



Ministère de l'Environnement, de l'Énergie et de la Mer

Ministère du Logement et de l'Habitat durable

PUCA

plan
urbanisme
construction
architecture



EA 7337 EIREST

Call for papers

BEFORE AND AFTER TOURISM

The post-tourism future and civil society

While some places that have traditionally been associated with mass tourism are heading into a crisis or are changing to such an extent that they are becoming like “ordinary” locations, making an exit from tourism, tourism is entering a new phase of invention, changing the way activities in locations considered to be “ordinary” are perceived. Thus, some tourist resorts are turning into ordinary towns (Stock, Lucas, 2012), while some working class suburbs are presenting themselves as emerging tourist destinations (Gravari-Barbas, Fagnoni, 2013). This role-swapping between tourist locations and “ordinary” locations is of equal concern to local stakeholders as to the scientific community. The transformations that are currently taking place in some long-established tourist resorts are drawing attention to the issue, of “an exit from tourism”, which for a long time has been relegated to the margins of historiography (Knafou, 1996). Conversely, the beginnings of a new phase of tourist invention, of a new “moment de lieu” (Équipe MIT 2005) (characterised by the paradoxical consecration of ordinary places by tourism, because of their ordinariness, while traditionally the invention of tourism has consisted of presenting places that have hitherto been considered ordinary as extraordinary) seem to be identifiable outside the major tourist centres and their Central Tourist Districts, in the outskirts of metropolitan areas [particularly in London (Maitland, 2010, 2013), New York (Novy, 2011), Berlin (Novy, Huning, 2008) and Paris (Fagnoni, Gravari-Barbas, 2013)], in post-industrial zones (Fagnoni, 2004) and some rural areas. How can these changes be managed and/or encouraged? How should they be interpreted?

Can this dual process be explained simply as the result of the life cycle of tourist areas (Butler, 1980), the economic cycle of the thirty-year post-war boom, or the outcome of the end of the standardisation of tourism, while a new cycle that exemplifies the new globalised state of tourism, marked by heightened competition within tourism and, consequently, the invention of new locations and new practices, is beginning? Or, more profoundly, can we interpret the beginning and end of these forms of tourism as a faint sign of a new tourist paradigm, taking over from the paradigm of mass tourism, breaking down the boundaries between “tourist” locations and behaviours and “ordinary” locations and behaviours and also giving a greater role to “civil society”?

In the context of the “second urban tourism revolution” (Stock, Lucas, 2012), the number of “tourist referents” that are encountered in “day-to-day urban life” is increasing (Pradel, Simon, 2012); tourist behaviours and ordinary behaviours are mixing within a fun-based urban world (Stock, Lucas, art. cit.). The opposition between tourist areas and residential areas is being replaced by a “multiplace lifestyle” (Stock, 2006), while the duality between tourist and non-tourist travel is giving way to a continuum of mobility practices (Knafou, 2000; Maitland, 2010). Tourists themselves are increasingly participating in the creation of tourist products, as is highlighted by the term “prosumption” – which describes a combination of production and consumption – coined by Alvin Toffler (1980, *in* Gombault, 2011). In other terms, a clearly defined tourist system in which tourism does not take place in “ordinary” places and at “ordinary” times and which does not involve “ordinary” practices is tending to be replaced by the cross-cutting permeation of tourism, which has become a “common gender” (Lussault, 2007), in society. This situation requires us to call into question the classical definition of tourism in terms of the number of overnight stays outside one’s normal area in favour of a definition that stresses the tourist attitude, which is characterised by the fact that individuals engage in tourist activities in their own area.

While tourism studies usually focus on established tourist destinations, PUCA (Plan Urbanisme Construction Architecture) and EIREST (Equipe Interdisciplinaire de REcherches Sur le Tourisme) are organising a cycle of three seminars with the aim of bringing attention to bear on the less well-known parts of the trajectory of a tourist destination – the end and the beginning of tourist activity. Our hypothesis is that the area in which regional and tourist journeys and tourist and non-tourist practices merge constitutes a laboratory for the development of (post)-tourism innovation. This call for papers therefore proposes working on the borderlines, fronts and frontiers of tourism (François, Bourdeau, Perrin-Bensahel, 2013). Its novelty lies in its simultaneous examination of the two ends of the trajectory of tourism (which are treated separately in the scientific literature) in order to back up the hypothesis that a change is taking place in the nature of tourism.

This position entails a change in scales of analysis, both spatial and temporal. It requires us to shift our

attention onto emerging phenomena, towards the rearrangement of the micro-geographies of tourism, away from established destinations. It also requires us to take a fresh look at some of the stakeholders who are for the most part not associated with tourism (residents, as witnessed by the phenomenon of “greeters” and associations for example). The three days of seminars will consider the increasing role played by civil society in the merging between tourism and the ordinary, before and after tourism, which raises doubts about the validity of seeing tourism as a closed system. We need to open the “black box” of civil society – defined in either the liberal sense of the term (including the market) or in the radical meaning of the term as a third sector which depends neither on the State nor the market. Priority will be given to a critical review of the concept of civil society (Pirotte, 2007), which originated in the political thought of the 18th and 19th centuries, and which, although frequently referred to today, are rarely subjected to analysis.

The aim of this call for papers is to elicit experiences and/or analyses of the beginning or end of tourism, as well as interpretations of the end of the differentiation between the tourist and ordinary worlds which we are currently observing. Comparisons and attempts at modelling will be welcome. The papers may be proposed by researchers, practitioners or associations and may be jointly authored. They must deal with one of the three topics described below, which are to be the subject of three successive seminars.

1. EXITS FROM TOURISM: THE TRANSFORMATION OF AREAS AND REAPPROPRIATIONS.

Thursday 15 December 2016, auditorium of the Tour Sequoia, MEEM/MLHD, La Défense

The first seminar will consider “exits from tourism” as the outcome of a crisis or a transformation.

It will consider and analyse the causes of exits from tourism (which may be exogenous, for example natural catastrophes, endogenous, such as the crisis in the tourism system, short-term, for example the economic crisis, or structural, for example climate change...) and will present a survey of examples of actual or potential exits from tourism. Much attention has been focused on ski resorts in France (Bourdeau, 2007, 2009). However, mid-mountain resorts, coastal resorts and rural or peri-urban holiday destinations are also involved.

Various non-exclusive types of trajectory for an exit from tourism, which is rarely complete, have already been identified and analysed in terms of “tourism capital” (Darbellay et alii, 2011). These consist of “upward” or “downward” exits (Knafou, 1996), between “the abyss” and “metamorphosis”

(Clivaz, Nahrath, Stock, 2011; Darbellay, Clivaz, Nahrath, Stock, 2011). The following in particular deserve to be mentioned:

- a functional diversification scenario, in which a tourist resort is gradually transformed into a multifunctional town (Stock, 2001; Sauthier, 2011)
- and/or a residential scenario (Viard, 2000 and 2006; Rieucan, 2000; Violier, 2002)
- a scenario in which tourism gives way to fun-based activities,
- a scenario of decline (Darbellay *et alii*, 2011)
- a less common scenario, consisting of a tourism wasteland (Rostock, Zadnicek, 1992; Löfgren, 1999; Bachimon, 2013).

These trajectories are rendered more complex by a number of social changes. The mixing of lifestyles or local dynamics is constantly reinventing the situation in an area, overturning forecast changes or reversing anticipated trends. “Exits from tourism” are sometimes just one stage in an area’s trajectory.

Describing, analysing and explaining phenomena of touristic decline are nevertheless major challenges for research and major issues for the areas in question. Is such decline due to a lack of investment and a failure to replace infrastructure or products? Or, on the contrary, are they expected and desired? And what is the social, economic and cultural cost of exits from tourism whether desired or not or foreseen or not?

More broadly, there is a need to consider exits from tourism within the general context of the new phase of the globalisation of tourism (Duhamel, Kadri, 2011; Sacareau, Taunay, Peyvel, 2015), the creation of metropolitan areas (as shown, for example, by the integration of Brighton within the metropolitan area of London), and the geography of risk or climate change (Bourdeau, 2009).

The seminar will also analyse the policies (resistance, specialization and transformation strategies...) adopted by local stakeholders in the framework of an exit from tourism, and the ways in which civil society retakes possession of places which have ceased to have a tourist function. It will demonstrate the processes at work in so-called “post-touristic spirals” (Girard, 2013) in which areas become increasingly less involved in tourism. It will question whether an exit from tourism is necessarily due to a crisis and ask how the previous tourism activity can provide a basis for a post-touristic future for an area, and what new uses can be proposed for former tourist sites. It will also look for concepts which can help describe situations of exit from tourism such as that of “meta-resorts” (Vlès, 2014).

2. REINVENTING THE ORDINARY: THE FRONTIERS OF TOURISM.

PLACES, PLAYERS, TOURISM IMAGINARIES

Thursday 2 February 2017, auditorium of the Tour Sequoia, MEEM/MLHD, La Défense

The second seminar will attempt to map and analyse the frontier of the invention of contemporary tourism. Following in the footsteps of such scholars as Henri Lefebvre (1947), Michel de Certeau (1980) or the writings of Georges Perec (1989), it will apply the study of the ordinary to the sphere of tourism. Since the 1990's, and above all since the years 2000, this process has transcended traditional hierarchies and is apparent in the social sciences (Marie, Dujardin, Balme, 2002), geography (Berger, Pousin, 2008), urban geography in particular (Robinson, 2006; Halbert, 2010; Paquot, 2010), history (Farge, 1994; Artières, 2014), urban history in particular (Clémentçon, 1999, 2015; Montel, Backouche, 2007), anthropology (Fabvre, 1993; Chauvier, 2011), sociology (Maffesoli, 2011), the fine arts (Leclercq, 2013), heritage studies (Bromberger, 1999; Isnart, 2012; Geppert, Lorenzi, 2013; Letissier, 2014), the conservation of nature (Godet, 2010).

The proposals may relate to one or more of the following topics:

*The spread of tourist activities in the outskirts of tourist destinations, particularly in the case of metro areas

*Promotion of the tourism of the "ordinary"

*The touristic inversion of a geographical stigma (Goffman, 1963).

Several issues can be identified at the outset, pertaining to:

The stakeholders

Who develops the tourism of the ordinary? Who are the players, from the tourist and non-tourist sectors, from the public, private and associative sectors, activists or non-activists, who develop the tourism of the ordinary? What role does civil society play in these changes? What causes (economic, geographical, cultural, social, and in some cases activism-related), underlie the development of the tourism of the ordinary?

Who (*repeaters*, the middle and higher social classes...) engage in the tourism of the ordinary, how and why or for what (activism, a strategy of social distinction...)?

The practices

What kinds of travel practices – for example, alternative and/or ordinary themselves (i.e. cycling or walking) characterise the development of the tourism of the ordinary?

What links and tensions exist between the quest for social distinction and the activism that may characterize the frequentation of new tourist locations?

Areas

What modification of geographical conception lies behind the invention of new touristic locations? Does the invention of tourism in “ordinary” locations go hand-in-hand with or precede their acquisition of heritage status (material or immaterial)?

To what extent does the development of tourism in “ordinary” locations improve equality between areas and spatial justice?

How can the creation of metropolitan areas combined with global competition generate new tourist destinations? In the context of heightened globalised competition in tourism, there is a tendency for a polycentric tourist structure to develop in metro areas, for new tourist practices and new tourist destinations to emerge, and for “post-tourism” to develop. The new tourist districts are often former working class and/or immigrant districts that are undergoing gentrification. In the paradigmatic (post-)touristic metro areas of Paris (Gravari-Barbas, Fagnoni 2013), London, Berlin and New York, how is the frontier of contemporary tourist invention changing at the present time? How is it changing in other tourist cities? How do ordinary areas change as a result of the development of tourism? What functions does the development of tourism in ordinary areas serve? How operational is the scenario of regeneration through tourism? To what extent does the development of tourism go hand in hand with gentrification or vice-versa?

The seminar would like to encourage papers that provide an understanding of the paradox of the development of tourism in ordinary places. Is it possible to identify a post/hyper-tourist “moment de lieu” (Équipe MIT, 2005), which can be simply defined as the period at which tourist activity in a place is invented? Papers that question the discourses that accompany and justify it will also be welcome: what categories (tourism off the beaten track (Maitland, Newmann, 2009 ; Gravari-Barbas, Delaplace, 2016), alternative tourism (Williams, 2004), participative tourism (Sallet-Lavorel, 2003), “tourism of underprivileged suburbs” (Jacquot, Gravari-Barbas, Fagnoni, 2013)) are at work in this new phase of the invention of tourism? Who creates these categories? What do they reveal? The seminar wishes to understand the dynamic of the observed phenomena: What obstacles and resistance does the frontier of the invention of contemporary tourism encounter as it moves forward? What stages make up the process of the development of tourism in ordinary areas?

The scientific committee will be particularly interested in prospective thinking: What changes in values and geographical conception lie behind this invention of a new type of tourism? Does inventing

tourism in “ordinary” locations necessarily lead to integration within the tourist market system? If so, when does this integration occur? How can initiatives that are backed by stakeholders from “civil society” coexist with development and tourist planning projects backed by local authorities? What forms of equilibrium can be achieved between the “traditional” tourist market sector and initiatives that are, in particular, based on new communications technologies? Is the development of tourism in “ordinary” places condemned to remaining a “niche” phenomenon or is it capable of becoming a “common gender” of tourism?

3. BEYOND TOURISM. SHARING, EXPERIENCES, MIXING

Thursday 16 March 2017, auditorium of the tour Sequoia, MEEM/MLHD, La Défense

The third cross-cutting seminar will deal with the transcending of the paradigm of tourism. It will attempt to prove – or disprove – the hypothesis that since the years 2000, the nature of tourism has changed as a result of the reign of hypermobility and the hypermodern society. It aims to consider whether the age of tourism has been transcended as a result, in particular, due to the role of civil society in the coproduction of the tourist product.

What conceptualisations are appropriate in order to describe the transcending of tourism as it has emerged in western industrialised societies and as it has developed in a Fordist economy? The hypothesis of post-tourism was first made in 1985 (Feifer, 1985) and it has since been developed by other scholars in order to describe the increased amount of mixing that is occurring between tourist and “ordinary” behaviours and the coproduction of the tourist product by the tourists themselves. In view of the changes that theories have undergone since that date as well as the ways in which tourism has changed, how can we present this hypothesis today? In other terms, “What is new about “new” urban tourism?” (Novy, 2011).

While post-tourism in the literal sense of “a process of transition and residential conversion affecting tourist resorts and regions” (Bourdeau, 2012, p. 43) will be studied in the second seminar, the third will be devoted to post-tourism in the broad sense of “post-modern tourism, given fresh impetus by the recreational and geotouristic reinventions which highlight the heterogeneous nature of the new tourist locations (...) and the new attitudes, practices and ties that are apparent in them” (*ibid.*).

The alternative characterisations of après-tourism, hyper-tourism (which coexists with mass tourism), post-Fordist (Urry, 1990) and/or neo-Fordist tourism (Torres, 2002), alter-tourism (Corneloup, 2014) ... will also be analysed, in relation to the theories of post-modern or hypermodern society (Lipovetsky, 2006). For example, Philippe Bourdeau (2012) has proposed an interpretation of après-tourism the makes a distinction between post-tourism, hyper-tourism and trans-tourism. How can these

categories describe the changes that are apparent in different places?

This seminar will consider the mixing which will determine the future after tourism. How and by whom are the barriers between the day-to-day and the touristic broken down? What status should be given to the paradox of the tourism of residents that is promoted by some players, for example the Seine-Saint-Denis Département Tourism Committee (Jacquot, 2015)?

It will analyse the features of the “new” tourism. Is this “new” tourism marked by the quest for a fantasised authenticity (Maitland, 2010), a new *backstage* (Mac Cannell, 1973), or by a willingness to consume spectacles irrespective of their authenticity (Cohen, 2008) (both these tendencies have been described in the literature)? How are the barriers between tourism and recreation broken down?

What are the links between post- or hyper-tourism and a hyper-heritage, which is also characterised by the destruction of hierarchies, disintermediation and an experience-based approach (Gravari-Barbas, 2014)?

Organisation

Dates and location of the seminars:

Seminar 1: Thursday 15 December 2016, auditorium of the tour Sequoia, MEEM/MLHD, La Défense

Seminar 2: Thursday 2 February 2017, auditorium of the tour Sequoia, MEEM/MLHD, La Défense

Seminar 3: Thursday 16 March 2017, auditorium of the tour Sequoia, MEEM/MLHD, La Défense

Target audience for the seminars:

The seminars, which are highly interdisciplinary, are aimed at practitioners, researchers, PhD candidates and students interested in the field of tourism and planning.

Responses to the call for papers:

The proposed papers must contain the following:

- The name of the seminar for which it is being submitted
- The title of the paper
- The name(s) of the author(s)
- An abstract, consisting of a maximum of 9000 characters with spaces,

- The full contact details of the principal author
- A brief presentation of the authors (a maximum of 700 characters with spaces).

The proposed papers may be in English or French

Submission of papers:

- The proposed papers must be sent by email to Maria Gravari-Barbas (maria.gravari-barbas@wanadoo.fr) and Géraldine Djament-Tran (geraldine.djament@wanadoo.fr).
- The deadline for submissions is Thursday 15 September 2016.
- The organising committee will answer on Monday 17 October 2016.

Dissemination:

The seminars will be filmed. The video footage will be put on the PUCA website.

A selection of papers will be published as part of a feature in the journal *Les Annales de la recherche urbaine*. A specific call for articles will be issued later, according to this journal's procedures.

Scientific leaders:

Maria Gravari-Barbas (EA 7337 EIREST), Géraldine Djament-Tran (UMR 7363 SAGE, associate of EIREST)

Scientific Committee:

CHENEVEZ Alain	MCF (Sociology)	EA 4177 CIMEOS	Université de Bourgogne
COMINELLI Francesca	MCF (Economy)	EA 7337 EIREST	Université Paris 1
CONDEVAUX Aurélie	Docteur (Anthropology)	EA 7337 EIREST	Université Paris 1
DJAMENT-TRAN Géraldine	MCF (Geography)	UMR 7363 SAGE, associate of EIREST	Université de Strasbourg
FAGNONI Edith	PR (Geography)	UMR 8185 ENEC, associate of EIREST	Université Paris IV

GRAVARI-BARBAS Maria	PR (Geography)	EA 7337 EIREST	Université Paris 1
GUINAND Sandra	Post-doctoral researcher (Geography)	Associate of EIREST & Centre Jacques Berque, Rabat	
HERTZOG Anne	MCF (Geography)	Laboratoire MRTE	Univ. de Cergy-Pontoise
JACQUOT Sébastien	MCF (Geography)	EA 7337 EIREST	Université Paris 1
RENARD-DELAUTRE Cécile	Docteur (Architect)	EA 7337 EIREST	

Steering Committee:

BANÂTRE Marie, PUCA

CORDOBES Stéphane, CGET

CROS Laurence, Club ville aménagement

DESMET Marie-Laure, Atout-France

DIAZ Isabel, DGALN/AD1

GAY Christophe, Forum vies mobiles

LE LAGADEC Anne, PNR Haute vallée de Chevreuse

SALLET-LAVOREL Hélène, CDT94

SAMUEL Eva, architecte conseil de l'Etat

TILLET Marion, IAU IDF

VERNHES Martine, PUCA

Organising Institutions:

PUCA:

The Plan Urbanisme Construction Architecture (PUCA) is an interdepartmental agency that was set up in 1998 in order to build knowledge on regions and cities and inform public action. PUCA launches programmes of incentivised research, action research and trials and supports innovation and development in the fields of regional planning, urban planning, housing, architecture and construction.

Webs: <http://www.urbanisme-puca.gouv.fr/>

EA EIREST:

The Equipe Interdisciplinaire de REcherches Sur le Tourisme (EA EIREST 7337) at Université Paris 1 Panthéon-Sorbonne brings together teacher-researchers and doctoral candidates on the topic of tourism, which is approached as a cross-cutting theme. It has a three-pronged research strategy: “tourism and metropolitisation”; “tourism, heritage and development”; “images, tourism imaginaries and imaginations”. It has a strong presence in research seminars, conferences and publications. As part of Université Paris 1, EIREST works in close collaboration with the UNESCO “Culture Tourism and Development” Chair. It is also one of the partners that support the international, cross-disciplinary and multilingual journal *Via@* (<http://viatourismreview.com/>). EIREST is also a member of the Dynamite Labex (Laboratory of Excellence).

Site Internet: <https://www.univ-paris1.fr/unites-de-recherche/eirest/>

Commenté [GDT1]: Imaginaries ?

Bibliography

- Artières, Philippe, 2014, *Rêves d'histoire - Pour une histoire de l'ordinaire*, Paris, Editions Verticales.
- Bachimon, Philippe, 2013, *Vacance de lieux*, Paris, Belin.
- Bourdeau, Philippe (dir.), 2007, *Les sports d'hiver en mutation : crise ou révolution géoculturelle ?*; Paris, Hermès Science Publication, Lavoisier.
- Bourdeau, Philippe, 2009, « De l'après-ski à l'après-tourisme, une figure de transition pour les Alpes ? », *Revue de Géographie Alpine | Journal of Alpine Research*, n° 97-3, mis en ligne le 09 décembre 2009. URL : <http://rga.revues.org/1049>
- Bourdeau, Philippe, 2012, Le tourisme réinventé par ses périphéries ?. Bourlon F., Osorio M., Mao P., Gale T. Explorando las nuevas fronteras del turismo. Perspectivas de la investigación en turismo, Nire Negro, pp.31-48, 978 956 8647 07 0. <hal-01002411>
- Bromberger, Christian, 1999, « Les monuments ordinaires de la vie quotidienne », in R. Debray (éd.), *L'abus monumental?*, Paris: Fayard, pp. 197-206.
- Butler, Richard W., 1980, "The concept of the tourist area life-cycle of evolution: implications for management of resources", *Canadian Geographer* 24 (1), pp.5-12.
- Corneloup, Jean, 2014, « L'habitabilité récréative et écologique des métropoles contemporaines, une ressource territoriale majeure », in Kadri, Boualem (dir.), *Dynamiques métropolitaines et développement touristique*, PUQ.
- de Certeau, Michel, 1980, *L'invention du quotidien*, Paris, Union générale d'édition.
- Chauvier, Eric, 2011, *Anthropologie de l'ordinaire. Une conversion du regard*, Toulouse, Anacharsis, coll. Essais.
- Clivaz, Christophe, Nahrath, Stéphane & Mathis Stock, 2011, « Le développement des stations touristiques dans le champ touristique mondial », in Duhamel, P. & Kadri, B. (dir.), *Tourisme et mondialisation* Paris: Espaces, p. 276-286.
- Cohen, Erik, 2008, "The Changing Faces of Contemporary Tourism", Symposium: Touring the World, *Society*, Volume 45, No 4, pp 330-333.
- Darbellay, Frédéric, Clivaz, Christophe, Nahrath, Stéphane, Stock, Mathis, 2011, « Approche interdisciplinaire du développement des stations touristiques », *Mondes du Tourisme*, n°4, pp. 36-48.
- Duhamel, Philippe, Kadri, Boualem, 2011, *Tourisme et mondialisation*, Paris, Éditions touristiques européennes.
- Équipe Mit, 2005, *Tourismes 2. Moments de lieux*, Paris: Belin.
- Fabre, Daniel (dir.), 1993, *Écritures ordinaires*, Paris, POL.
- Fagnoni, Edith, 2004, « Amnéville, de la cité industrielle à la cité touristique : quel devenir pour les territoires urbains en déprise ? », *Mondes en développement*, n° 125, pp. 51-66.
- Feifer, Maxine, 1985, *Going places*, Macmillan.
- Farge, Arlette, 1994, *Le Cours ordinaire des choses dans la cité du dix-huitième siècle*, Paris, Éditions du Seuil, coll. « La librairie du xx^e siècle ».
- François, Hugues, Bourdeau, Philippe, Perrin-Bensahel, Liliane (dir.), 2013, *Fin (?) et confins du tourisme : interroger le statut et les pratiques de la récréation contemporaine*, Paris, L'Harmattan.
- Geppert, Anna et Emmanuelle Lorenzi, 2013, « Le "patrimoine du quotidien", enjeu renouvelé pour les urbanistes européens », *Bulletin de l'Association de géographes français*, vol.90, n°2, pp.170-185.
- Girard, Alain, 2013, « Faut-il raccorder une théorie générale de la postmodernité à une théorie à moyenne portée du post-tourisme ? », in Bourdeau, Philippe, Hugues François et Liliane Perrin-Bensahel (dir.), *Fin (?) et confins du tourisme. Interroger le statut et les pratiques de la récréation contemporaine*, Paris: L'Harmattan, pp. 43-52.
- Goffman, Erving, 1963, *Stigma*, Englewood Cliffs, Prentice Hall. (Ed. française : 1975, *Stigmates : les usages sociaux des handicaps*, Paris, Editions de Minuit).
- Gravari-Barbas, Maria, Fagnoni, Edith, 2013, *Métropolisation et tourisme. Comment le tourisme redessine Paris*, Belin, Paris.
- Gravari-Barbas, Maria, Delaplace, Marie, 2016, Le Tourisme hors des sentiers battus, *Teoros* (à paraître).

- Gravari-Barbas, Maria, 2014, Atelier de réflexion prospective Nouveaux défis pour le patrimoine culturel. Rapport final: <http://www.agence-nationale-recherche.fr/missions-et-organisation/ateliers-de-reflexion-prospective/nouveaux-defis-pour-le-patrimoine-culturel/>
- Isnart, Cyril, 2012, « Les patrimonialisations ordinaires. Essai d'images ethnographiées ». *ethnographiques.org*, Numéro 24 - juillet 2012
- Jacquot, Sébastien, 2015, « Politiques de valorisation patrimoniale et figuration des habitants en banlieue parisienne (Plaine Commune) », *EchoGéo*, n°33, URL : <http://echogeo.revues.org/14317> ; DOI : 10.4000/echogeo.14317
- Jacquot, Sébastien, Gravari-Barbas, Maria, Fagnoni, Edith, 2013, « Patrimonialisation et tourisme dans la région métropolitaine parisienne. », in Gravari-Barbas, Maria, Fagnoni, Edith (dir.), *Métropolisation et tourisme. Comment le tourisme redessine Paris*, Belin, Paris, pp.103-117.
- Knafou, Rémy, 2000, « Les mobilités touristiques et de loisirs et le système global des mobilités », in Bonnet, Michel, Desjeux, Dominique (eds), *Les territoires de la mobilité*, Paris, PUF, pp. 85-94.
- Knafou, Rémy, 1996, « La transformation des lieux anciennement touristiques », *Méditerranée*, 84, n°3, pp. 3-4.
- Leclercq, Jean-Luc, 2013, *L'ordinaire comme catégorie esthétique*, thèse en arts plastiques de l'université Jean Monnet (Saint-Etienne)
- Lefebvre, Henri, 1947, *Critique de la vie quotidienne : introduction*, Paris, Grasset.
- Letissier, Fanny, 2007, *Les temps de l'urbanité : habiter le patrimoine à Paris*, thèse de géographie de l'université de Reims
- Lipovetsky, Gilles, 2006, *Les temps hypermodernes*, Paris, Librairie générale française.
- Löfgren, Orvar, 1999, *On Holiday. A History of Vacationing*, Berkeley, University of California Press.
- Lussault, Michel, 2007, « Le tourisme, un genre commun », in Philippe Duhamel et Rémy Knafou (dir), *Mondes urbains du tourisme*, Belin, Paris, pp. 333-349.
- Mac Cannel, Dean, 1973, « Staged Authenticity. Arrangements of social space in tourist settings », *American Journal of Sociology*, vol. 79, n° 3, pp. 589-603.
- Maffesoli, Michel, 2011, *La passion de l'ordinaire : miettes sociologiques*, Paris, Editions du CNRS.
- Maitland, Robert, 2010, « Everyday life as a creative experience in cities », *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research*, Vol. 4 Iss: 3, pp.176 – 185.
- Maitland, Robert, 2013, "Backstage Behaviour in the Global City: Tourists and the Search for the 'Real London'", *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, Volume 105, 3 December 2013, pp. 12–19.
- Maitland, Robert, 2010, « Everyday life as a creative experience in cities », *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research*, vol. 4, n °3, pp.176 – 185.
- Maitland, Robert, Newman, Paul, 2009, *World Tourism Cities: Developing Tourism Off the Beaten Track*, Abingdon, Routledge.
- Marie, Jean-Louis, Dujardin, Philippe, Balme, Richard (dir.), 2002, *L'ordinaire : modes d'accès et pertinence pour les sciences sociales et humaines*, Paris, L'Harmattan.
- Novy, Johannes, 2011, *Marketing marginalized neighborhoods. Tourism and leisure in the 21st century inner city*, PhD, Columbia university.
- Novy, Johannes, Huning, Sandra, 2008, "New tourism (areas) in the 'New Berlin'", in R. Maitland, and P. Newman (eds.), *World tourism cities. Developing tourism off the beaten track*, Routledge, London.
- Perec, Georges, 1989, *L'infra-ordinaire*, Paris, Seuil.
- Pirotte Gautier, 2007, *La notion de société civile*, Paris, La Découverte, «Repères».
- Rieucou, Jean, 2000, La Grande-Motte, Ville permanente, ville saisonnière, *Annales de Géographie*, N° 616, p 631-654.
- Rostock, Jürgen, Zadniecek, Franz, 1992, *Paradiesruinen: das Kdf-Seebad der Zwanzigtausend auf Rügen*, Berlin, C. Links.

- Sacareau, Isabelle, Taunay, Benjamin, Peyvel, Emmanuelle, 2015, *La mondialisation du tourisme : les nouvelles frontières d'une pratique*, Rennes, Presses universitaires de Rennes.
- Sallet-Lavorel, Hélène, 2003, « Encourager le rapprochement entre visiteurs et Franciliens. Pour un tourisme urbain participatif en Île-de-France », *cahier Espaces*, n°78.
- Sauthier, Géraldine, 2011, Trajectoire de développement touristique et régimes urbains : analyse du cas de Montreux, mémoire de master sous la direction de Christophe Clivaz, Institut Universitaire Kurt Bösch, 98 p.
- Stock, Mathis, 2006, "L'hypothèse de l'habiter poly-topique : pratiquer les lieux géographiques dans les sociétés à individus mobiles.", *EspacesTemps.net*, Travaux, 26.02.2006, <http://www.espacestemps.net/articles/hypothese-habiter-polytopique/>
- Stock, Mathis, 2001, "Brighton and Hove : station touristique ou ville touristique ? Étude théorico-empirique / Brighton and Hove : a tourist resort or a tourist town ?", *Géocarrefour*, vol. 76, n°2, pp. 127-131. <http://www.espacestemps.net/articles/hypothese-habiter-polytopique/>
- Stock Mathis, Lucas Léopold, 2012, « La double révolution urbaine du tourisme. », *Espaces et sociétés*, n° 151, p. 15-30
- Torres, Rebecca, 2002, Cancun tourism's development from a Fordist spectrum of analysis, *Tourist studies*, vol. 2 (1), p. 87-116
- Urry John, 2002, *The Tourist Gaze*, Sage publications.
- Vlès, Vincent, 2014, *Métastations : Mutations urbaines des stations de montagne. Un regard pyrénéen*. Presses Universitaires de Bordeaux.
- Viard, Jean, 2000, *Court traité sur les vacances, les voyages et l'hospitalité des lieux*. L'Aube.
- Viard, Jean, 2006, *Eloge de la mobilité*. L'Aube.
- Violier Philippe, 2002, « La Baule de la station au lieu de vie », *Mappemonde*, n° 66, pp. 20-24.
- Williams, Stephen (ed.), 2004, *Tourism. Critical concepts in the social sciences*. Vol. 4: *Tourism: New directions and alternative tourism*, Londres, New York, Routledge.