Tourists in the spatial structures of a big Polish city: Development of an uncontrolled patchwork or concentric spheres?

Jacek Kotus*, Michał Rzeszewski, Wojciech Ewertowski

Institute of Socio-Economic Geography and Spatial Management, Department of Human Spatial Behaviour, Adam Mickiewicz University, Poland

HIGHLIGHTS

- Tourists are one of the influential factors changing spatial structure of the city.
- We examine tourist behaviour in the city and their motivations.
- We conduct experiment with GPS registration of tourist movement.
- Tourist behaviour reflects city socio-spatial structure.
- Model is created showing tourist spatial structure of the big Polish city.
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ABSTRACT

The popular thesis about the development of a postmodern city under the impact of tourist traffic emphasises the patchwork character of those processes. The research is intended to test its validity for one of the Polish Cities – Poznan.

The aims are: to recognise which of city areas are ignored by tourists and which are selected by them, to identify in what way spatial structures of the city develop in terms of urban tourism, to create a model mapping a polish city, using Poznani as an example, in terms of tourists' activity and possible scenarios of its development. Presented research shows concentration of tourists' attraction in the city, tourists' behaviour and their motivation. Places that build this tourist structure can be classified according to their functions and spatial arrangement. Authors distinguish “induction spots”, “gates to the city”, “anchor spots”, “bridges”, “undiscovered places”.

© 2015 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Today urban attractions are often manufactured, and tourism is one of the key dimensions of urban development (Edwards & Gryffin, 2013b). Judd and Fainstein (1999) list three types of cities visited by tourists: those created from the ground up with tourists in view, e.g. Las Vegas, historic cities that possess a cultural identity and a historical past, e.g. Amsterdam, and those in which selected areas evolve towards tourist attractions, thus presenting a contrast with other, non-tourist parts, e.g. Atlanta.

There are relatively few cities, even at the global scale, filled with places created exclusively for leisure and amusement. In turn, the other two categories of cities that are tourist targets are very broad, and ever new urban places keep aspiring to them. Many cities seek their chance for growth in tourism. Taking this chance in a more or less random way, they draw up and implement strategies of tourism development.

Those processes also occur in the cities of Poland. The great potential of the historical and cultural assets they have accumulated, the dynamic economic development of the recent decades connected with the socio-economic changes in this part of Europe, and the relatively stable current economic situation of the country make Polish cities an even stronger presence on the tourist market. There is no doubt that those processes have been reinforced by Poland’s accession to the European Union in 2004 and its share in the Community budget, more intensive investment allowed by the EU assistance programmes, and by Polish cities playing host to
international events of global significance (the 2008 Climate Summit, Poznań) or of a European impact (Euro 2012, Gdańsk, Poznań, Warsaw and Wrocław).

There have been huge changes in the spatial structures of many Polish cities, especially the largest ones. New investments in transport, shopping, cultural and amusement infrastructure as well as promotional action attract to them one of the dominant categories of city users — tourists. However, those changes are not always programmed, monitored and controlled by city authorities. For most of their representatives, the urban tourist is a sign of a correct direction of development and a hope for an inflow of cash to the city budget.

In this context it is justified to pose the following research questions:

- What is the pattern of tourism-related development of spatial structures in a big Polish city, taking Poznań as an example?
- Is there a concentration of tourist behaviour and a concentration and centralisation of tourism-related facilities in Poznań, or does tourist traffic spread evenly also on the area outside the city centre? and
- What space of the city remains in the use of its residents?

The aim of those research questions is:

- To determine the extent to which a big Polish cities are starting to be used by tourists, and which of their areas are ignored and which are selected by them. The popular thesis about the development of a postmodern city under the impact of tourist traffic emphasises the patchwork character of those processes (Ashworth & Page, 2011). The research is intended to test its validity for Poznań, one of the East European cities.
- To identify in what way spatial structures of the city develop in terms of urban tourism.

The final effect of the analysis and discussion is the creation of a model mapping a polish city, using Poznań as an example, in terms of tourists' activity and possible scenarios of its development.

As Ashworth and Page state (2011: 2), "Urban tourism is an extremely important, world-wide form of tourism: It has received a disproportionately small amount of attention from scholars of either tourism or of the city, particularly in linking theoretical research to Tourism Studies more generally. Consequently, despite its significance, urban tourism has remained only imprecisely defined and vaguely demarcated with little development of a systematic structure of understanding." The authors of this paper hope that the presented research will contribute to a further discussion about the presence of tourists in cities.

2. Tourists' influence on urban change: theoretical background

Ashworth (1989) formulated four key approaches to an analysis of urban tourism: a facility approach, an urban ecological approach, a user approach, and a policy approach. Twenty years later, Ashworth and Page (2011) list 12 sub-themes of potential interest to researchers studying a city as an area of tourist activity. In this way they emphasise the wide spectrum of possible conceptual and research fields. Given the scope of this paper, the key theoretical and empirical reflections in the literature on the subject are connected with the tourist — city's spatial structures — resident triad. Many scholars stress tourist-related changes in urban morphology when they talk about the appearance of non-places (Augé, 1995), tourist bubbles (Judd, 1999), successive arrangement and simultaneous arrangement types of spatial order (Boerwinkel, 1995), segregated spaces (high use-depth syntax) and integrated spaces (shallow use-depth syntax) (Hillier, 2005; Hillier & Hanson, 1984), counter-structures (Gospodini, 2001), or livable and creative places (Wagner & Caves, 2012). The authors examining urban tourism in terms of changes in a city's spatial structures emphasise that the tourist plays one of the key roles in the city, deciding, whether directly or indirectly, about those changes. Gospodini (2001) observes that from the point of view of smaller European towns, a more favourable type of development of urban structures is that based on the simultaneous arrangement of attractive spaces, resulting in high use-densities. This is connected with an offer of many different choices in experiencing spaces characterised by shallow syntactic depth.

An important role of the tourist in a city has been mentioned by scholars representing the research trend employing the conception of “city users” or “city visitors” (Judd, 1999, 2003; Martiniotti, 1996). Today tourists have become the most important category among “city users”. Their share in city life steadily growing, they have practically appropriated some areas, pushing indigenous residents out of them. In a number of cases there have appeared “tourist bubbles”, or amusement enclaves for visitors. In the conception of “city users”, tourist activity and changes in the spatial structures of a city are in a clear coincidence or ever correlation with each other. Scholars have found that more intensive tourist traffic makes selected, usually central, parts of the city bloom, but it is also associated with the fall of its other quarters, for example old neighbourhood districts.

The feedback within the tourist — city's spatial structures — resident triad can be reinforced by mega- or special events organised in a city (Getz, 2007; Roche, 1992, 2000). Especially grand occasions of a global impact (mega-events) or of a continental/regional significance (special events) are usually held in cities, attracting individual and group tourists (Roche, 2000). The great ease of movement characteristic of our times, the sense of mobility, and the popularity of a life style connected with tourism cause cyclic events (e.g. the Olympic Games, the World Football Cup, the European Football Cup) and one-time occasions (the wedding of a royal couple) to attract interested crowds from all over the world (Solberg & Preuss, 2006). While taking part in a mega- or special event, visitors assume the role of a couple-of-days tourist. In the case of a lot of events of this type, their start is preceded by many months, if not years, of investment work. Often the investment leads to permanent changes not only in the spatial structure of a city, but also in its social fabric. Not infrequently old public spaces and residential areas are liquidated and transformed into building sites for a new investment serving a mega-event (Newman, 1999; Prayag, Hosany, Nunkoo, & Alders, 2013).

Theoretical reflections about the transformation of urban spaces under the impact of tourist traffic can also be found in works by the Polish social geographer Liszewski (1995, 1999). He notes that there has developed an urban tourist space in modern cities in which one can distinguish:

- a tourist penetration space, or the most traditional type of urban space, e.g. historic and ecclesiastical facilities, historic centres, cemeteries, zoological and botanical gardens;
- a tourist assimilation space, or spaces of contact with the local population and learning its customs, living conditions, and everyday life; places of at least partial integration;
- a tourist exploration space, or places not discovered by tourists yet, showing the city's climate and uniqueness;
- a tourist colonisation space, or city areas featuring permanent tourist development; and
• a tourist urbanisation space, or the transformation of a non-urban space into an urban one.

The categorisation of a city's tourist spaces presented above is a static profile of the morphology of urban space. Inspired by Liszewski's reflections and accommodating the guests/residents relation, we can determine stages in the activity of an external user in urban space, and hence a dynamic profile of the city in terms of “city visitors” (Kotus, 2009). Then we can list the following stages:

- the stage of domination of the residents,
- the stage of entry of an external user,
- the stage of coexistence and cooperation,
- the stage of succession.

Although many scholars stress detrimental effects of tourism on host communities, there are also voices claiming that it is possible to have balanced development in this respect, both in a more general approach (Simpson, 2008) and with reference to urban structures (Edwards & Griffin, 2013a, 2013b, Moscardo, Konovalov, Murphy, & McGeehe, 2013; Novy, 2011a, 2011b). From this perspective, we can ask about the kinds and role of tourist behaviour in a city and the position of various urban areas not only in the development of urban tourism, but also in the development of the city as the place of its residents' life.

3. Methods and the starting model of a city under tourist impact

3.1. Why Poznań?

Poznań was qualified for the research as the central city of a region and one of the Poland's major cities. It is a typical large Polish city with a distinctive monocentric spatial layout.1 The activation of tourist traffic is a point the city authorities have included in its development strategy. It is increasingly often host to events important at a European and a global scale (the 2008 climate summit, the Euro 2012 Football Championship) and it aspires to the events important at a European and a global scale. It is increasingly often host to spatial development of Poznań, which is a point the city authorities have included in their development strategy.

In 2009 one could formulate the thesis about a natural tendency for most investments addressed to an external user to concentrate in the downtown area. This co-occurred with a high concentration of many historic monuments in this zone. The chief spaces of more intensive contact of visitors and residents are those in the strict centre. Those were usually spaces of assimilation and penetration, with few areas of tourist colonisation.

• By creating a model that mapped the activity space of external users it was possible to state that at that time the residents had two city zones practically in their sovereign power. Those were recreational and strictly residential areas (with blocks of flats, tenement blocks and single-family houses) situated outside the downtown zone. Areas of recreation for residents and residential ones formed a sort of a double belt around the central zone exposed to tourist impact, hence this pattern was termed a “double-sphere model”.

In this model Poznań appeared as a city creating no spatial barriers to tourist behaviour, offering a choice in the central part, but not provoking to an activity outside it.2 As follows from the preliminary analysis conducted, Poznań has many interesting sites to offer also outside the strict centre and the downtown area, for example historical neighbourhoods, or green areas and lakes. Unfortunately, there was no consistent planning and managerial activity in the city designed to control the spread of tourist traffic into its other areas, outside the downtown part. Tourist traffic tended to head slightly in the direction of the city's eastern limits, with a clear dominance of the central (historic and commercial/entertainment) zone. This model and the conclusions drawn from the research served as a starting point for further interdisciplinary in-depth studies.

3.3. Methods

To analyse and verify the above starting model, in the years 2012 and 2013 a multi-aspect research was carried out on “Guests in a City – a City in Relation to Visitors”. The project was interdisciplinary in nature and combined knowledge from the fields of sociology, social geography and geoinformation, both in methodological as well as conceptual and empirical terms. It had three parts:

(1) An analysis of urban structures, late 2012/early 2013:
   a) recreation facilities: courts, skate-parks, swimming pools, shopping and entertainment centres, climbing walls, go-cart tracks, zoological and botanical gardens,
   b) pubs and restaurants,
   c) cultural facilities: cinemas, theatres, the opera, museums, art galleries,
   d) hotels: all categories of hotels, hostels, camping sites,
   e) transport: airports, bus and railway stations,
   f) monuments: ecclesiastical and secular buildings.

(2) An analysis of the city's image on the social-networking service Flickr. Flickr appeared in 2004; its users can put their photos on-line together with a description, a tag and possibly information about where the photograph was taken in the form of a name or geographical coordinates. This last property can be used to identify places most often photographed in the given area (Girardin, Vaccari, Gerber, Biderman, & Ratti, 2009), to identify city cores (Hollenstein

---

1 Detailed map of the study area can be found on the project website: http://ebih.pl/tmp/skupienia.php.

2 The typical structure of a Polish city embraces a strict historic centre, a downtown zone with mixed, old but also socialist buildings, and a zone of block-of-flats estates intertwined with old tenement houses and villa-type residential areas. Inserted into this layout are new residential, entertainment and commercial investments: multiplexes, shopping and amusement centres, and office blocks.
Tourist spatial structure of Poznań

An analysis of the spatial structures of Poznań in terms of six categories of facilities used by tourists (Fig. 1) shows that many of them are clustered in a fairly compact downtown zone. Most of the many facilities interesting from the point of view of a tourist are featured in a circle with a radius of about 4–5 km from the city centre. Practically, each facility is accessible to a tourist in a 1.5-h walk. This is a very important, generally overlooked asset of the city — its spatial compactness.

In architectural terms, Poznań is a typical European city with a naturally developed historic centre. The concentration of historic facilities here is the effect of their accumulation over the ages. The Old Town has a clear potential in this respect. This is a zone where pubs and restaurants tend to locate most often almost automatically; their number here is decidedly greater than in other parts of the city. However, it is also worth noting at this point that a growing number of pubs are being established outside the downtown area, especially in the older quarters and in the northern part of the north–south axis. The location of pubs, restaurants and cafes outside the downtown zone, in other older parts of Poznań, is connected with the owners seeking new attractive and competitive locations for their facilities. This step enlivens old areas and can be a magnet attracting other investment (e.g. hostels) and tourist traffic. In turn, the location of pubs and restaurants along the longitudinal axis of the city may be connected with the location in this area of large shopping centres. Theoretically, such facilities also attract a greater number of users and provoke the establishment of such spots as pubs and restaurants.

Also cultural establishments, especially theatres, art galleries and museums, tend to concentration around the city centre, thus utilising the unique climate of the area. This is the case of feedback because those facilities reinforce the climate of the central and downtown zones of Poznań.

Some cultural facilities are also located outside the downtown zone, in the northern part of the city’s longitudinal axis and in the eastern part of its latitudinal axis. Those are mostly multi-audience cinemas (multiplexes) connected, as in the case of restaurants, with the shopping centres established here earlier.

A downtown concentration is also characteristic of many recreational facilities, although the greater proportion of them – bowling halls, swimming pools, courts, shopping and entertainment centres, skate-parks — are located beyond the downtown zone, in the city’s residential areas. Their offer is rather addressed to the everyday city user — its inhabitant.

Hotels are those tourist-related facilities that show the greatest dispersal in the structure of Poznań. Of course, as can easily be guessed, their largest number are located in the downtown area. However, there are also many outside the centre, especially in the western direction. This “western shift” may be connected with the fact that in 2012 Poznań was host to the European Football Championship — the stadium where group matches were played is situated in the western part of the city. But it is certainly also connected with one of the more attractive green wedges located there.

Summing up the observations made in identifying facilities and places typical of tourist traffic, one can note:

- a clear predominance of facilities and places in the central zone of the city, and
- a tendency of many facilities to disperse along the city’s latitudinal axis, with a slight shift westwards.

Summing up the observations in the context of the research questions posed and goals adopted, it can be stated that the city’s tourist-related spatial structures concentrate in its central parts. However, there has been a slow increase in the number of such facilities as restaurants or hotels in the older quarters, especially along the city’s latitudinal and longitudinal axes. On the one hand, this is due to bottom-up action resulting from the growing attractiveness of tenement-block areas to people who buy flats there because they want to live in those areas with their specific atmosphere. It provokes the appearance of infrastructure in the form of

---

3 Every adult member of each group had his/her own tracker. In this way the researchers ensured freedom of movement to each member of the groups. They were not required to wander around the city together, but it was only the 4-member group of young people that availed themselves of this possibility and split sometimes during the visit into two 2-person subgroups, henceforth called Subgroup A and Subgroup B.
Fig. 1. Density of the examined elements of the city’s spatial structure seen against areas most popular with the experiment participants.
cafes, restaurants, hostels, or galleries. On the other hand, this development follows from the top-down investment decisions concerning the location of shopping and entertainment centres. Both reasons “stretch” the area of the city regarded as attractive. Although there is no doubt that in terms of the city’s spatial structure its centre is still the dominant magnet for visitors.

5. Tourist behaviour

5.1. Ways of planning visit and choosing accommodation

In the discussion the experiment participants revealed several ways of looking for sleeping facilities and for the choice of an optimum place in the city. An important factor taken into consideration was the price for a night’s lodging. In the discussion everybody emphasised this unanimously. Still, they also claimed that the price was only a starting factor, and right after it there appeared a search resting on at least one of those elements:

- an earlier knowledge of the hotel brand,
- a location near public transport means or simply in the centre, and
- the wish to make a closer acquaintance with the residents.

The single visitor to Poznań said: “Presumably because I know this chain of medium-sized hotels. I know what I can expect from them simply. And besides, the hotel is very close to a tram line going to the very centre of the city. Literally I had to walk a tiny distance in order to get to the tram.” In turn, the young married couple with the small child stated that: “...we slept with people. I mean I looked for sleeping facilities by couchsurfing, I hoped that those would be four different nights with four different persons. That’s what motivates us in our choice, meeting new people on this occasion.” The criterion used by the group of four young people in their choice of accommodation was nearness to the city centre. What they had in mind were not monuments or museums so much as the atmosphere and a rich offer of amusement places that would allow spending time in public space in an interesting way.

The FGI participants were also asked about how they prepared for their visit in Poznań and planned sightseeing. The single visitor stressed he had made a plan already before he came to the city: “I planned the entire excursion. Those were places I already knew from various sources. I confirmed my opinion that they were fine ... More in terms of historical interest, I was interested in Cathedral Island. Also the historical attractions close to the city — Rogalin, Kórnik.” As a person travelling alone, he enjoyed greater independence, could plan the visit well in advance and carry it out with no compromises with other participants. In other words, it was easier for him to put the plan into practice. The backbone of the plan was the city’s characteristic places that it promoted.

The family with the older child also tried to approach the stay in the city in a systematic way, at least at the stage of planning the visit and the places worth seeing. They described their approach thus: “Generally our planning looked as follows: we divided the city on the map into several parts, and one day we are in this part of the city, next day in another part. That’s why we moved on foot, it was simply easier. And it turned out more or less right. We looked for attractions on this hostel or city map and roughly planned so as to have individual points along our route. The visit in Poznań was planned in a general outline. But as to detailed concrete places, at what hour, where, this happened of itself in reality”.

On the spot they used plans published by the City Office, with attractions worthy of note marked on them. The city turned out to be more compact than they expected, and actual distances between attractive places much shorter. This allowed them to visit many facilities in one day and forced a modification of plans. “I thought that Lake Malta, the New Zoo, will take all day. But in sum, when we left the market looking for a place to have lunch, we came to Cathedral Island. When we got there, we got on the Maltanka4 and we had an hour left before the Zoo closed, but we went in anyway. In sum, since we were already there, there was no sense in coming again and more precisely. Very footloose. We had a general idea where to go. We kept rambling here and there and finally left, feeling no pressure about missing this or that”.

The couple with the small child was decidedly more restricted by what was possible to the youngest family member. They had no plans prepared in advance, and those they had were verified on the spot by the child’s capabilities: “We always thought a day ahead about what to see. The guide “Poznań the shortest way” and the booklet “I go by tram, I discover Poznań” were our basic information sources. Trams were also very helpful, because obviously, small feet will not get everywhere. Generally, we went out in the morning and came back in the evening — we got where we went. When you travel with such a nipper, some places are within your range, and some you just have to give up. This is more of an hourly plan. Whether we shall have time to go somewhere. Urban transport is up to its task”. Perhaps the fact of having no detailed walking routes in Poznań made the family with the small child more open to discovering spaces not advertised by the city. We shall mention it in the next paragraphs.

A decidedly different approach to the visit in the city was adopted by the group of four young people. They behaved in an intuitive way, with no plans made in advance. As they said: “We only planned to pop to Malta. And the rest in fact was pure improvisation: we go for a walk and do something. We were going to the Old Town, we dropped in to the Castle Gallery. And on the way there was something here, something there. About the Palm House, we learnt from my cousin ... We planned to go to the gallery, but in effect we didn’t make it. Instead, still in the evening when were looking for a place where we could sit down and talk, we came across a pub that invited us by its name: The Brewery Ministry.”

Summing up the issue of sightseeing plans, it is worth noting that what greatly helps visitors not familiar with the city is a map of it featuring its attractions. This device allows urban tourists a gentle “entry into the city” and makes their first contact with it easier. To some extent it also makes it possible to anticipate their paths and allows controlling their behaviour, at least in part.

5.2. Tourist behaviour and opinions about visited places

The method employed made it possible to distinguish 25 areas/ clusters of activity. They were identified and named — using Authors’ knowledge and FGI information (Table 1). However, it is not always easy to determine the function they play in the movements. It cannot be assumed that those are simply places most attractive in tourist terms; they can equally well perform the function of transport nodes, the accommodation base, etc. The clusters were ordered by their popularity with the experiment participants (Fig. 2). Their spatial distribution shows a high concentration in the central part of the city: as many as twelve of them are in its oldest area. The rest are distributed fairly evenly in a narrow latitudinal belt. The most popular place is undoubtedly the Old Market, which is no surprise given its high accumulation of all types of tourist services and attractions (Fig. 1). What is surprising is the great popularity of the Kaponiera Roundabout region, probably connected with its significance as a transport node and the density of its hotel facilities. Other factors that can draw

4 The Park Train serving a 4-km narrow-gauge railway line between the Śródkę Roundabout and the New Zoo.
During the FGI respondents also most frequently mentioned Old Market e.g. the couple with the small child added that they turned their first steps to the Old Market: “First I read the kid the legend (about the Billy Goats), what's the story behind it, as with Cracow’s Wawel dragon. That’s why we went there, not to see them butting, but because this is an important place in Poznań/C19. There is a Town Hall, a market, and also some history connected with all this.

Lesser popularity is enjoyed by a fairly sizeable category of areas located outside the strict centre, in the downtown zone. It includes transport routes that are also public spaces, like St. Martin Street and Liberty Square, and shopping centres, like the MM Gallery. Three areas from this group lie outside the downtown zone: the Poznań Central Station, Cathedral Island on the Warta river, and Wilson’s Park with its Palm House. In this diversified category the most frequented area is the classic “gate to the city”, i.e. the Poznań Central railway station. What is surprising is that the tourists devoted relatively little time to visiting Cathedral Island. This is readily visible in their individual paths (Fig. 3): while all groups crossed the Cathedral Island area, none of them spent much time on seeing its sights. In the case of Subgroups A and B, the tourists only passed across the island using public transport means. In the remaining cases it was visited on foot while moving to the eastern area of the city (Table 2). The surprise stems from the fact that the Cathedral is one of the most advertised places in Poznań, an element of the so-called Imperial-Royal Trail. Perhaps a reason for such tourist behaviour is the lack of distinct elements of space development provoking visitors to leave the Old Market – Lake Malta route and stop by the Cathedral. During the FGI respondents also perceived this area as interesting but less popular and demanding e.g. “Well, there really must be something in it because there is a huge crowd milling around the Poznań market, while for example on Cathedral Island there was nobody but me” and “I (...)”.

![Table 1](https://example.com/table1.png)

Table 1
Comparison of the popularity of the delineated areas of tourist activity against elements of the urban structure. Cells with values greater than the background are distinguished. Per cent values in comparison with the background, determined as a convex hull of all areas (1 = 100%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area id</th>
<th>Name of the area/place</th>
<th>Popularity</th>
<th>Recreational facilities</th>
<th>Public and restaurants</th>
<th>Cultural facilities</th>
<th>Hotels</th>
<th>Hubs of public transportation</th>
<th>Monuments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>City Stadium</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>New Zoo</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>“Poznań Glowny” train station</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Cathedral Island</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Malta water park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Malta shopping mall</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Vicinity of Kaponiera roundabout</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Old Market</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25.53</td>
<td>35.84</td>
<td>29.67</td>
<td>17.40</td>
<td>26.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Cytwela Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Arena Music Hall – Kasprovicz city park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Botanical Garden</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Plaza shopping mall</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Garbary–Estkowski’s junction</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>“Old Brewery” shopping mall</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>PKS Bus station</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>“UAM – theatrical bridge” precinct</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Poznań Greenhouse – Wilson city park</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>St. Martin precinct</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.46</td>
<td>8.38</td>
<td>8.34</td>
<td>11.77</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Synagogue</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>16.92</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>7.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Green Gardens</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>11.05</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Freedom Square</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>11.98</td>
<td>10.10</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Wielkopolski Square</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>“MM gallery” – shopping precinct</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.99</td>
<td>9.41</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>8.19</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>St. Wojciech Hill</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: own compilation.

5 The term “gate to the city” is used here in the sense of places or hubs through which city users enter the city: railway stations, bus stations, the airport.
could recommend, certainly Cathedral Island, but this for the well-advanced and willing. If they wish."

The last, most sizeable category embraces urban areas frequented only sporadically and only by individual experiment participants. Two subcategories can be distinguished in it. One includes places lying definitely outside the downtown zone. Most of them are concentrated along the east-west line across the entire city, but some, like the Plaza shopping centre, fit the longitudinal pattern. Those are mainly extensive green areas: the Botanical Garden, the Citadel, the park around the Arena, the recreation ground on Lake Malta, but there are also shopping centres: the Plaza and Malta, as well as the City Stadium. The FGI showed that there was a variety of motives for visiting those places. The family with the small child noted that Poznań had also less known but still interesting places: “The Citadel park. Forgotten squares. Seem wild, but you can spend time pleasantly there.” What is interesting, the place they mentioned, the Citadel, is not a forgotten place but rather one unknown in tourist terms. It is popular with the city residents for spending time in. Located north of the downtown zone, it is not equipped with much tourist infrastructure and is devoid of either urban hustle and bustle or spectacular attractions. Although it is crossed by marked tourist trails and is the site of the Polish Army Museum with its open-air exhibition of military vehicles and aeroplanes, the Citadel did not feature much in the discussion of the survey participants. It was mentioned precisely as “forgotten”. Characteristically enough, it was “discovered” by the family with the small child, by assumption moving slower around the city in search of peace and quiet.

Another site mentioned by the respondents was the Palm House. It impressed both, representatives of the student group: “What I liked, for example, was the Palm House. Yes, in sum we were to leave early on the last day, but we decided there was still a place we would like to see, and we were fascinated”; and the families with children: “Yes, some time earlier we were in Goteborg and they have a similar facility there, under glass. We wanted to see the one in Poznań. And really, Poznań has nothing to be ashamed of”.

It is surprising that during the FGI the Lake Malta area was mentioned frequently as a very attractive place e.g. the family with the small child stated: “Malta — no other city has got such an artificial lake. So well developed. And in the close vicinity of the Old Market, too. Something pleasant for everybody. A universal attraction.” This is not reflected by map of popular places (Fig. 2).

The other subcategory includes areas situated on the margins of the downtown zone: the coach station, the intersection of Garbary and Estkowskiego Streets, the Old Brewery shopping centre, the Synagogue, and St. Adalbert’s Hill. This is a highly heterogeneous subcategory in terms of functions, and its common feature seems to be the location of the sites on the margins of the principal east-west route of tourist movement. The first two places perform purely transport functions: the Coach Station is one of the “gates to the city”, and the intersection is an important changing point on the way to the east of Poznań. As to the other areas in this subcategory, one might suppose that some of the experiment participants decided they were worth visiting, but not interesting enough to devote to them more time, or even that they appeared on their paths only because they were “en route”. This can also be observed when analysing the most frequent sequences of movement of the experiment participants (Table 2). All are located in the eastern part of Poznań, outside the central area. In this region, in contrast to the centre, the number of attractions is greatly limited and they are evident counterstructures (Lengkeek, 1995) in the urban fabric, channelling and restricting tourist traffic to some extent.

Worth noting is Cathedral Island as a point of departure for further tourist penetration. A similar role is performed by the Synagogue — the last of the facilities visited in the centre before going east.

It seems interesting to compare the most often visited areas with the structure of Poznań tourist facilities (Table 1). In the table we marked places in which there are more structural elements than the background mean, with the background assumed to be the values of the convex hull determined with the help of all clusters; in this case it would not be justified to use the city’s administrative limits. There seems to be a distinct relation between the
Fig. 3. Trajectories of the experiment participants against the backdrop of the most popular areas identified.
In view of the character of Poznań discussed earlier, it is not surprising that the greatest accumulation of photographed places gathered from Flickr can be found in the city’s strict centre, in its oldest part (Fig. 4). Their density decreases markedly with the growing distance from this area, but it is possible to identify several latitudinally distributed points standing out from the general background. Those are the Poznań Central Station, the City Stadium, and Lake Malta. Less intensively photographed are the Botanical Garden and the Citadel situated north of the centre. A comparison of those areas against the sites most often visited in the experiment reveals two things. First, photo maxima largely coincide with the ellipses determined for tracking data — especially in the case of the Poznań Central Station and practically the entire centre — which justifies the conclusion that the method of determining the ellipses was effective. Secondly, the most frequently photographed places are not always those visited most often, in which tourists spend most time, as a comparison with the most popular areas shows (Fig. 4). Area no. 8, the Kaponiera Roundabout, is one of the places where the experiment participants spent much time but took photographs rather rarely. Presumably its function is eminently transport- and hotel-related, and the frequency of visits there is not a derivative of tourist attractiveness. On the other hand, it is possible to indicate areas that were visited fairly rarely during the experiment, but are very often photographed by Flickr users. An example can be area no. 20, the Synagogue, where visitors seem to stop only and exclusively in order to see the building from outside and take photos, without devoting any more time for sightseeing or coming back to this place later. It seems, therefore, that the places most attractive in tourist terms among the ones indicated can be considered those that both, stand out enough from the urban structure to attract visitors for a longer time and that are interesting enough to leave a trace in cyberspace: the Old Market, Liberty Square, the Poznań Central Station, Cathedral Island, the City Stadium, and to a lesser extent, Lake Malta and the Old Brewery. Five of those places are situated in the central part of the city.

There is no doubt that Poznań’s greatest attractions can be found in the downtown zone and its direct neighbourhood. Therefore the respondents’ indications concerned those attractions and this zone. Most, or at least those most important for the tourist, show a latitudinal arrangement. Those that go outside the centre tend to “stretch” the attractive area rather than “break it up”. There are no distinct sites between the successive areas along the east-west line that would be “empty” in tourist terms. The transition from one to another is relatively smooth.

Both in the declarations of the experiment participants and in the analysed tourist structure, Poznań appears as a compact city ready to meet one of the basic requirements of a livable space — walkability.

### 6. Discussion

In the case of Poznań, but also other similar East-European cities, the concentration in the strict centre of both, tourist infrastructure and tourist activities results from several facts deriving from their recent or more distant history, namely:

- the existence of a strict historic centre, in this the case with medieval roots,
- the planning past of the city in which historical, tenement-house areas outside the strict centre and historic places were effectively degraded by the socialist authorities and planners of those times. Those places and buildings were assigned administrative functions, they became public utilities, or were simply liquidated, e.g. the premises of historic facilities were turned...
into office seats, office blocks, or public swimming pools. In place of dilapidated and demolished tenement blocks there appeared wide streets, office blocks, or blocks of flats. In this way the strict centre turned into an urban island of a sort, surrounded by declining tenement blocks and the newly emerging Socialist Realist type of building. Cinemas, performance halls or swimming pools, located outside the downtown zone, served the residents and did not become tourist attractions.

- the systemic transformation of the former socialist cities and post-1990 investment activity precisely in the central area of the city. In those years it was the easiest and most natural to locate tourist investment — hotels, restaurants, new museums, cinemas and theatres — in the already existing central area.

In addition, for many decades the cities now called post-socialist did not see tourism among their development targets. The number of tourists was relatively limited and controlled to some extent. If tourists did appear, those were organised domestic groups. Foreign guests were few in comparison with the present situation, which followed from the specific nature of the political system of that time. Because of the Iron Curtain, cities in this part of Europe were not hosts to great sporting or entertainment events. Hence the spatial structure of the city can be classified according to their functions and spatial arrangement. We propose the following types:

1. “induction spots” leading to the city, or simply attractions that allow planning a network of paths around the city already before the visit, known from tourist guides and advertisements (the Old Town with its Town Hall and the Poznań Billy Goats, the Cathedral, the New Zoo, the Palm House);

2. “gates to the city”, or entrance hubs: the railway and coach stations, the airport, and the most promoted sleeping facilities. Such places in Poznań include the Integrated Rail/Bus Transport Centre, the Ławica Airport, and sleeping facilities of various standards concentrating in the downtown zone;

3. “anchor spots”, or attractive places one keeps coming back to during a visit, places of repeated visits during one stay in the city. They can be found in the Old Market zone. There are too few of them and they are concentrated too much in one area. If there are other “anchor spots” outside the strict centre at all, they are hardly visible to a tourist; and

4. “bridges” between attractions offering a passage and a chance of coming out in “non-promoted” places (entrance to “undiscovered places”). In other words, a possibility (that can be provoked by the authorities) of discovering an unknown city. In Poznań the tourist definitely moves around promoted places and very rarely goes beyond them.

On the basis of these types and their spatial arrangement emerges the proposed model of the Poznań as a monocentric city under tourist influence (Fig. 5) that can be clearly separated into two different worlds: areas in practically sovereign use by residents, and areas in which tourists appear more and more often while not pushing residents out.

Areas of residents’ life are not promoted in tourist terms and are visited by tourists only rarely, if at all. Among them are also valuable recreation sites and old historic neighbourhood areas. Nearly three-fourths of the city are areas where Poznanians clearly “rule”. Areas attractive in tourist terms fill the city centre and the part east of it. This is the zone with historic places, but also with amusement attractions. Both the former and the latter are also used by city residents. Thus, tourist processes in Poznań have an aggregation rather than a patchwork character. Tourist traffic, and attractions that can be considered tourist, concentrate in the central parts of the city and, apart from individual cases, do not tend to spill into its other spaces so far.

Poznań is a spatially compact city and practically all its places are accessible to a walker in at most a 2-h walk. Still, its more distant and latest history has resulted in the present development of urban tourism in its central part, while areas neighbouring with the downtown zone and those farther away from the centre are largely ignored. Thanks to the concentration of tourist traffic in the central parts of the city, residents have their enclaves of neighbourly life as well as recreation and resting sites. The intensity of tourist traffic in Poznań is not high, although in the recent years one can observe its growth. Because of the moderate number of tourists there, the downtown parts of the city are also used by residents, and there are no conflicts arising from the participation of tourists in the city’s everyday life. The situation in this respect is the least comfortable in the downtown part and in the strict centre of Poznań — the Old Market. This is the area of an accumulation of anchor spots, or places in which the tourist stops for a longer time: cafes, pubs and restaurants. Such anchor spots seem to be missing outside the strict centre. The city’s tourist policy should foresee the creation of such places in a more broadly understood downtown zone and in the Malta recreational area. Perhaps there should also appear new “bridges” joining the potential and the existing attractions of Poznań located in its western, northern and southern parts with the centre. In the course of writing this paper, on completion of the empirical part of the research, the so-called Poznań Gate — a modern interactive museum and a cultural centre — was opened between the Old Town and the Malta recreational area. Advertised as a meeting place of Poznanians and visitors, it is supposed to be an “anchor” for a tourist wandering between the Old Town and the Malta recreational complex. While we cannot know for sure if it is going to be successful as anchor spots, it is certainly yet another attraction directing tourist traffic eastwards.

7. Conclusions

The authorities of many European cities, including Eastern European ones, decide to put the development of tourist traffic among their fundamental strategic goals. In the opinion of many people, the appearance of tourists in a city augurs well for its development. There appear new investments in the city, the rhythm of life changes in its selected areas, its spaces become more attractive. It is a common belief that in effect also residents stand to gain something, in both material and non-material terms. But the absence of an urban policy on tourism, or an ill-conceived tourist policy, can lead in the long run to non-harmonious development of places in the city and can destabilise the everyday life of its inhabitants. This can lead to a situation in which residents will start to lose because of the more intensive tourist traffic in selected parts of the city. Excessive tourist activity can diminish the attractiveness of an area both for its residents and the next groups of tourists. Urban spaces — over-invested and crowded — can turn into declining areas. It is therefore easy to conclude that tourist traffic in a city should be
organised, and tourist investment well-thought-out in both spatial and social terms. The situation we have in many towns of Poland and other countries in this part of Europe is one of discovering those places for tourist traffic. Cities open to tourists ever wider, and tourism starts to feature more and more prominently in their development. They are in the growth stage of the process and so far most of them need not fear its destructive effect. However, when deciding on this development trajectory, the authorities of those cities should have their balanced development in view. The term “balanced”, often overused in describing things, is perfect in this situation. The balance should be worked out in a discussion about to what extent city residents should have their own integral areas in sovereign use, and to what extent tourists should be admitted to take part in city life.

On the one hand, the decision to concentrate tourist traffic in the central zone of a city gives a chance of protecting its other spaces for residents. On the other, however, the concentration of tourist activities can lead to the centre fast becoming overcrowded. This, in turn, can cause the tourist capacity of the area to be exceeded and can eliminate it from use by residents. It seems, therefore, that what helps a city to control its tourist traffic to some extent is having induction spots, creating anchor spots, but also provoking visits in undiscovered places. Naturally, we speak here primarily of cities that have not experienced a flood of tourists so far and in which the carrying capacity of concrete areas has not been exceeded yet. Today most cities of East-Central Europe are right at this stage of their development.
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