport-and-logistics/our-insights/coping-with-success-managing-overcrowding-in-tourism-destinations
10. Gardner, G. A., Robinson, D., & Purpura, J. (2026). Over-tourism impacts and strategies: An assessment of current strategies for sustainable tourism. In Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Tourism Research (ICTR 2026) (pp. 180–189). Academic Conferences International. https://papers.academic-conferences.org/index.php/ictr/article/view/4446
11. Mihalic, T., & Kuščer, K. (2022). Can overtourism be managed? Destination management factors affecting residents' irritation and quality of life. Tourism Review, 77(1), 16–34. https://doi.org/10.1108/TR-04-2020-0186
12. Mihalic, T. (2020). Conceptualising overtourism: A sustainability approach. Annals of Tourism Research, 84, Article 103025. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2020.103025
13. Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. Structural Equation Modeling, 6(1), 1–55. https://doi.org/10.1080/10705519909540118
14. Cruise Lines International Association. (2024, April). 2024 state of the cruise industry report. https://cruising.org/en/news-and-research/press-room/2024/april/state-of-the-cruise-industry-report
15. Watkins, T., & Dumoulin, A. (2025, June 26). Barcelona market pulse 2025 – From strength to strength. HVS. https://www.hvs.com/article/10190-barcelona-market-pulse-2025-from-strength-to-strength