

# Article

# The Relationship between Cities' Cultural Strength, Reputation, and Tourism Intensity: Empirical Evidence on a Sample of the Best-Reputable European Cities

Vladimir Pavković <sup>1</sup>, Darjan Karabašević <sup>2,\*</sup> , Jelena Jević <sup>1</sup> and Goran Jević <sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The College of Tourism Belgrade, Academy for Applied Studies Belgrade, Bulevar Zorana Đinđića 152a, 11070 Belgrade, Serbia; vladimirp@visokaturisticka.edu.rs (V.P.); jelena.jevic@visokaturisticka.edu.rs (J.J.); jevicg@visokaturisticka.edu.rs (G.J.)

<sup>2</sup> Faculty of Applied Management, Economics and Finance, University Business Academy in Novi Sad, Jevrejska 24, 11000 Belgrade, Serbia

\* Correspondence: darjan.karabasevic@mef.edu.rs; Tel.: +381-60-3383333

**Abstract:** As the social phenomenon that takes into account cultural venues and facilities and cultural participation and attractiveness, the cultural strength of a city is a significant dimension of each city relevant for its inhabitants, as well as its visitors. The results of a research study on the nature of the relationship between cultural strength, on the one hand, and reputation and tourism intensity, on the other, are presented in this paper on a sample of the 20 European cities with the best reputation index according to the report entitled “The World’s Most Reputable Cities” (2018 City RepTrak<sup>®</sup>). The primary goal of the study is to determine the relationship between the cultural strength and reputation of these cities. The secondary goals are focused on determining the relationship between cultural venues and facilities as a segment of cultural strength and tourism intensity. The methodology used in the study comprises: the definition and analysis of the city reputation concept, as well as the determination of the differences in comparison with the reputation of an urban tourism destination, the identification of the constituents of the cultural strength of the cities and their role in tourist attractions, and finally, the investigation of the nature of the relationship between cultural strength, on the one hand, and tourism intensity, on the other. In order to conduct the analysis of these relationships and their interdependence, correlation and regression analyses are used. One of the conclusions of the paper is that cultural venues and facilities are not connected with the reputation of cities, whereas the correlation regarding cultural participation and attractiveness is confirmed. The results of the study also show the most important “cultural venues and facilities” indicator in relation to tourism intensity. In terms of this and based on the obtained research results of the study, the role that cultural strength plays in positioning cities in stakeholders’ perception through the strategic process of the creation and management of cities’ reputation, as well as the tourism attractiveness of cities and a consequent increase in the number of tourists as important stakeholders and ensuring their satisfaction, are presented in the paper.

**Keywords:** reputation of cities; cultural venues and facilities; cultural participation and attractiveness; tourism intensity



**Citation:** Pavković, V.; Karabašević, D.; Jević, J.; Jević, G. The Relationship between Cities’ Cultural Strength, Reputation, and Tourism Intensity: Empirical Evidence on a Sample of the Best-Reputable European Cities. *Sustainability* **2021**, *13*, 8806. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13168806>

Academic Editor: Alan Fyall

Received: 27 June 2021

Accepted: 2 August 2021

Published: 6 August 2021

**Publisher’s Note:** MDPI stays neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.



**Copyright:** © 2021 by the authors. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

## 1. Introduction

Cities are urban socio-areal entities with a high concentration of the population, companies, and cultural facilities, a developed infrastructure, and good traffic connections with destinations across the globe by air, water, or land. The primary task entrusted to the city management is the creation of the foundations for its economic and social growth and the quality of the life of its citizens, primarily in terms of work opportunities, education, and healthcare. Thus, cities should attract as many experts as possible in various fields, creative individuals and industries, students, tourists, and visitors. The complexity of

such a destination mainly embodied in the number and diversity of internal and external stakeholders poses a demanding task of choosing the best possible city management strategies, one of the most important being the creation and management of the city's reputation. As such, good reputation is a competitive advantage, mainly reflecting through ensuring the desired position on the global market and in the minds of the key stakeholders as well. Starting from the papers written by the numerous authors who consider reputation to be a psychological construct [1–6] based on the attitudes of the stakeholders grounded in their personal experiences and time [7–9], reputation of a city dealt with in this paper is perceived as follows: various stakeholders' attitudes related to the city, which are based on their personal experiences gained over time, which is a comparable category in terms of personal and social expectations and in terms of competition as well, whereas reputation as such influences stakeholders' city-oriented intentions and behavior. One of the most important models for measuring cities' reputations is that created by the Reputation Institute, which presented the results of the research they had carried out in the report entitled "The World's Most Reputable Cities". In the research presented in this paper, the results published in the report entitled "The World's Most Reputable Cities" (2018 City RepTrak®) [10] are used.

Starting from the above-mentioned, cities' cultural supply is an important segment of their reputation given the fact that culture is one of the main motivational factors [11–16] in the processes of making decisions about paying a visit to a city, so that is the reason why it is important that cities should contain cultural attractions, such as historical city centers, the architecture, monuments, archeological sites, museums, galleries, theatres, and local, regional, and international cultural events. In the context of the creation and management of a city's reputation and starting from the fact that the experience and expectations connected with that reputation and cultural attractions can also be identified in the substructure of this process, it can be noticed that the latter play a dual role—both indirect and direct. The indirect role reflects a city's features, above all its attractiveness and authenticity, which influence tourists' expectations (the image and the brand) related to the city and its cultural supply, consequently influencing their decision to pay a visit to the city, so that they can compare their expectations with the actual experience they have gained after their stay. The direct role is reflected in ensuring quality experiences and impressions for the visitor. Starting from the premise that the reputation of a city represents various stakeholders' attitudes towards the city, the fact that a city's attractions, including cultural attractions as well, are not solely aimed at tourists and visitors, but also at the local community, as stated in the paper written by Ashworth and Page [17] and Edwards et al. [18], should not be overlooked.

With the aim of determining the nature of the relationship between the cultural supply and the reputation of cities, the data retrieved from "The Cultural and Creative Cities Monitor" created by Montalto et al. [19] and the Joint Research Centre (JRC), the European Commission's science and knowledge service, are used in this paper for the purpose of conducting the research. In the Monitor, there is an analysis of the cultural vibrancy of a city, which is determined by the number of cultural venues and facilities, as well as its attractiveness and people's participation in the cultural supply of the city. Based on the features of its elements, the cultural vibrancy dealt with in the paper is perceived as cultural strength, bearing in mind the fact that the number of cultural attractions, as well as their attractiveness and tourist participation, are all taken into account. The variety of cultural facilities, their number and significance, as well as their areal density, are one of the key features of a city. The cultural strength of a city plays a few roles, ranging from the protection and interpretation of the local and global cultural identities, as well as the education of the local population and visitors, to attracting tourists.

Tourism is cities' important segment in both the economic and the social aspects. The notions of cities and urban tourism destinations differ from each other, although they may apply to the same physical area. An urban tourist destination comprises tourism, the elements of tourism attractiveness, and tourist activities in a city as a destination.

All the other industries are categorized into those which, whether to a great extent or only marginally, influence tourism and those which do not influence it at all. This is the reason why city development and management strategies, on the one hand, and urban tourism destination strategies, on the other, differ from each other. Additionally, the stakeholders of an urban tourism destination only constitute a portion of all stakeholders in the city, and their significance differs. For example, primary stakeholders for an urban tourism destination are tourists, whereas in the case of a city, tourists are but one segment of the stakeholders and do not hold a primary position. Starting from the foregoing considerations, the nature of the relationship between cultural strength and tourism intensity as an important indicator of tourism development that, according to Eurostat [20], represents a ratio between the number of overnight stays at tourist accommodation points and the number of the residents who permanently live in the area, are analyzed in the paper.

Starting from the above-mentioned considerations, additionally, the research carried out in this paper comprises the determination of the role cultural strength plays in the strategic reputation creation and management processes by observing the cities with good reputation, and the role cultural strength plays in the tourism intensity of these cities. In this respect, the subject matter of the research consists of defining and analyzing the cultural strengths of the cities, with special attention being paid to cultural venues and facilities and attractiveness and people's participation in the cultural supply of the city, the city's reputation, and tourism intensity of the cities. The primary goal of the research is to determine the relationship between the cultural strength and the reputation of the cities with good reputations. The secondary goals are focused on determining the relationship between cultural venues and facilities as a segment of cultural strength which influences the expectations related to the cities with good reputation and their cultural supply, on the one hand, and their tourism intensity, on the other. In order to reach the goals set in this research in a proper way, as many as 20 cities with the best reputation according to the report of the Reputation Institute are analyzed and further research is conducted in relation to these. The European cities were taken as the samples in the analysis due to a large number of the cultural attractions of global importance concentrated in these cities and, consequently, due to their undoubted importance for the world cultural supply. As the confirmation of this, Montalto et al. [21] believe that culture is a phenomenon that mostly 'happens' in urban areas, and it is thus not surprising that, as of today, the cultural heritage of most nations—especially in Europe—is concentrated in cities.

Based on the research subject and the goals, the main hypothesis, as well as the research questions and the other hypotheses, are formulated as follows:

**Hypothesis 1 (H1).** *In the case of the cities with good reputation, there is a positive correlation between particular indicators—cultural strength, on the one hand, and reputation and tourism intensity, on the other.*

RQ1: In the case of the cities with good reputation, is there a connection between cultural strength and reputation?

**Hypothesis 2 (H2).** *In the case of the cities with good reputation, cultural venues and facilities are not in correlation with their reputation.*

**Hypothesis 3 (H3).** *In the case of the cities with good reputation, cultural participation and attractiveness are in a positive correlation with their reputation.*

RQ2: In the case of the cities with good reputation, is there a relationship between cultural strength and their tourism intensity?

**Hypothesis 4 (H4).** *In the case of the cities with good reputation, particular "cultural venues and facilities" indicators are in a positive correlation with tourism intensity.*

**Hypothesis 5 (H5).** *In the case of the cities with good reputation, particular “cultural venues and facilities” indicators have an influence on tourism intensity.*

In terms of this, the paper is structured into a few parts. After the Introduction, Section 2 is dedicated to the theoretical background, where special attention is paid to the presentation of the notions of a city’s reputation, the cultural strength of cities and tourism, and tourism intensity. In Section 3 of the paper, the materials and methods, the measurements, the data, and the research method are presented. Section 4 of the paper comprises the results and discussion, connected with the causal relationship between cultural strength and reputation and the causal relationship between reputation and tourism intensity. Section 5 presents the conclusion.

## 2. Theoretical Background

### 2.1. A City’s Reputation

Cities differ from rural areas in terms of the number and diversity of their inhabitants. The accessibility of cities is enabled by means of up-to-date, high-quality traffic and tourism infrastructures [11,22]. Cities are characterized by an “urban lifestyle” [17] and by a high density of cultural facilities, simultaneously also being business and finance hubs where numerous companies are located. In order to maintain the functionality of a city, the city management authority has to identify the most important internal and external stakeholders along with their respective needs and expectations. With respect to diverse stakeholders, a city represents a place which, according to Delgado-García and De Quevedo-Puente [23] (p. 2831), provides the inhabitants with prerequisites for life, work, relaxation, education, and healthcare, simultaneously providing companies with the conditions for conducting business operations and an easy recruitment of employees. Tourists and visitors enjoy culture, education, and entertainment there, while investors are offered investment opportunities and resources for their economic activities. Regarding this, Romão et al. [24] introduced the “smart city” concept characterized by investment in human and social assets and in the transportation, information, and communication infrastructures as well, where sustainable economic development, a high quality of life, and natural resource management are encouraged.

Taking the above into consideration, one of the most significant strategic choices cities have should be the creation and management of their reputation. Starting from the definition of corporate reputation, certain authors look at the reputation of a city as stakeholders’ perception of the city’s capacity to meet their demands and expectations [23] (p. 2831) [25] (p. 2) [26] (p. 4), or the expectations of future performances based upon the perception of a past behavior [27] (p. 2). The reputation basis consists of perceptions of [28], opinions on [29], feelings for [29,30], assessments of [31], beliefs about [6,32,33], and attitudes towards [28,34] the reputation subject. Numerous authors emphasize the importance of time needed for reputation formation [33,35–40] and an experience with the subject of such reputation [7,8,29,36], which means that time and personal experience are needed in the reputation formation process, both of which consequently influence the intensity of stakeholders’ attitudes. Ali et al. [41] conceptualize experience as a psychological construct which ensues from contact with the subject of experience, where interaction is an element which greatly influences experience.

In order to understand the reputation concept in a better manner, it is necessary to distinguish it from the image and brand concepts preceding reputation formation. Explaining the chain of a city’s reputation formation, Dastgerdi and De Luca [42] state that the image is created first, only to be followed by the brand and reputation in the end. The image of a destination is “a cluster of beliefs, ideas and impressions that an individual holds about a destination” [43] (p. 104) [44] (p. 703), most often based on information transmitted by mass media [45,46]. On the other hand, the branding process links the image and identity of a city with the aim of creating authenticity. A brand distinguishes a city from its competition and is accepted by stakeholders, as held by Dastgerdi and De Luca [42]

(p. 2), who define it as “a cluster of images, features and feelings that consumers bring to mind when they think about a certain symbol, product, service, company or destination.” According to Kladou et al. [47], the most significant aim of branding is recalling positive associations connected with a destination, as well as its differentiation from the competition. An important observation is noted by Mareque et al. [48] (p. 12), who hold an opinion that city marketing should consider a balance between the identity, the image, and the desired reputation, whereby the brand will not work unless it is backed up by reality. Thus, cities should focus their efforts on increasing their appeal and continuing to improve their reality. By doing so, they will have a better image and they will attract more visitors and potential residents and investors.

In the context of corporate reputation, Vlastelica et al. [9] (p. 13) provide one of the most comprehensive explanations applicable to cities as well, according to which reputation is the attitudes formed over time based upon personal experience or indirect information. Such attitudes are considered to be trustworthy by stakeholders, whereby reputation influences their intentions and behavior in the end. Khan and Digout [37] further explain the reputation concept by viewing it as a comparable category primarily in relation to expectations and the competition. In a similar fashion, Chun [36] finds the reputation basis to lie in the difference between a stakeholder's expectations and experience with respect to the reputation subject, which implies the fact that a negative reputation will be created if experience is worse than expectations, and vice versa. Thus, stakeholders form their expectations through the image and brand of a city, which are then compared to the experience created in it to their experiences in other cities, too. This finally leads to the creation of the reputation of a particular city. In line with this, Pardo-Garcia et al. [49] emphasize the fact that tourists' expectations are formed on the basis of external sources and that tourists cannot attest to them until they visit the destination [50]. Starting from different approaches to the definition of this notion, the reputation of a city is referred to in this paper as various stakeholders' attitudes towards a city created through their personal experiences having been gained over time, representing a comparable category in terms of personal and social expectations as well as the competition, whereby reputation as such influences such stakeholders' intentions and behaviors concerning the city. The reputation of a destination is created by numerous elements [51] and requires a corporate approach of different subjects at a destination, which is the reason why a destination's reputation management has become an important strategic and operational activity of the state, regional, and local authorities [52]. The reputation of cities increases their competitiveness [52,53]. Therefore, destinations with a good reputation will be regarded as destinations with a higher credibility and trustworthiness level than others [54]. In a similar fashion, cities with a good reputation also have a potential to keep current inhabitants and attract new ones [53,55], which will lead to an increase in the economic activity, encouraging the growth of the existing companies and decreasing unemployment [23,25,56], and also an increase in the number of investors and investments [27,42,53,55,57]. In turn, such successes may attract a greater number of tourists and visitors [25,27,42], as well as creative industries and people [58].

In the city's reputation creation and management strategy formation process, it is necessary to take into account the differences among stakeholders, mostly in terms of the city's dimensions important to them. Urban tourism is a fast-growing form of tourism [59,60] and cities continue to attract more and more tourists [24,61], so that an urban destination [62], which implies the fact that a city is an area with numerous ongoing tourist activities [22], is one of the most important types of tourism destinations. From the standpoint of tourism, a city is an urban tourism destination, whereas differences are visible between the terms. A city denotes a smaller or bigger urban settlement whose population works in various fields, with tourism being but one of such fields. On the other hand, an urban tourism destination emphasizes tourism, tourist attractions, tourists, visitors, and tourist activities in a city regarded as a destination. All the other industries can be seen as those that exert a certain level of influence on tourism, or those that have no influence at all. These differences



directly influence the choice of the most important stakeholders and consequently the choice of the strategies for the creation and management of the reputation of a city or an urban tourism destination. Therefore, a city is a wider term than an urban tourism destination, while a city's reputation is a more complex concept than the reputation of an urban tourism destination. It is also necessary to bear in mind the fact that one of the most important features of a city as a tourism destination is the fact that facilities are not only intended for tourists, but for the local community as well [12,17,18,63–65].

## 2.2. The Cultural Strength of Cities and Tourism

As Su and Teng [66] claim, cultural tourism is becoming one of the biggest and the fastest-growing tourism markets. According to Garau [67], the global organizations such as the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS), United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), and World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) have always shown interest in the development of cultural heritage in tourism. The last two decades have recorded a massive increase in the interest in culture as a major resource for urban change, as explained by Montalto et al. [21] (p. 167), who also add the fact that culture has been argued to be a constitutive part of the local identity and the quality of life, as well as a competitive sector on its own, having broader impacts on tourism creativity and innovation, urban growth, and cities' regeneration and their wellbeing.

Depending on the quality and attractiveness of a cultural heritage, Ebejer [68] states that cultural heritage may be a significant factor in tourism development as it is a practice in a number of cities. Cultural and creative industries are growing notably, especially in developed countries, enhancing ties amongst cultures, institutions, territories, and cities [69], and providing an economic benefit, mostly as a result of increased tourism consumption [70]. Mareque et al. [48] (p. 1) use the notion of creativity tourism, which is explained as "a type of tourism which offers visitors the opportunity to develop their creative potential through active participation in learning experiences which are characteristic of the holiday destination where they are undertaken", where the focus is, among other things, on the nontraditional uses of the cultural potential of destinations.

Tourist attractions are the basic elements of the attractiveness of a destination, as according to Vengesayi [71], who adds that these are the main reason why tourists choose one destination over other competitors. As such, cities attract tourists with different interests and motivations for a visit [72], with culture being one of the primary motivators [11–16,64,73,74]. Consequently, cities with rich cultural facilities are attractive, well-visited destinations [24], and become cultural hubs [75]. In a similar fashion, Su et al. [66] state that cultural tourism is important to cities because of the high density of the cultural heritage sites, which are simultaneously important tourist attractions. In their typology of urban tourism destinations, Smith et al. [76] see a significant position in the capitals of culture (capitals with rich cultural heritage and a broad range of museums, galleries, opera halls, concert halls, and aesthetically attractive areas, such as Prague or Vienna), cities with monumental heritage (cities with cultural heritage, where the historical city center is visited most, as is the case in Venice), artistic cities (cities with a high concentration of museums, galleries, and other artistic facilities, such as Berlin with its Museum Island), creative cities (the cities that encourage creative industries, such as visual arts, music, architecture, and design, as can be seen in Barcelona or Helsinki), and festival cities (those where cultural events and festivals often take place, as in Edinburgh). Stating that cultural facilities should be understood as the strategic tourist attractions that will link culture and tourism in an urban setting, Garau [67] points out the fact that numerous cities place an emphasis on culture in their promotional strategies in order to increase the attractiveness of the destination itself.

The tourists whose primary travel motivation is culture leave the place of living in search of an experience connected with cultural heritage and local culture [77], where their perceptions of culture at the destination will significantly be determined by the local community's attitude towards their own cultural heritage [78]. However, there is

a significant difference among the tourists who visit cultural attractions. There are the tourists whose interest in culture is only superficial, and they visit attractions while visiting them during a holiday without any significant wish to increase their knowledge about them. Therefore, in that case, attractions are only visited in order to be ticked off the list. On the other hand, there are the tourists who regard cultural attractions as a key factor in their making a decision on the choice of a destination.

Numerous authors have focused on the cultural attractions that exert an influence on the perception and attractiveness of an urban tourism destination, defining the most important as follows: historical city centers [64], the architecture and cultural heritage [18,75,79–86], historical attractions [18,65,82,86], archeological finds [87], the religious places of worship, monuments, statues, concert halls, cinemas [83], theatres [83,88], museums, and galleries [15,62,74,80,83,84,86,89], exhibitions [70,83,85,86], cultural events [13,86], and festivals [65,80,84–86,88,89].

Authenticity is an important feature of cultural facilities and it can be their significant competitive advantage on the market. Experience at a destination must be unique, i.e., authentic [90], as it contributes to the differentiation of supply [91] and thus constitutes a competitive advantage [46]. If authenticity is neglected, the consequence will be a failure in attracting new tourists and generating revenue at the destination. Antón et al. [92] (p. 48) say that “cultural activities may be regarded as leisure activities that enable individuals to enjoy unique and unforgettable experiences.” Emphasizing the importance of cultural heritage for tourism destinations, Park et al. [93] hold an opinion that authenticity has a crucial role in the creation of experiences, as such an original value is the main driving force that motivates tourists to travel to various, often distant places. With respect to this, Farrelly et al. [94] point out the fact that tourists’ perceptions of the authenticity of a cultural heritage are influenced by its basic features, ranging from the physical appearance and cultural and historical significance to the active transmission of information about its significance. The transmission of the information about the significance and authenticity of a cultural heritage, also called a narrative, is very important for a city and for an urban tourism destination. In their analysis of the narratives and focusing on the importance of authenticity, Hsu et al. [95] hold a view that cities are capable of creating the unique identities that will help tourists to step outside their “ordinary lives” into unforgettable experiences.

### 2.3. *Tourism Intensity*

Tourism is one of the fastest-growing industries in the world [96–98] and is recognized by many countries as an opportunity to improve their economies by a strategic approach to its development and increased investment in the field, as stated in the papers written by Milne and Ateljević [99], González [100], and Teker and Teker [101]. Significant and rapid changes at the global level are the main features of contemporary tourism. The technical and technological development of the media, the appearance of the Internet, online media, notably social media and networks, as well as the development of information systems and transportation means, have enabled virtually every single destination in the world to become a tourism destination. Tourists have access to a large amount of information. In comparison with the past, they are more educated and more demanding when tourist services are concerned. There have also been changes in the way holidays are taken—instead of a longer stay at one destination, there is a global trend of paying visits to several destinations throughout a year, with tourists staying at a destination for shorter periods of time [102]. On the other hand, special interest tourism, among others urban tourism, is playing an important role in the global tourism market [103]. Given the fact that the number of travelers is on a continuous rise, the tourism of today is the greatest voluntary migration of people in the world [104]. These changes are visible both in supply and in demand, which is a causal relationship arising from the reaction of supply towards the instability and changes on the demand side.

For a long time now, the focus in theory and practice has been placed on the discovery of proper methods for measuring the success of tourism at a specific destination, including

cities as urban tourism destinations, among other things. The largest number of research studies have been based on residents' perceptions of the influence tourism has had on the local community and the destination where they live [105]. The latest research studies, however, have moved their focus towards the measures assessing the objective record of that influence. Tourism intensity is one of the most regularly used. It shows the ratio between the number of overnight stays in tourist accommodation facilities and the overall number of the residents who permanently live there [20]. According to Mikulić et al. [106], this method is significant given the fact that it takes into consideration the socio-demographic features of the destination which is the subject matter of the measurement. According to the authors, this method is also the most common as the objective indicator of tourism development and the economic significance of tourism and its sustainability, too.

### 3. Materials and Methods

#### 3.1. Measurement

With the aim of determining the causality of the relationship between cities' cultural strength, their reputation, and tourism intensity, a sample of the 20 European cities (except Dublin, where relevant data were not available) with the best reputation according to the report entitled *The World's Most Reputable Cities (2018 City RepTrak®)* published by the Reputation Institute [10] is used in this paper. As has already been explained, the European cities were selected because of a large number of the cultural attractions of global importance that can be found in them. In the report published by the Reputation Institute, a total of the 56 world cities were presented, 25 of them being European cities. The data about the 20 European cities are used in this paper as a valid sample. On the other hand, cultural strength was determined through the results obtained from the report entitled *The Cultural and Creative Cities Monitor (2019 Edition)* by Montalto et al. [19] published by the European Commission. Tourism intensity for each city was obtained by calculating the number of tourist overnight stays in comparison to the number of inhabitants.

In the methodology used by the Reputation Institute, the four dimensions of a city's reputation were taken into account, namely admiration, trust, feeling, and esteem. The dimensions relate to the following attributes: the advanced economy (the business environment, financially stable, with opportunities for future growth, well-respected products and services, the headquarters of the leading companies, technology), the appealing environment (a beautiful city, appealing experiences, well-known personalities), and effective government (well-developed political and legal institutions, social, economic, and environmental policies, adequate transport, communications, and the adequate infrastructure, the well-respected leaders, safety). In the methodology applied by the Reputation Institute, the cities were chosen according to the following criteria: the GDP, the population, and the level of familiarity. In the research study, a total of 12,044 people from the G8 economies (Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Russia, The United Kingdom, and The United States) were included in the survey and they were asked to make an assessment of the selected cities using the above-mentioned criteria.

Numerous researchers, such as Jakab and Happ [107] (who focused on the reputation and communications of the Hungarian town of Djera) and the Audi Hungaria Zrt. Company, used the report by City RepTrak® in their work. Vollebregt [108] used it to carry out research on the reputation of the town of Beverwijk in the Netherlands, while De Jesus et al. [109] relied on it when they focused on creative education in Rio De Janeiro. It was also used by Tsouli [110] in the research he carried out on the relationship between popularity in social media and a city's reputation, by Balashov [111] (who estimated the global competitiveness of the town of Kiev), and by Kolotouchkina [112] (whose paper deals with the engagement of inhabitants in sporting mega-events on the example of the Olympic Games in Tokyo).

A lack of proper monitoring tools in the field of culture basically revolves around the two main arguments: on the one hand, the difficulty of defining and delimiting culture given the complexity of cultural production and consumption processes and the



heterogeneity of the actors involved, and a lack of suitable and comparable data, on the other, considered by Montalto et al. [21] (p. 167), adding using a newly created dataset as a good solution—the Cultural and Creative Cities Monitor (CCCM). Montalto et al. [19] created The Cultural and Creative Cities Monitor as a web tool offering quantitative and qualitative data about 190 cities adapted for the purposes of comparison and research, primarily aimed at providing support for urban policies' creation. The quantitative data comprised 29 specific indicators categorized into 9 dimensions and 3 main domains. For the purposes of this research study, the following two dimensions of the cultural vibrancy domain were used, namely cultural venues and facilities, and cultural participation and attractiveness. In this research, the whole cultural vibrancy domain has not been included as the quantified score of its two dimensions, but the research study encompasses cultural strength as a social phenomenon that looks at these indicators separately instead.

The cultural venues and facilities dimension measures the cultural richness of the cities and takes the following into account: sights and landmarks (the points of historical, cultural, and/or artistic interest, such as architectural buildings, religious sites, monuments and statues, churches and cathedrals, bridges, towers and fountains, amongst other things, divided by the total population and then multiplied by 100,000), museums and art galleries (the number of the museums and the art galleries open to the public divided by the total population and then multiplied by 100,000), cinemas (the number of the cinema seats in the city divided by the total population and then multiplied by 1000), concert and music halls (the number of theatres and other music venues such as concert halls, clubs, etc., divided by the total population and then multiplied by 100,000), and theatres (the number of the theatres in the city divided by the total population and then multiplied by 100,000). On the other hand, the cultural participation and attractiveness dimension measures participation in cultural activities, taking into account tourist overnight stays and tourist satisfaction with cultural facilities. The report entitled The Cultural and Creative Cities Monitor was used in the papers written by the following authors: Mareque et al. [48], who did research on creative tourism and its significance for small towns; Henriques and Moreira [113], who explain the growing significance of cultural and creative tourism in Lisbon and Porto; Suciu and Năşulea [114], who focus on intellectual assets and the creative economy as the key driving forces of competitiveness towards smart and sustainable development. The report was also used by the following authors: De Jorge-Moreno and De Jorge-Huertas [115], who measure the effectiveness of the European cultural and creative cities; Fekete and Morvay [116], who explore the creative and cultural aspects of the Hungarian town of Djera and its position compared to the creative cities of Central and Eastern Europe; Rodrigues and Franco [117], whose research focus is on measuring performances in creative cities. On the other hand, Montalto et al. [19] state that a great number of cities used these reports to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses needed for the creation of appropriate strategies, such as Madrid did, where they were used for the creation of branding and investment strategies, or Geneva and Djera, where they were used for the purposes of carrying out an analysis of the strategies for cultural and creative economies and investment needs.

According to Eurostat [20], tourism intensity accounts for the ratio between the number of overnight stays at the accommodation points and the number of the local residents who permanently live there. The data about overnight stays used in this research study were retrieved from a few relevant sources, namely TourMis [118], City of Edinburgh Council—Edinburgh by Numbers 13th Edition [119], The Frankfurt Tourist + Congress Board [120], and Hellenic Statistical Authority [121], while the data about the number of the residents were collected from TourMis [118] and the United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs [122]. As an important indicator of tourism activities, tourism intensity has been used in numerous research papers. For example, Mikulić et al. [106] used it to determine the ratio between the brand strength and tourism intensity in European capitals, Tokarchuk et al. [123] explored the influence of tourism intensity on the inhabitants' satisfaction with their life in Germany, Neuts [124] used it as one of the parameters for doing research in tourism as a driving force of economic growth, whereas Dumbrovská

and Fialová [125] use tourism intensity for the comparison of urban tourism development in Prague with that in Vienna and Budapest.

### 3.2. Data

In order to assess the relationship and influence of the explored variables in a proper manner, a table was used for the data matrix (Table 1). The following parameters were included in the analysis: the city's reputation (CR), the cultural venues and facilities (CVF), the concert and music halls (CMH), the museums and the art galleries (MAG), the theatres (THE), the cinemas (CIN), the sights and landmarks (SL), cultural participation and attractiveness (CPA), and tourism intensity (TI).

**Table 1.** The data used in the research.

Rate	City Name	CR	CVF	CMH	MAG	THE	CIN	SL	CPA	TI
1.	Copenhagen	81.0	35.7	47.6	45	29.2	29	28.9	54.4	11.4
2.	Vienna	80.9	26.2	37.8	21.7	21.8	22.9	22.9	52.2	8.7
3.	Stockholm	80.8	21.3	15.9	22.9	33	20	10	50.5	6.3
4.	Venice	80.3	55.8	70.9	100	25.9	26.2	100	61.9	31.4
5.	Rome	79.2	24	25.9	20.8	16.2	23.6	40.2	35	9.9
6.	Zurich	78.5	42	23.4	44.6	46.6	69	13.6	47.5	3.6
7.	Munich	78.2	18.6	14.4	11.6	19.7	28.4	11.8	42.2	11.8
8.	Helsinki	77.7	24.9	17.5	38.9	32.7	23	14.1	38.3	6.5
9.	Milano	77.1	25.7	28.9	29.1	17.3	22.4	39.3	40.6	9.0
10.	Barcelona	76.5	25.1	42.4	26.5	16.9	17.2	21	31.3	11.9
11.	London	76.4	15.2	27.5	10.2	10.3	14	7.7	29.2	6.6
12.	Madrid	76.1	17.7	31.9	9.4	15.6	12.6	12.1	23.3	6.2
13.	Edinburgh	75.7	32.9	46.1	56.3	19.9	19.3	36	27	32.8
14.	Amsterdam	75.5	37.9	54.1	46.9	38.7	22.1	26.4	40.7	19.5
15.	Frankfurt	75.5	19.8	20.2	15.1	25.5	17.5	16.7	36.5	13.6
16.	Prague	74.4	48	70.8	77	43.1	24.5	29.9	33.3	13.9
17.	Paris	73.3	58.5	73.1	31.8	60.8	54.4	59.3	54.4	7.7
18.	Brussels	72.1	16.5	13.4	26.5	23.2	9.3	13.4	23.9	5.8
19.	Berlin	72.0	22.3	22.2	17.5	25.7	27.4	10.8	40.8	9.1
20.	Athens	71.5	60.4	40.1	35.3	84.8	91.2	15.8	17.8	2.3

Sources: The World's Most Reputable Cities (2018 City RepTrak®); The Cultural and Creative Cities Monitor (2019) Edition); TourMis (2020); City of Edinburgh Council—Edinburgh by Numbers 13th Edition (2019); The Frankfurt Tourist + Congress Board (2020); Hellenic Statistical Authority (2020); United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs (2018).

### 3.3. Research Method

The results obtained after having carried out the research study were statistically analyzed by using an appropriate choice of statistical methods in correlation with the data type, with the aim of ensuring the optimal recognition of the influences and the interdependence of the data analyzed in the paper.

For the descriptive representation of the variables, a median with a range was used. As the central observation, the median is an important central tendency measure not depending on the extreme ends of the range. In an ordered list of numbers, it is the middle number. As the number of the data in this research study is an even number, the median in this paper is the average of the two central pieces of the data, i.e., the median is equal to the arithmetic mean of the two central members of the statistical series. The median was used to calculate the average values of the variables: the city's reputation, the cultural venues and facilities, the concert and music halls, the museums and the art galleries, the theatres, the cinemas, cultural participation and attractiveness, and ultimately tourism intensity.

The connection among the numerical variables in this paper was tested by means of Kendall's tau coefficient of correlation. Correlation explores the strength and direction of the relationship between two variables, so the positive direction shows that both variables grow or decline together, whereas the negative direction shows that the other variable

declines when one variable grows, and vice versa. If the direction, i.e., the signs of a plus or a minus, is not taken into account, it is possible to notice the strength of the link between the variables. Kendall's tau coefficient of correlation was used to determine the link between the reputation variable and the following variables: the cultural venues and facilities, the sights and landmarks, the museums and the art galleries, the cinemas, the concert and music halls, the theatres, and cultural participation and attractiveness. Apart from the above-mentioned, Kendall's tau coefficient of correlation was also used to determine the connection amongst the tourism intensity variable and the following variables: the cultural venues and facilities, the sights and landmarks, the museums and the theatres.

For a prediction purpose, univariant linear regression was used. Statistical relevance was defined at the level of the probability of the null hypothesis according to the formula  $p \leq 0.05$ . Statistical data processing and analysis were performed using the SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) ver.24 computer software. It was explored whether the six independent variables (the cultural venues and facilities, the sights and landmarks, the museums and art galleries, the cinemas, the concert and music halls, and the theatres) were the predictors of tourism intensity. A simple regression model was applied.

#### 4. Results and Discussion

The research study consists of the three parts intended to determine the causality of the following relationships: the cultural venues and facilities and the cities' reputation, on the one hand, and cultural participation and attractiveness and the cities' reputation, on the other, as well as the cities' cultural venues and facilities and their tourism intensity. The starting point was research in the sample of the 20 best-reputable European cities.

The sample (Table 2) includes the 20 European cities selected according to the above-mentioned criteria. The average reputation of the city included in the sample of the 20 cities is  $Me = 76.45$ . The theoretical range of reputation is from 0 to 100, while the sample values range from  $Min = 71.5$  to  $Max = 81$ . The average value of all the cultural venues and facilities equals  $Me = 25.4$ , ranging from  $Min = 15.2$  to  $Max = 60.4$ . When the particular aspects of the cultural venues and facilities are concerned, the highest average score relates to the concert and music halls ( $Me = 30.4$ ), only to be followed by that of the museums and the art galleries ( $Me = 27.8$ ), the theatres ( $Me = 25.6$ ), and the cinemas ( $Me = 22.95$ ). The lowest score is noticed in the case of the sights and landmarks ( $Me = 18.8$ ). The values of cultural participation and attractiveness range from  $Min = 17.8$  to  $Max = 61.9$ , the average being  $Me = 39.45$ . The values of tourism intensity range from  $Min = 2.3$  to  $Max = 32.8$ , with the average of  $Me = 9.05$ .

**Table 2.** The descriptive indicators: the city's reputation, the cultural venues and facilities, and cultural participation and attractiveness.

	N = 20
THE CITY'S REPUTATION	76.45 (71.5–81)
CULTURAL VENUES and FACILITIES	25.4 (15.2–60.4)
Concert and music halls	30.4 (13.4–73.1)
Museums and art galleries	27.8 (9.4–100)
Theatres	25.6 (10.3–84.8)
Cinemas	22.95 (9.3–91.2)
Sights and landmarks	18.85 (7.7–100)
CULTURAL PARTICIPATION and ATTRACTIVENESS	39.45 (17.8–61.9)
TOURISM INTENSITY	9.05 (2.30–32.80)

The median (the minimum–the maximum) are shown in the table. Source: The authors' calculation.

##### 4.1. The Causal Relationship between Cultural Strength and Reputation

In order to achieve the defined goals of the research in the most efficient way, the following research question was defined in this part of the analysis:

RQ1: In the case of the cities with good reputation, is there a relationship between cultural strength and reputation?

This was the basis for the following hypotheses:

**Hypothesis 2 (H2).** *In the case of the cities with good reputation, cultural venues and facilities are not in correlation with their reputation.*

**Hypothesis 3 (H3).** *In the case of the cities with good reputation, cultural participation and attractiveness are in a positive correlation with their reputation.*

Using Kendall's tau correlation coefficient, the research study was conducted with the aim of determining if the measured parameters were interrelated (Tables 3 and 4) or not. The results (Table 3) show that the reputation of the sample cities is not in a statistically significant correlation with the following variables: the cultural venues and facilities and the five indicators of this dimension (the sights and landmarks, the museums and the art galleries, the cinemas, the concert and music halls, and the theatres). As reputation is an experience with a city, the relationship between one's expectations and experience with a city plays an important role in its formation. Taking into account an experience with other competitor cities, it is clear that the number of cultural facilities a city has does not influence its reputation.

**Table 3.** The correlation between the cities' reputation and the cultural venues and facilities and their indicators.

	CR	CVF	SL	MAG	CIN	CMH	THE
CR	1.000	−0.047	0.079	0.042	0.090	−0.090	−0.164
CVF	−0.047	1.000	0.474 **	0.628 **	0.505 **	0.621 **	0.568 **
SL	0.079	0.474 **	1.000	0.438 **	0.211	0.516 **	0.084
MAG	0.042	0.628 **	0.438 **	1.000	0.237	0.438 **	0.417 **
CIN	0.090	0.505 **	0.211	0.237	1.000	0.189	0.474 **
CMH	−0.090	0.621 **	0.516 **	0.438 **	0.189	1.000	0.189
THE	−0.164	0.568 **	0.084	0.417 **	0.474 **	0.189	1.000

Kendall's tau is shown in the table. \*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level. Source: The authors' calculation. Legend: The city's reputation (CR), the cultural venues and facilities (CVF), the sights and landmarks (SL), the museums and the art galleries (MAG), the cinemas (CIN), the concert and music halls (CMH), the theatres (THE).

**Table 4.** The correlation between the reputation of the cities and cultural participation and attractiveness.

	CR	CPA
CR	1.000	0.455 **
CPA	0.455 **	1.000

Kendall's tau is shown in the table. \*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level. Source: The authors' calculation. Legend: the city's reputation (CR), cultural participation, and attractiveness (CPA).

Based on the results, it can be concluded that the hypothesis H2 is confirmed.

On the other hand, the reputation of these cities is in a positive correlation with the cities' cultural participation and attractiveness (Kendall's tau = 0.455,  $p < 0.01$ ), as is shown in Table 4. As participation implies contact with cultural facilities, which is directly related to gaining an experience because there is no experience without participation, the result can be considered as logically expected. The attractiveness of cultural facilities is an important predictor, which as such has special significance for the cities' reputation, and it means that the cities are capable of drawing attention, prompting them to action (in terms of paying visits), as an indirect influence on reputation through the creation of expectations, and providing expected experience as a direct influence on reputation. Therefore, the attractiveness of cultural facilities, especially so if these are globally important, lays the foundations for the creation of a good reputation. In terms of attractiveness, looking at

the sample cities studied in this research, the attractions important for reputation are as follows: The Acropolis in Athens, the Colosseum in Rome, the architectural heritage of Gaudi in Barcelona, the historical hearts of Venice and Prague, among others, given the fact that their significance exceeds the boundaries of a city or of a country. Taking into consideration the above-mentioned results, it is clear that the quality of cultural facilities is in correlation with the reputation of a city as opposed to the quantity of these.

As is explained in the Methodology Section, a city's reputation relates to many attributes. Therefore, while interpreting the results, it should be noted that cultural participation and attractiveness relate to the reputation of a city only up to a certain extent, and they are insufficient for the creation of an overall reputation. With regard to this, according to the report entitled *The World's Most Reputable Cities (2018 City RepTrak®)*, the most important attribute in a city's overall reputation is its effective government (38%), which is followed by the appealing environment (35.7%) and the advanced economy (26.3%) of the overall score. The most important sub-attributes of the reputation of a city are as follows: offering a safe environment for visitors and residents (12.2%), being a beautiful city (11.9%), and being run by respected leaders (8.6%), which amount to 32.7% of the overall reputation when taken together. The nature of the relationship between the cultural strength and overall reputation of a city will primarily depend on the category of stakeholders, because they, and consequently their expectations, differ.

Based on the results, it can be concluded that the hypothesis H3 is confirmed and that the research question RQ1 was partially affirmatively answered.

#### *4.2. The Causal Relationship between the Cultural Strength and Tourism Intensity*

In order to achieve the goals set in the study in the most efficient way, the following research question was defined in this part of the analysis:

RQ2: In the case of the cities with a good reputation, is there a correlation between the cultural strength and their tourism intensity?

**Hypothesis 4 (H4).** *In the case of the cities with a good reputation, the particular cultural venues and facilities indicators are in a positive correlation with tourism intensity.*

**Hypothesis 5 (H5).** *In the case of the cities with a good reputation, the particular cultural venues and facilities indicators have an influence on tourism intensity.*

As cultural strength consists of the two indicators: cultural venues and facilities, and cultural participation and attractiveness, only the first indicator was used in this part of the research study. As the cultural participation and attractiveness indicator implies that tourists have already stayed in a city and thus have become familiar with its cultural attractions, this indicator is not used in further research and analysis. In terms of this, Kendall's tau correlation coefficient was used to explore whether the cultural venues and facilities indicator is in a statistically significant correlation with tourism intensity (Table 5). The results show that tourism intensity is not in a statistically significant correlation with the overall dimension of the cultural venues and facilities indicator, but it is rather in a statistically significant positive correlation with the one indicator of cultural venues and facilities: the sights and landmarks (Kendall's tau = 0.326,  $p < 0.05$ ). The positive direction of the correlation shows that the higher the score in the above-mentioned indicator of the cultural venues and facilities, the higher the tourism intensity.



**Table 5.** The correlation between cultural venues and facilities and tourism intensity.

	CVF	SL	MAG	CIN	CMH	THE	TI
CVF	1.000	0.474 **	0.628 **	0.505 **	0.621 **	0.568 **	0.158
SL	0.474 **	1.000	0.438 **	0.211	0.516 **	0.084	0.326 *
MAG	0.628 **	0.438 **	1.000	0.237	0.438 **	0.417 **	0.206
CIN	0.505 **	0.211	0.237	1.000	0.189	0.474 **	−0.021
CMH	0.621 **	0.516 **	0.438 **	0.189	1.000	0.189	0.305
THE	0.568 **	0.084	0.417 **	0.474 **	0.189	1.000	−0.105
TI	0.158	0.326 *	0.206	−0.021	0.305	−0.105	1.000

Kendall's tau is shown in the table. \*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level. \* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level. Source: The authors' calculation. Legend: the cultural venues and facilities (CVF), the sights and landmarks (SL), the museums and the art galleries (MAG), the cinemas (CIN), the concert and music halls (CMH), the theatres (THE), tourism intensity (TI).

Based on the results, it can be concluded that the hypothesis H4 is confirmed.

The influence of the specific indicators of cultural venues and facilities on tourism intensity (Table 6) was explored using univariant linear regression. The sights and landmarks influence tourism intensity (Beta = 0.630 (0.091–0.378),  $p < 0.01$ ), accounting for 36.3% of the variance of the dependent variable.

**Table 6.** The influence of some of the indicators of cultural venues and facilities in the cities on tourism intensity and the city's reputation.

		Univariant	Linear	Regression
		Beta (95%CI)	<i>p</i>	Adjusted R Square
TOURISM INTENSITY	CVF	0.229 (−0.142–0.398)	0.332	0.000
	SL	0.630 (0.091–0.378)	0.003	0.363
	MAG	−0.076 (−199.539–146.325)	0.750	−0.049
	CIN	−0.307 (−0.313–0.066)	0.188	0.044
	CMH	−0.370 (−229.440–24.808)	0.108	0.089
	THE	−0.255 (−0.335–0.102)	0.278	0.013

Abbreviations: 95% CI—95.0% Confidence Interval, *p*—statistical significance. Source: The authors' calculation. Legend: the cultural venues and facilities (CVF), the sights and landmarks (SL), the museums and the art galleries (MAG), the cinemas (CIN), the concert music halls (CMH), the theatres (THE).

As the indicator of the cultural venues and facilities, the sights and landmarks have a high-score positive influence on tourism intensity. In other words, the higher the score of a city's sights and landmarks, the higher the tourism intensity score. Therefore, that indicator is a statistically important predictor of tourism intensity, whereas the overall dimension of cultural venues and facilities, as well as the other indicators, has no significant influence on tourism intensity. The fact that cultural venues and facilities have no influence on tourism intensity while one constituent (the indicator) does have an influence can be explained by the low score of the other constituents.

Sights and landmarks, as well as the architecture, monuments, statues, historical hearts of a city, and other highlights, have a significant influence on tourism intensity, representing the cultural attractions of a city which have a high potential to attract a great number of tourists. Due to that, it is important that these should be paid due attention to in terms of protection and restoration, tourism valorization, and promotion. Therefore, perceiving a city as an urban tourism destination, potential tourists consider the cultural attractions influencing “a city's looks” which are often used in promotional campaigns as very important. Exceptional significance is given to the so-called “tourism icons” that represent a globally recognizable attraction that is often the basis of the branding of a city. In terms of this, Anholt [126] specifically points to the significance of the cities with globally recognizable attractions, such as Paris (the Eiffel Tower), Edinburgh (the Edinburgh Castle),

Berlin (the Berlin Wall and the Branderburg Gate), Moscow (Red Square and Kremlin), London (Big Ben), Rome (the Colosseum and the Vatican), Milan (La Scala Theatre), Brussels (the Bronze Statue of Manneken Pis), Prague (Charles' Bridge), and Barcelona (Sagrada Familia). In the process of creating an image of a city and branding a city, i.e., in the process of the creation of the expectations related to it, it is also very important to pay attention to the features of the city explained in the typology accounted for by Smith et al. [76], such as: cities with esthetically attractive areas, such as Prague or Vienna, cities with monumental heritage (cities with cultural heritage where the historical city center is visited most, as is the case with Venice), and creative cities (especially in the sense of visual arts and architecture).

Starting from the data provided by Su and Teng [66], according to which the Louvre doubled the number of its doors due to an increase in the number of visitors, while the British Museum is going to enlarge its entrances, and comparing these with the data obtained through the research carried out in this paper, it may be assumed that museums do not exhibit the key "pull" effect for attracting a large number of tourist to a destination, but when tourists visit a city attracted by some other motivational factors (sights and landmarks), a considerable number of them will seize the opportunity and visit these cultural institutions, especially if they contain the exhibits of global cultural significance. On the other hand, the fact that the museum exhibitions will attract passionate culture lovers indicates that their number is extremely low compared to the overall number of tourists, especially in the case of big cities, and consequently mass tourism in them. Additionally, concert and music halls (such as Musikvereinssaal, home to the Viennese Philharmonic Orchestra, Berlin Philharmonie, Philharmonie de Paris, L'Olympia in Paris, and others as well) attract music lovers, but, as in the case of museums, they are not a strong "pull" factor in terms of attracting large numbers of tourists to pay a visit to a destination.

Based on the obtained results, it can be concluded that the hypothesis H5 is confirmed and that the research question RQ2 was partially affirmatively answered.

Based on the obtained research results, the conducted analysis, the research questions, and the hypotheses, it can be concluded that the main hypothesis of the paper is confirmed:

**Hypothesis 1 (H1).** *In the case of the cities with a good reputation, there is a positive correlation between particular indicators—the cultural strength, on one hand, and reputation and tourism intensity, on the other.*

## 5. Conclusions

This research study is based upon the 20 best-reputable European cities according to the World's Most Reputable Cities (2018 City RepTrak®) published by the Reputation Institute. According to the results obtained in the research study, the cultural venues and facilities indicator (as the quantitative indicators of the cultural strength) are not in a statistically significant correlation with the cities' reputation, whereas the cultural participation and attractiveness qualitative indicators show a positive correlation in this respect. The results clearly account for the fact that, in the cities' reputation and taken together with visitor participation, cultural attractiveness and activity constitute the important elements as the predictors of quality experiences and impressions. In order to consider a city's cultural attractiveness, it is necessary that it should contain a large number of authentic cultural facilities characterized by both global and local features representing a good foundation for the city's image and its brand creation, as well as its reputation based on experience.

The sights and landmarks of a city influence tourism intensity, as is shown in this paper. This result has a specific importance to the city management authorities since it points out which cultural attributes of a city have the potential for the creation and management of the city's cultural image and brand that will stand for the basis for the formation of tourists' expectations, and consequently for their paying a visit to the city. With respect to this, the above-mentioned facilities should be made as attractive as possible

in order to ensure visitors' high-quality impressions and unforgettable experiences, which will lead to a good reputation and consequently to the position on the market and the image in stakeholders' minds it aspires to achieve. When interpreting this result, the specific features of a city should be taken into account, as well as the complexity of the motivational factors in the tourists who visit it. One should also bear in mind the fact that although they have been attracted by one dominant motivational factor, tourists will spend their time in a city becoming familiar with its other features with respect to which they had no expectations prior to visiting it, or their expectations were of lower intensity. Based on these contacts, tourists/visitors will form attitudes towards the features and the city itself, which will have implications for the city's reputation.

However, tourists are but one of many groups of the stakeholders who are significant for the functioning of a city, while tourism is but one out of the economic activities of a city. This has been shown by the methodology used by the Reputation Institute, concluding that the constituents playing a role in tourists' impressions and experience are only one segment of the overall reputation of a city. While measuring the reputation of a city, the numerous attributes and sub-attributes important for the overall reputation of a city, but not playing a crucial role in visitors' and tourists' impressions and experiences (such as the advanced economy, the business environment, financially stable and future growth, the effective government, well-developed political and legal institutions, the headquarters of the leading companies), are taken into consideration. This statement does not mean that these attributes do not have indirect significance for tourists, given that the largest number of these provide preconditions necessary for tourism development and ensure necessary investment in tourism in the general city infrastructure as well, which may play an important role in ensuring tourist satisfaction. In order to obtain precise data and determine the causality of these relationships, it is necessary to explore the nature of the correlation between the reputation of an urban tourist destination and the other measured variables, given the fact that, in such cases, analysis would exclusively comprise the attributes directly related to tourism.

Finally, the fact that as many as 20 European cities were included in the research study should also be noted. Therefore, the results apply to them, not to all cities. With this in mind, there is a possibility that a larger sample may lead to different results.

**Author Contributions:** Conceptualization, V.P. and D.K.; methodology, V.P. and G.J.; software, J.J.; validation, D.K., J.J., and G.J.; formal analysis, J.J.; investigation, V.P.; resources, V.P. and J.J.; data curation, G.J. and J.J.; writing—original draft preparation, V.P.; writing—review and editing, D.K.; visualization, J.J.; supervision, D.K.; project administration, G.J. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

**Funding:** This research received no external funding.

**Institutional Review Board Statement:** Not applicable.

**Informed Consent Statement:** Not applicable.

**Data Availability Statement:** The data are contained in the paper.

**Conflicts of Interest:** The authors declare no conflict of interest.

## References

1. Van Riel, C.B.; Fombrun, C.J. *Essentials of Corporate Communication: Implementing Practices for Effective Reputation Management*; Routledge: London, UK, 2007; ISBN 9780415328265.
2. Dowling, G. Reputation risk: It is the board's ultimate responsibility. *J. Bus. Strategy* **2006**, *27*, 59–68. [[CrossRef](#)]
3. Fombrun, C.J.; Gardberg, N.A.; Sever, J.M. The Reputation QuotientSM: A multi-stakeholder measure of corporate reputation. *J. Brand Manag.* **2000**, *7*, 241–255. [[CrossRef](#)]
4. Rindova, V.P.; Williamson, I.O.; Petkova, A.P.; Sever, J.M. Being Good or Being Known: An Empirical Examination of the Dimensions, Antecedents, and Consequences of Organizational Reputation. *Acad. Manag. J.* **2005**, *48*, 1033–1049. [[CrossRef](#)]
5. Walsh, G.; Beatty, S.E. Customer-based corporate reputation of a service firm: Scale development and validation. *J. Acad. Mark. Sci.* **2007**, *35*, 127–143. [[CrossRef](#)]
6. Dowling, G.R. Corporate Reputations: Should You Compete on Yours? *Calif. Manag. Rev.* **2004**, *46*, 19–36. [[CrossRef](#)]

7. Gotsi, M.; Wilson, A.M. Corporate reputation: Seeking a definition. *Corp. Commun. Int. J.* **2001**, *6*, 24–30. [CrossRef]
8. Harvey, W.S.; Tourky, M.; Knight, E.; Kitchen, P. Lens or prism? How organisations sustain multiple and competing reputations. *Eur. J. Mark.* **2017**, *51*, 821–844. [CrossRef]
9. Vlastelica, T.; Kostic, S.C.; Okanovic, M.; Milosavljevic, M. How Corporate Social Responsibility Affects Corporate Reputation: Evidence from an Emerging Market. *J. East. Eur. Manag. Stud.* **2018**, *23*, 10–29. [CrossRef]
10. Reputation Institute. The World's Most Reputable Cities, (2018. City RepTrak®). Available online: <https://insights.reputationinstitute.com/reptrak-reports/city-reptrak-2018> (accessed on 14 May 2021).
11. Xu, Z.; Zhang, J. Antecedents and consequences of place attachment: A comparison of Chinese and Western urban tourists in Hangzhou, China. *J. Dest. Mark. Manag.* **2016**, *5*, 86–96. [CrossRef]
12. Ben-Dalia, S.; Collins-Kreiner, N.; Churchman, A. Evaluation of an Urban Tourism Destination. *Tour. Geog.* **2013**, *15*, 233–249. [CrossRef]
13. Carlisle, S.; Johansen, A.; Kunc, M. Strategic foresight for (coastal) urban tourism market complexity: The case of Bournemouth. *Tour. Manag.* **2016**, *54*, 81–95. [CrossRef]
14. Koutoulas, D.; Tsartas, P.; Papatheodorou, A.; Prountzou, E. Understanding the tour operators' point of view for effectively marketing a tourist destination: The case of Athens. *Ann. Tour. Res.* **2009**, *9*, 65–77. Available online: [https://www.academia.edu/1817662/Understanding\\_the\\_tour\\_operators\\_point\\_of\\_view\\_for\\_effectively\\_marketing\\_a\\_tourist\\_destination\\_The\\_case\\_of\\_Athens](https://www.academia.edu/1817662/Understanding_the_tour_operators_point_of_view_for_effectively_marketing_a_tourist_destination_The_case_of_Athens) (accessed on 15 June 2021).
15. Brida, J.G.; Meleddu, M.; Pulina, M. Understanding Urban Tourism Attractiveness. *J. Travel Res.* **2012**, *51*, 730–741. [CrossRef]
16. Charterina, J.; Aparicio, G. A comparison of antecedents of satisfaction in city break traveling. *Rev. Esp. Invest. Mark. ESIC* **2015**, *19*, 71–82. [CrossRef]
17. Ashworth, G.; Page, S.J. Urban tourism research: Recent progress and current paradoxes. *Tour. Manag.* **2011**, *32*, 1–15. [CrossRef]
18. Edwards, D.; Griffin, T.; Hayllar, B. Urban Tourism Research. *Ann. Tour. Res.* **2008**, *35*, 1032–1052. [CrossRef]
19. Montalto, V.; Tacao Moura, C.J.; Alberti, V.; Panella, F.; Saisana, M. *The Cultural and Creative Cities Monitor*; EUR 29797 EN; Publications Office of the European Union: Luxembourg, 2019; ISBN 978-92-76-08806-6.
20. Eurostat. Glossary: Tourism Intensity. Available online: [https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php?title=Glossary:Tourism\\_intensity](https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php?title=Glossary:Tourism_intensity) (accessed on 15 June 2021).
21. Montalto, V.; Tacao Moura, C.J.; Langedijk, S.; Saisana, M. Culture counts: An empirical approach to measure the cultural and creative vitality of European cities. *Cities* **2019**, *89*, 167–185. [CrossRef]
22. Griffin, T.; Dimanche, F. Urban tourism: The growing role of VFR and immigration. *J. Tour. Futur.* **2017**, *3*, 103–113. [CrossRef]
23. Delgado-García, J.B.; De Quevedo Puente, E. The complex link of city reputation and city performance. Results for fsQCA analysis. *J. Bus. Res.* **2016**, *69*, 2830–2839. [CrossRef]
24. Romão, J.; Kourtiti, K.; Neuts, B.; Nijkamp, P. The smart city as a common place for tourists and residents: A structural analysis of the determinants of urban attractiveness. *Cities* **2018**, *78*, 67–75. [CrossRef]
25. Torres, P.; Godinho, P. The influence of city reputation on T-KIBS concentration. *Eur. Plan. Stud.* **2020**, *28*, 1960–1978. [CrossRef]
26. Šerić, M.; Vernuccio, M. The impact of IMC consistency and interactivity on city reputation and consumer brand engagement: The moderating effects of gender. *Cur. Issues Tour.* **2020**, *23*, 2127–2145. [CrossRef]
27. Bonaiuto, M.; Aricchio, S.; De Dominicis, S.; Fornara, F.; Molinaro, E.; Troffa, R.; Wang, H. City Reputation Indicators (CRIs): Measuring inhabitants' city representation/Indicadores de Reputación Urbana: Midiendo la representación de una ciudad en sus habitantes. *PsyEcology* **2019**, *10*, 31–87. [CrossRef]
28. Wepener, M.; Boshoff, C. An instrument to measure the customer-based corporate reputation of large service organizations. *Serv. Mark.* **2015**, *29*, 163–172. [CrossRef]
29. Martinez, R.J.; Norman, P.M. Whither reputation? The effects of different stakeholders. *Bus. Horiz.* **2004**, *47*, 25–32. [CrossRef]
30. Hardeck, I.; Hertl, R. Consumer Reactions to Corporate Tax Strategies: Effects on Corporate Reputation and Purchasing Behavior. *J. Bus. Ethics* **2014**, *123*, 309–326. [CrossRef]
31. Cable, D.M.; Graham, M.E. The determinants of job seekers' reputation perceptions. *J. Organ. Behav.* **2000**, *21*, 929–947. [CrossRef]
32. Ponzi, L.J.; Fombrun, C.J.; Gardberg, N.A. RepTrak™ Pulse: Conceptualizing and Validating a Short-Form Measure of Corporate Reputation. *Corp. Reput. Rev.* **2011**, *14*, 15–35. [CrossRef]
33. Laaksonen, S.M. Casting Roles to Stakeholders—A Narrative Analysis of Reputational Storytelling in the Digital Public Sphere. *Int. J. Strateg. Commun.* **2016**, *10*, 238–254. [CrossRef]
34. Dutot, V.; Castellano, S. Designing a Measurement Scale for E-Reputation. *Corp. Reput. Rev.* **2015**, *18*, 294–313. [CrossRef]
35. Fombrun, C.; Shanley, M. What's in a Name? Reputation Building and Corporate Strategy. *Acad. Manag. J.* **1990**, *33*, 233–258. [CrossRef]
36. Chun, R. Corporate reputation: Meaning and measurement. *Int. J. Manag.* **2005**, *7*, 91–109. [CrossRef]
37. Khan, S.; Digout, J. The Corporate Reputation Reporting Framework (CRRF). *Corp. Reput. Rev.* **2018**, *21*, 22–36. [CrossRef]
38. Walker, K.A. Systematic Review of the Corporate Reputation Literature: Definition, Measurement, and Theory. *Corp. Reput. Rev.* **2010**, *12*, 357–387. [CrossRef]
39. Argenti, P.A.; Druckenmiller, B. Reputation and the Corporate Brand. *Corp. Reput. Rev.* **2004**, *6*, 368–374. [CrossRef]
40. Bennett, R.; Rentschler, R. Foreword by the Guest Editors. *Corp. Reput. Rev.* **2003**, *6*, 207–210. [CrossRef]



41. Ali, F.; Kim, W.G.; Li, J.; Jeon, H.M. Make it delightful: Customers' experience, satisfaction and loyalty in Malaysian theme parks. *J. Dest. Mark. Manag.* **2018**, *7*, 1–11. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
42. Dastgerdi, S.A.; De Luca, G. Strengthening the city's reputation in the age of cities: An insight in the city branding theory. *City Territ. Arch.* **2019**, *6*, 1–7. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
43. Agustí, D.P. Characterizing the location of tourist images in cities. Differences in user-generated images (Instagram), official tourist brochures and travel guide. *Ann. Tour. Res.* **2018**, *73*, 103–115. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
44. Styliadis, D.; Belhassen, Y.; Shani, A. Three Tales of a City. *J. Travel Res.* **2015**, *54*, 702–716. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
45. Hwang, J.; Park, H.Y.; Hunter, W.C. Constructivism in Smart Tourism Research: Seoul Destination Image. *J. Inf. Syst.* **2015**, *25*, 163–178. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
46. Kokosalakis, C.; Bagnall, G.; Selby, M.; Burns, S. Place image and urban regeneration in Liverpool. *Int. J. Consum. Stud.* **2006**, *30*, 289–397. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
47. Kladou, S.; Kavaratzis, M.; Rigopoulou, I.; Salonika, E. The role of brand elements in destination branding. *J. Des. Mark.* **2017**, *6*, 426–435. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
48. Mareque, M.; De Prada Creo, E.; Álvarez-Díaz, M. Exploring Creative Tourism Based on the Cultural and Creative Cities (C3) Index and Using Bootstrap Confidence Intervals. *Sustainability* **2021**, *13*, 5145. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
49. Pardo-García, C.; Coll-Serrano, V.; Rausell-Köster, P.; Pérez Bustamante-Yábar, D. Cultural attitudes and tourist destination prescription. *Ann. Tour. Res.* **2018**, *71*, 59–61. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
50. Beritelli, P.; Laesser, C. Power dimensions and influence reputation in tourist destinations: Empirical evidence from a network of actors and stakeholders. *Tour. Manag.* **2011**, *32*, 1299–1309. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
51. Morgan, N. Time for 'mindful' destination management and marketing. *J. Dest. Mark. Manag.* **2021**, *1*, 8–9. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
52. Morgan, N.; Huertas, A. Advancing the study of place brands, tourism and reputation management. *Cat. J. Com. Cult. Stud.* **2011**, *3*, 149–158. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
53. Delgado-García, J.B.; de Quevedo-Puente, E.; Blanco-Mazagatos, V. The impact of city reputation on city performance. *Reg. Stud.* **2018**, *52*, 1098–1110. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
54. Artigas, E.M.; Vilches-Montero, S.; Chasco Yrigoyen, C. Antecedents of tourism destination reputation: The mediating role of familiarity. *J. Retail. Consum. Serv.* **2015**, *26*, 147–152. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
55. Gammelsæter, H. Media visibility and place reputation: Does sport make a difference? *J. Place Manag. Dev.* **2017**, *10*, 288–298. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
56. López-López, V.; Iglesias-Antelo, S.; Vázquez-Sanmartín, A.; Connolly, R.; Bannister, F. E-Government, Transparency; Reputation: An Empirical Study of Spanish Local Government. *Inf. Syst. Manag.* **2018**, *35*, 276–293. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
57. Bell, F. Looking beyond place branding: The emergence of place reputation. *J. Place Manag. Dev.* **2016**, *9*, 247–254. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
58. Wijngaarden, Y.; Hitters, E.; Bhansing, P.V. Close to the 'local cool': Creative place reputation in Dutch 'ordinary cities. *Creat. Ind. J.* **2019**, *12*, 86–104. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
59. Bock, K. The changing nature of city tourism and its possible implications for the future of cities. *Eur. J. Futur. Res.* **2015**, *3*, 1–8. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
60. Postma, A.; Buda, D.M.; Gugerell, K. The future of city tourism. *J. Tour. Futur.* **2017**, *3*, 95–101. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
61. Schäfer, P.; Just, T. Does urban tourism attractiveness affect young adult migration in Germany? *J. Prop. Invest. Financ.* **2018**, *36*, 68–90. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
62. Li, M.; Fang, L.; Huang, X.; Goh, C. A spatial-temporal analysis of hotels in urban tourism destination. *Int. J. Hosp. Manag.* **2015**, *45*, 34–43. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
63. Pearce, D.G. An integrative framework for urban tourism research. *Ann. Tour. Res.* **2001**, *28*, 926–946. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
64. García-Hernández, M.; De la Calle-Vaquero, M.; Yubero, C. Cultural Heritage and Urban Tourism: Historic City Centres under Pressure. *Sustainability* **2017**, *9*, 1346. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
65. Rasoolimanesh, S.M.; Roldán, J.L.; Jaafar, M.; Ramayah, T. Factors Influencing Residents' Perceptions toward Tourism Development: Differences across Rural and Urban World Heritage Sites. *J. Travel Res.* **2017**, *56*, 760–775. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
66. Su, Y.; Teng, W. Contemplating museums' service failure: Extracting the service quality dimensions of museums from negative on-line reviews. *Tour. Manag.* **2018**, *69*, 214–222. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
67. Garau, C. Emerging Technologies and Cultural Tourism: Opportunities for a Cultural Urban Tourism Research Agenda. In *Tourism in the City*; Bellini, N., Pasquinelli, C., Eds.; Springer: Berlin, Germany, 2017; pp. 67–80. ISBN 978-3-319-26877-4.
68. Ebejer, J. Urban heritage and cultural tourism development: A case study of Valletta's role in Malta's tourism. *J. Tour. Cult.* **2019**, *17*, 306–320. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
69. Wu, Y.C.; Lin, S.W.; Wang, Y.H. Cultural tourism and temples: Content construction and interactivity design. *Tour. Manag.* **2020**, *76*, 103972. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
70. Torre, A.; Scarborough, H. Reconsidering the estimation of the economic impact of cultural tourism. *Tour. Manag.* **2017**, *59*, 621–629. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
71. Vengesai, S. A conceptual model of tourism destination competitiveness and attractiveness. In Proceedings of the ANZMAC, Australia and New Zealand Marketing Academy Conference, Adelaide, Australia, 1–3 December 2003; pp. 637–647.
72. Caldeira, A.M.; Kastenholz, E. Tourists' spatial behaviour in urban destinations. *J. Vacat. Mark.* **2018**, *24*, 247–260. [\[CrossRef\]](#)



73. Van der Ark, L.; Richards, G. Attractiveness of cultural activities in European cities: A latent class approach. *Tour. Manag.* **2006**, *27*, 1408–1413. [CrossRef]
74. Jansen-Verbeke, M.; Van Rekom, J. Scanning museum visitors. *Ann. Tour. Res.* **1996**, *23*, 364–375. [CrossRef]
75. Maitland, R.; Newman, P. *World Tourism Cities: Developing Tourism off the Beaten Track*; Routledge: New York, NY, USA, 2014; ISBN 9780415762038.
76. Smith, M.; Macleod, N.; Robertson, H. *Key Concepts in Tourist Studies*; Sage: London, UK, 2010; ISBN 13.
77. Cetin, G.; Bilgihan, A. Components of cultural tourists' experiences in destinations. *Curr. Issues Tour.* **2016**, *19*, 137–154. [CrossRef]
78. Rabotić, B. Tourist guides as cultural heritage interpreters: Belgrade experience with municipality-sponsored guided walks for local residents. In Proceedings of the Book of the International Tourism Conference: Cultural and Event Tourism Issues & Debates, Alanya, Turkey, 5–7 November 2008; pp. 213–233.
79. Mellano, P. Pegaining the culture of cities. *City Territ. Arch.* **2017**, *4*, 1–6. [CrossRef]
80. Pasquinelli, C. Building from scratch? An 'inner connectivity' framework for soft urban tourism development. *Int. J. Tour. Cities* **2016**, *2*, 248–256. [CrossRef]
81. Gospodini, A. Urban Design, Urban Space Morphology, Urban Tourism: An Emerging New Paradigm Concerning Their Relationship. *Eur. Plan. Stud.* **2001**, *9*, 925–934. [CrossRef]
82. Shoval, N. Urban planning and tourism in European cities. *Tour. Geogr.* **2018**, *20*, 371–376. [CrossRef]
83. Law, C.M. Urban Tourism and its Contribution to Economic Regeneration. *Urban. Stud.* **1992**, *29*, 599–618. [CrossRef]
84. Vinyals-Mirabent, S. European urban destinations' attractors at the frontier between competitiveness and a unique destination image. A benchmark study of communication practices. *J. Des. Mark. Manag.* **2019**, *12*, 37–45. [CrossRef]
85. Wong, P.P.W.; Teoh, K. The influence of destination competitiveness on customer-based brand equity. *J. Des. Mark. Manag.* **2015**, *4*, 206–212. [CrossRef]
86. Boivin, M.; Tanguay, G.A. Analysis of the determinants of urban tourism attractiveness: The case of Québec City and Bordeaux. *J. Des. Mark. Manag.* **2019**, *11*, 67–79. [CrossRef]
87. Ross, D.; Saxena, G. Participative co-creation of archaeological heritage: Case insights on creative tourism in Alentejo, Portugal. *Ann. Tour. Res.* **2019**, *79*, 1–14. [CrossRef]
88. Gomez-Casero, G.; Alba, C.A.J.; Beltrán, J.J.; Nogueras, J.R. Cultural Events: Case Study of a Theatre Festival as an Element of Tourist Attraction. *Mediterr. J. Soc. Sci.* **2018**, *9*, 177–185. [CrossRef]
89. Rogerson, C.M. Urban tourism in the developing world: The case of Johannesburg. *Dev. South. Afr.* **2002**, *19*, 169–190. [CrossRef]
90. Dickinger, A.; Lalicic, L. An analysis of destination brand personality and emotions: A comparison study. *Inf. Technol. Tour.* **2016**, *15*, 317–340. [CrossRef]
91. Binter, U.; Ferjan, M.; Neves, J.V. Marketing Mix and Tourism Destination Image: The Study of Destination Bled, Slovenia. *Organizacija* **2016**, *49*, 209–223. [CrossRef]
92. Antón, C.; Camarero, C.; Garrido, M.J. A journey through the museum: Visit factors that prevent or further visitor satiation. *Ann. Tour. Res.* **2018**, *73*, 48–61. [CrossRef]
93. Park, E.; Choi, B.-K.; Lee, T.J. The role and dimensions of authenticity in heritage tourism. *Tour. Manag.* **2019**, *74*, 99–109. [CrossRef]
94. Farrelly, F.; Kock, F.; Josiassen, A. Cultural heritage authenticity: A producer view. *Ann. Tour. Res.* **2019**, *79*, 1–12. [CrossRef]
95. Hsu, S.-Y.; Dehuang, N.; Woodside, A.G. Storytelling research of consumers' self-reports of urban tourism experiences in China. *J. Bus. Res.* **2009**, *62*, 1223–1254. [CrossRef]
96. Kovačević, I.; Zečević, B.; Veljković, S. "Gamification" concept": Theoretical framework and destination marketing management practice. *Ekon. Preduz.* **2014**, *62*, 315–322. Available online: <http://scindeks-clanci.ceon.rs/data/pdf/0353-443X/2014/0353-443X1406315K.pdf> (accessed on 13 June 2021). [CrossRef]
97. Mussalam, G.Q.; Tajeddini, K. Tourism in Switzerland: How perceptions of place attributes for short and long holiday can influence destination choice. *J. Hosp. Tour. Manag.* **2016**, *26*, 18–26. [CrossRef]
98. Divisekera, S. Tourism Demand Models: Concepts and Theories. In *Handbook of Tourism Economics: Analysis, New Applications And Case Studies*; Tisdell, C.A., Ed.; World Scientific Publishing: Singapore, 2013; pp. 67–86. [CrossRef]
99. Milne, S.; Ateljević, I. Tourism, economic development and the global-local nexus: Theory embracing complexity. *Tour. Geogr.* **2001**, *34*, 369–393. [CrossRef]
100. González, S. Bilbao and Barcelona 'in motion'. How urban regeneration 'models' travel and mutate in the global flows of policy tourism. *Urban Stud.* **2011**, *487*, 1397–1418. [CrossRef]
101. Teker, S.; Teker, D. Tourism Projects Financing: A Public-Private-Partnership Model. *Bus. Manag. Dyn.* **2012**, *2*, 5–11. Available online: [http://bmdynamics.com/issue\\_pdf/bmd110280,%2005-11.pdf](http://bmdynamics.com/issue_pdf/bmd110280,%2005-11.pdf) (accessed on 21 July 2021).
102. Kozak, M.; Buhalis, D. Cross-border tourism destination marketing: Prerequisites and critical success factors. *J. Destin. Mark. Manag.* **2019**, *14*, 100392. [CrossRef]
103. Rabotić, B. *Selektivni Oblici Turizma*; The College of Tourism: Belgrade, Serbia, 2013; ISBN 978-86-82371-64-9.
104. Pavković, V. Dimensions of national culture as a factor in shaping tourist behaviour and preferences. *Tur. Posl.* **2018**, *22*, 71–80. [CrossRef]
105. Tokarchuk, O.; Gabriele, R.; Maurer, O. Tourism intensity impact on satisfaction with life of German residents. *Tour. Econ.* **2016**, *22*, 1315–1330. [CrossRef]

106. Mikulić, J.; Miličević, K.; Krešić, D. The relationship between brand strength and tourism intensity: Empirical evidence from the EU capital cities. *Int. J. Cult. Tour. Hosp. Res.* **2016**, *10*, 14–23. [CrossRef]
107. Jakab, P.; Happ, E. Impact Assessment between the City and the Company Reputation. *Econ. Soc.* **2017**, *10*, 279–289. [CrossRef]
108. Vollebregt, D.E. The Value of Nothing: Reconciling Cultural Capital in Society. *Corp. Reput. Rev.* **2018**, *21*, 139–152. [CrossRef]
109. De Jesus, D.S.V.; Kamlot, D.; Dubeux, V.J.C. The Decline of Creative Education in the City of Rio de Janeiro: Main Causes and Consequences. *Creat. Educ.* **2019**, *10*, 1670–1684. [CrossRef]
110. Tsouli, D. Social Media as Source for Cities Reputation: Evidence From Top Ranked Cities. *PNMReview* **2018**, *3*, 500–509. Available online: <https://revues.imist.ma/index.php/PNMReview/article/view/16052/8941> (accessed on 14 June 2021).
111. Balashov, D. Kyiv as a City Brand in International Indices and Rankings: Coincidence or Ineffective Local Government? In Proceedings of the International Scientific Conference, Riga, Latvia, 27 September 2019; pp. 190–192. [CrossRef]
112. Kolotouchkina, O. Engaging citizens in sports mega-events: The participatory strategic approach of Tokyo 2020 Olympic. *Commun. Soc.* **2018**, *31*, 45–58. [CrossRef]
113. Henriques, C.; Moreira, M.C. Creative Tourism and Urban Sustainability: The Cases of Lisbon and Oporto. *Rev. Port. Estud. Reg.* **2019**, *51*, 93–114. Available online: <http://www.apdr.pt/siteRPER/numeros/RPER51/51.6.pdf> (accessed on 14 June 2021).
114. Suci, M.C.; Nășulea, D.F. Intellectual capital and creative economy as key drivers for competitiveness towards a smart and sustainable development: Challenges and opportunities for cultural and creative communities. In *Intellectual Capital Management as a Driver of Sustainability*; Matos, F., Vairinhos, V., Selig, P., Edvinsson, L., Eds.; Springer: Berlin, Germany, 2019; pp. 67–97. [CrossRef]
115. De Jorge-Moreno, J.; De Jorge-Huertas, V. Measuring European cultural and creative cities efficiency: A metafrontier DEA approach. *J. Econ. Stud.* **2020**, *47*, 891–901. [CrossRef]
116. Fekete, D.; Morvay, S. Creative cities in Central and Eastern Europe-Examining the position of Győr from the creative and cultural aspects of this macro-region. *Reg. Stat.* **2019**, *9*, 45–66. [CrossRef]
117. Rodrigues, M.; Franco, M. Measuring the Performance in Creative Cities: Proposal of a Multidimensional Model. *Sustainability* **2018**, *10*, 4023. [CrossRef]
118. TourMis 2020. Available online: <https://www.tourmis.info/cgi-bin/tmintro.pl> (accessed on 15 June 2021).
119. City of Edinburgh Council-Edinburgh by Numbers 13th Edition. Available online: <https://www.edinburgh.gov.uk/downloads/file/25200/edinburgh-by-numbers-2019> (accessed on 15 June 2021).
120. The Frankfurt Tourist+Congress Board. Available online: <https://www.frankfurt-tourismus.de/en/Press/Publications/Statistics> (accessed on 15 June 2021).
121. Hellenic Statistical Authority. Available online: <https://www.statistics.gr/en/statistics/-/publication/STO12/2018> (accessed on 15 June 2021).
122. United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division. The World's Cities in 2018—Data Booklet (ST/ESA/SER.A/417). Available online: [https://www.un.org/en/events/citiesday/assets/pdf/the\\_worlds\\_cities\\_in\\_2018\\_data\\_booklet.pdf](https://www.un.org/en/events/citiesday/assets/pdf/the_worlds_cities_in_2018_data_booklet.pdf) (accessed on 15 June 2021).
123. Tokarchuk, O.; Gabriele, R.; Maurer, O. Development of city tourism and well-being of urban residents. *Tour. Econ.* **2017**, *23*, 343–359. [CrossRef]
124. Neuts, B. Tourism and urban economic growth: A panel analysis of German cities. *Tour. Econ.* **2020**, *26*, 519–527. [CrossRef]
125. Dumbrovská, V.; Fialová, D. Tourist Intensity in Capital Cities in Central Europe: Comparative Analysis of Tourism in Prague, Vienna and Budapest. *Czech. J. Tour.* **2014**, *3*, 5–26. [CrossRef]
126. Anholt, S. The Anholt-GMI City Brands Index: How the world sees the world's cities. *Place Brand.* **2006**, *2*, 18–31. [CrossRef]