

Interactive comment on “Making a difference: tourist practices of repeat visitors in the city of Paris” by T. Freytag

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 5 May 2008

General comments

The article is a welcome addition to Social Geography. It is well structured, has conceptual value and is easy to read. The author presents an insightful and useful analysis of repeat visitor practices in Paris, with potential implications for the organisation of tourism in the city. The findings are based on substantial field work.

Specific comments

The title of the paper might have to be modified. Are tourist practices of repeat visitors making a difference? To whom and to what extent? Or does "making a difference" refer to Bourdieu's concept of "distinction"?

One other specific section that could have been better elaborated is methodology. It

S9

would have been interesting for the reader to see more evidence of statistical analysis of the questionnaires. The writer should therefore include a few paragraphs in which the questionnaires are analysed. A summary of core themes that have emerged from the in-depth interviews could also be included in the paper or in an appendix. A few extra sentences describing observational work and findings would also improve the article. What literature informed the observational work and the observational template construction? How was reliability of the findings tested? The section on the description of Paris and its touristic offer is a bit too long and the author may wish to consider reducing this section and enlarging the methodology section. Nevertheless, I do not see these suggestions for changes as substantial.

Typographical comments

Please make sure that every statement is properly referenced (e.g. lines 7 and 8 on page 13; lines 3 and 15 on page 18).

Please clarify whether the concluding statements (lines 11 and 24) are assumptions made by the author or based on empirical data, in-depth interviews or marketers' predictions? Along these lines, it might be unclear to the reader how and why repeat visitors, "who tend to ignore organized tourism activities" (line 7 on page 18), will then "integrate more of the suggested participatory tourism activities into their tourist practices" (line 11 on page 18) in the future?

Please eliminate the use of first person plural (we) in lines 8 and 11 (page 18) as the rest of the article is written in third person.

Apart from the above minor modifications, I see the article as a valuable contribution to the journal.

Interactive comment on Soc. Geogr. Discuss., 4, 1, 2008.