

This was published as Lynch, P, Germann Molz, J., McIntosh, A., Lugosi, P. And Lashley C. (2011) Theorising hospitality. *Hospitality & Society* 1(1), pp. 3-24. DOI: 10.1386/hosp.1.1.3_2

Please consult the final published version if citing.

Download this article free at:

<http://www.intellectbooks.co.uk/File:download,aid=10619/hs.1.1.3.pdf>

Hospitality & Society journal

Editorial

Theorizing hospitality

Paul Lynch, Jennie Germann Molz, Alison McIntosh, Peter Lugosi and Conrad Lashley

Keywords:

hospitality

social exchange

social control

strangers

difference

research agenda

Introduction

This new journal has been motivated by a paradox. As each of us has explored questions of hospitality from within our different areas of research, we have been struck by the extent to which the field has become intrinsically inhospitable to the interdisciplinary study of hospitality. This inhospitableness stems in part from the fact that there is limited interaction between scholars working in different academic traditions of hospitality, and perhaps even less interaction between

practitioners and academics. To us, this absence of interdisciplinary conversation and collaboration within and beyond the academy represents a missed opportunity to infuse hospitality studies with critical significance and to bring the concept of hospitality to bear on some of the most pressing social, cultural and political questions of our time. In consequence, the study of hospitality requires a more hospitable approach that is accepting of difference and presents an open face to its various intellectual representations. This journal aims to fill that gap. In addition to laying out the key aims of the journal, then, this editorial is meant as a metaphorical 'open door'. We invite readers to join us in the critical and interdisciplinary exploration of hospitality. Our intention is to create in these pages a space of 'intellectual hospitality' (Kaufman 2001) in which we can share insights derived from various backgrounds, engage in vigorous debate and contribute to the intellectual possibilities for the investigation of hospitality. The main part of the editorial reviews major traditions and themes in the study of hospitality, drawing out certain major contributions and reaching out to stimulate the various academic communities invested in this field. We then propose some of the specific research areas that we believe warrant further study, debate and theorization. Finally, we articulate the aims for the journal and introduce this first issue as an example of the kind of creative, critical and interdisciplinary approaches to hospitality we hope to foster here.

One of the problems with the current state of hospitality studies is that different disciplines and sectors frame hospitality in quite distinct ways. Even a brief review of the literature reveals that scholars and practitioners are approaching hospitality from very different perspectives and with very different objectives. Hospitality is framed quite differently in the social sciences than it is in the managerial sciences. Consider, for example, historical accounts of hospitality, which often hark back to Greek and Roman or Enlightenment antecedents (O'Gorman 2007; Still 2006). In these traditions, hospitality entailed a sacred obligation not just to accommodate the guest, but to protect the stranger who arrived at the door. Historians have also traced the shifting boundaries of hospitality, highlighting its specificity within particular religious and cultural contexts and historical periods. Even here, however, definitions of hospitality range from codes of etiquette to the ethical treatment of strangers to the provision of food and drink (Browner 2003; Pohl 1999; Walton 2000). Like many historians, anthropologists have approached hospitality as a cultural form, paying particular attention to the way kinship and friendship are negotiated through dialectics of hospitality and hostility (Selwyn 2000). In science and technology studies, as well, hospitality has emerged as a framework for thinking about the social dynamics of online interactions and virtual communities (Aristarkhova 1999, 2000) and the affordances of information and technology systems (Ciborra 1999, 2004). In this case, it is defined as a way of marking the boundaries between inside and outside, familiar and alien. More recently, academics within cultural and social studies have used the metaphor of hospitality to describe the often inhospitable, and even hostile, treatment by the state of migrants, refugees and asylum seekers (Ahmed 2000; Rosello 2001; Gibson 2003, 2006; Yegenoglu 2003). Here, and elsewhere in the social sciences, hospitality extends into political questions of citizenship and human rights (Derrida 1999, 2000a; Dikeç 2002; Vertovec and Cohen 2002; Benhabib 2004, 2006). These social and political connotations seem a far cry from the definitions that emerge in the commercial realm, where the study of hospitality is articulated in business and managerial terms. In this context, hospitality is defined at its simplest as the provision of the 'holy trinity': food, drink, accommodation (see Bell 2009; Brotherton 1999). Take for example, Cassee and Reuland's definition (1983: 144) of organizational hospitality: 'a harmonious mixture of food, beverage, and/or shelter, a physical environment, and behaviour of staff'.

Clearly, hospitality is constructed as much by the disciplines that engage it as by the cultures and societies in which it is practised and made meaningful. Unfortunately, scholars working in these disciplines rarely engage with each other in substantial ways (although see Lashley and Morrison

2000; Germann Molz and Gibson 2007; Lashley, Lynch and Morrison 2007). Furthermore, perhaps because the vast majority of publications on hospitality emerge from the business and managerial sector, the definition that tends to dominate public and academic discourse on the topic is one based on organizational practices and the provision of food, drink and accommodation. Such a definition, whilst useful, is limited as it fails to address the essence of hospitality and constrains its intellectual possibilities. This narrow focus reduces hospitality to an economic activity, just as it reduces the interactions between hosts and guests to commercial exchanges and the elements of hospitality (food, beverages and beds) to commodities. Until now, however, there has not been a suitable outlet to bring these various perspectives and approaches together to debate the terms of hospitality and to share critical insights.

A considerable literature has been generated across a range of disciplines regarding definitions of and approaches to hospitality, but as this necessarily brief review makes clear, there is neither a single definition of hospitality (though certain connotations dominate the discussion), nor is there a unified theoretical framework within which hospitality studies are situated. Nor is it our intention to try to establish such a uniform approach to hospitality. On the contrary, our impetus in creating this journal is to open hospitality up to a rigorous debate on precisely these points. What does hospitality mean? What should it mean? How should we study it? How should it be practised? How can we unlock its critical and theoretical potential? What we have found useful as a point of departure for such questions are examinations of the term's etymology. In tracing the word's trajectory through Middle English, Old Norse, Greek and Latin, scholars have highlighted some surprising connotations of the term: sacrifice, army, power, obligation, reciprocity and protection (Benveniste 1973; O'Gorman 2007). As we will see below, the fact that hospitality shares its linguistic roots with words like hostility, hostage and enemy should also not be overlooked. As a starting point, then, these definitions direct our attention from the material provision of food and drink to more theoretical and politically laden questions about power, identity, violence and equity. Zelinsky (1985: 51) in relation to two tangible elements of hospitality makes the connection that the study of hospitality is a potentially powerful tool of social analysis:

The notion that food and drink might serve as a central organizing theme for anyone studying the world of humankind seems to have eluded virtually all social scientists; but, after a bit of reflection, it does make abundant good sense.

In this regard, we have also found Brotherton and Wood's alternative approach (2007) to hospitality particularly useful. In their attempt to understand the meanings of hospitality, Brotherton and Wood identify two dominant themes in relation to definitions of hospitality in social scientific literature: hospitality as a means of social control; and hospitality as a form of social and economic exchange. The distinctiveness of the two themes is debateable, for example, social exchange might be considered as a form of social control (Burgess 1982; Lugosi 2009). However, the classification is useful in summarizing major themes in the literature and focusing attention away from simply regarding hospitality as a localized activity to thinking of hospitality as a tool of social analysis.

Hospitality as social control

A major dimension of this theme is the idea of hospitality being a means of controlling the 'other' or 'stranger', i.e. 'people who are essentially alien to a particular physical, economic and social environment' (Brotherton and Wood 2007: 40). Locating hospitality in this way highlights the manner in which hospitality acts as a powerful mediating social control mechanism. Of course,

defining the 'stranger' is no simple or innocent act, as Bauman (1990) and Brotherton and Wood (2007) acknowledge. Nevertheless, this strand of hospitality–social control–stranger investigation has permeated much of the literature. Historical analyses of hospitality have depicted it as concerned with managing the stranger who represents a potential for danger (e.g. Visser 1991) and is civilized through the process of providing hospitality, which facilitates the development of relationships (Selwyn 2000). As such, Selwyn (2000: 34) depicts hospitality as a means 'by which societies change, grow, renew and reproduce themselves'. Selwyn (2000: 19) indirectly categorizes types of strangers: 'Hospitality converts: strangers into familiars, enemies into friends, friends into better friends, outsiders into insiders, non-kin into kin'. One can see how the categories are based upon the seemingly bipolar nature, and foundations, of hospitality. Hospitality operates on a knife edge, embodying its etymological origins, viz. *hospes*, meaning friend as well as enemy (Visser 1991). Thus, antonyms commonly associated with hospitality in the literature include inter alia: stranger/friend, inclusion/exclusion, welcome/non-welcome, hospitality/inhospitality, conditional/unconditional, duty/pleasure, morality/transgression, religiosity/bacchanalian, order/disorder and high/low (Bell 2007a, 2007b; Derrida 1998, 2000b; Selwyn 2000; Sheringham and Daruwalla 2007). Conceiving of hospitality as a process concerning the management of strangers locates the act of hospitality within social and cultural discourses regarding duties, obligations and moral virtues involving two key participants: the host and the guest (Telfer 2000). It is the sociocultural expectations surrounding the hospitality encounter which contribute to the way that individuals manage difference (Cresswell 1996; Lugosi 2009).

Debate is ongoing concerning the extent to which hospitality has evolved from historical times and is significantly different in relation to duties, obligations and behaviours, with particular concerns focusing upon the influence of commercial hospitality and the contemporary nature of hospitality (cf. Brotherton and Wood 2007; Heal 1990; Zeldin 1994; Aramberri 2001). Such discussions draw attention to different domains in which hospitality takes place – social, private and commercial – and the ensuing nature of the hospitality produced (Lashley 2000; Lynch, McIntosh and Tucker 2009). The publication in the 1970s of Valene Smith's influential collection *Hosts and Guests* established hospitality and the related concepts of hosts and guests as a foundational structure through which to understand the social interactions between tourists and local residents in both commercial and non-commercial settings. The contributions to the collection, drawn primarily from the field of anthropology, shifted the focus of tourism studies away from the tourist and towards the broader relational aspects of tourism. From this perspective, the impacts of tourism on local people, places and cultures and the often unequal relationships between hosts and guests were made visible. At the centre of many of these critiques was the increasingly commercialized nature of hospitality. In fact, Aramberri (2001) subsequently suggested that the host should 'get lost', arguing that the commercialized interactions now common in tourism contravene 'the old covenant' of hospitality. On the contrary, he proposes, local people and tourists are more accurately described as 'service providers' and 'customers' than as hosts and guests (Aramberri 2001: 746). Nevertheless, hospitality remains a powerful term for describing social arrangements amongst strangers both within and beyond the commercial realm.

Related to the hospitality/stranger theme is that of hospitality as the management of difference embodied in the other. The idea of difference management further emphasizes hospitality as central to the organization of society and raises issues concerning inclusion and exclusion (Foster and Hagan 2007), welcome and non-welcome (Naas 2003), tolerance and conflict (Zlomislic 2004). It is unsurprising, therefore, that theological studies have shown a particular

interest in concepts of hospitality, such as host and guest or inclusion and exclusion, given the intertwining of such concepts with the social signification of food and drink consumption practices (Douglas 1975; Wood 1995) as well as the symbolic importance of hospitality in various religions (Anderson 1987; Fieldhouse 2002; Sudakov 2005). In a similar vein, Kant's ideas (1957: 21) on cosmopolitanism have been informed by the idea of 'universal hospitality' as necessary to enable peace and world citizenship (cf. Laachir 2007). Kant's conception of hospitality is that it is conditional, with the guest expected to conform to acceptable behaviours with regard to their right to visit. This perspective is contrasted with the ideal of unconditional hospitality (Derrida 2001). Such a focus upon hospitality and the other has led to fertile discussions regarding hospitality as an ethic and the ways in which hospitality governs social relations (Ben Jelloun 1999; Germann Molz and Gibson 2007). In this respect, hospitality moves from difference management to an acceptance of strangeness and difference (Ben Jelloun 1999) whereby the other becomes a face, an individual (Levinas 1969). Hence, discussions have focused upon hospitality and racism (for example, Ben Jelloun 1999; Laachir 2007), hospitality and treatment of asylum seekers (for example, Gibson 2003; La Caze 2004), hospitality and deportation (for example, Kurvet-Käosaar 2003), hospitality and the Internet (for example, Germann Molz 2007), and hospitality and the homeless (for example, Bolland and McCallum 2002; Damon 1997). A significant ongoing debate in human geography and other subjects such as sociology and cultural studies, partly inspired by Derrida's work on hospitality, relates to the transformation of human prejudice and the enactment of liberal values (Valentine 2008), and this perspective has driven a number of studies both illuminating as well as possibly obscuring the focus on 'how we might live with difference' (Valentine 2008: 334), such as Amin (2006) or Fincher and Iveson (2008). This debate is more broadly linked to the idea of creating a hospitable city through cosmopolitan hospitality (Yeoh 2004; Dines and Cattell 2006). Therefore, the theme of hospitality as an ethic is a major focus of inquiry (Popke 2007).

Questions of social control also emerge at the intersection between hospitality and mobility. Hospitality research, which often touches on complex patterns of physical and virtual mobilities, is uniquely positioned to reflect critically on the mobilities, immobilities and moorings that structure mobility systems and the increasingly networked patterns of economic and social life (Hannam, Sheller and Urry 2006). Hospitality is premised on the mobility of the visitor, the stranger, the exchange student, the tourist or the asylum seeker. At the same time, however, hospitality connotes slowing down, resting and stopping for a while. In this sense, it also always entails immobility; it moors the travelling subject (Germann Molz and Gibson 2007). Of course, just as not all travellers are mobile under similar conditions, neither are they hosted with the same degree of embodied or ontological comfort. Some guests may be constrained and smothered by too much hospitality, or left vulnerable by too little. The hotel rooms and resort suites that accommodate tourists are a far cry from the camps and prisons where refugees and asylum seekers are housed by the state (Gibson 2003; Pugliese 2002). Thus hospitality involves both movement and stillness, as well as the dialectics of social control and resistance embedded in each. From this perspective, hospitality may entail enforced immobility as well as voluntary mobility and stillness. Just as hospitality has been a useful metaphor for thinking about mobile social relations and control, so too can it offer a framework for teasing out the significance of geographies of confinement and imprisonment. Hospitality studies thus have much to gain from and contribute to a relational approach to mobility (Adey 2006).

A contribution by Bell (2007a, 2007b) acts as a bridge between the social control/social exchange categorization. Bell employs the simple but far-reaching definition of hospitality as 'welcome' and conceives a form of mobile hospitality that is at the heart of human relations and conforms to the idea of hospitality as a social ethic (Germann Molz and Gibson 2007). Bell (2007a, 2007b) proposes the idea of diurnal 'moments' of hospitality predicated upon interactions between hosts

and guests in city spaces, such as commuting to work, mega events and hospitality, or everyday urban hospitableness. Thus, one can conceive of a mobile hospitality that transcends spatial association with buildings. Bell (2007b) locates this in the context of hospitable cities. Whilst Bell (2007b) is concerned with an examination of the contribution of commercial hospitality to the cityscape, his work on moments of hospitality (Bell 2007a) points to the social significance of mundane moments of hospitality in daily life that determine the ethics of social relations. He refers to the work of Laurier and Philo (2004) who analyse in a café setting the ways strangers manage the sharing of public space, which is ‘heavily gestural and lightly conversational’ (Laurier and Philo 2004: 195).

Although stating that hospitality is not anchored to buildings, Bell (2007a) nevertheless draws attention to the mediatory role of non-humans, such as the (broader) built environment, in the affordance of daily hospitableness. For instance, public seating constitutes a form of non-human hospitality. With good reason, hospitality is typically represented as a human phenomenon. However, as Bell’s examples demonstrate, use of the host–guest metaphor extends the potential of hospitality analyses to examine human and non-human relationships, including divine–human relationships (Navone 2004), terra–human or human–animal relationships; the latter two appear to have been neglected to date in published academic studies. This approach also opens up new possibilities for thinking about the relationship between humans and machines. It is not incidental that computing discourse draws on the language of hospitality: hosting, ports, home pages. This terminology suggests that the interface between humans and computing technologies is akin to a relationship between strangers, involving both the transgression and reiteration of various boundaries. Several studies have engaged the metaphor of hospitality to analyse the way users extend, limit or revoke inclusion in online settings and virtual communities (for example, Aristarkhova 1999; Kuntsman 2009). Ciborra (1999, 2004) takes a somewhat different approach, asking instead how humans and technologies host each other. Focusing on information and technology systems in organizational settings, Ciborra acknowledges that technology often appears to users as an ambivalent and threatening stranger. He suggests reaching out to technology as a guest. He explains that ‘hospitality is the human process of making the Other a human like oneself. Hosting the new technology is then seen to mean accepting a paramount symmetry between humans and non-humans’ (Ciborra 2004: 27). Ciborra goes so far as to suggest that, following Kant’s notion of the universal right to hospitality, ‘humans should grant a set of rights to technology, such as the right to visit – but not necessarily the right to stay’ (Ciborra 2004: 27). Yet, he warns, like all guests, technology can dominate the host. Technology can turn into an enemy; humans and technologies can become hostages of each other. Ciborra’s claim that hospitality can render technology human, and his attention to the possibilities and dangers entailed in such a proposition, are emblematic of the kind of intellectual light a hospitality approach can shed on fundamental questions about identity, humanity, power and control. In this vein, we need to conceive of hospitality as infusing our day-to-day lives and as located in day-to-day activities, for example, language (Derrida 2000a, 2000b; Still 2005), acts of translation (Gwiazda 1999; Phipps and Barnett 2007), teaching situations (Higgins 2007) or taxi journeys (Toiskallio 2000). In undertaking such analyses, powerful new ways of examining or re-examining topics and problems arise offering new insights on the world.

Hospitality as social and economic exchange

The ideas of exchange and reciprocity permeate various definitions and descriptions of hospitality. For example, hospitality has been described as:

... a set of behaviours which originate with the very foundations of society. Sharing and

exchanging the fruits of labour, together with mutuality and reciprocity, associated originally with hunting and gathering food, are at the heart of collective organization and communality. While later developments may have been concerned with fear of and need to contain strangers, hospitality primarily involves mutuality and exchange, and thereby feelings of altruism and beneficence. (Lashley 2000: 4)

... a reciprocal right to protection and shelter... (Ben Jelloun 1999: 1)

... an exchange of honour... (Selwyn 2000: 34)

... provided for diverse motives but always embrac[ing] the expectation of reciprocity. This is not the same as saying that all forms of the provision of hospitality actually involve reciprocity although many, and probably almost all do. (Brotherton and Wood 2007: 47)

Brotherton and Wood (2007) locate the idea of exchange in relation to rational economic theory (Shilling and Mellor 2001) and gift exchange (Mauss 2002), reflecting economic and social exchange respectively. The nature of the social exchange varies. In the above examples, it is 'the fruits of labour' (Lashley 2000: 4); 'protection and shelter' (Ben Jelloun 1999: 1); 'honour' (Selwyn 2000: 34), all of which lean towards the gift exchange. Lazzarato (1997) describes the contemporary rise of the ethical economy as concerned with the production of "an ethical surplus", a social relation, a value, an affective intensity not there before'. This ethical economy is primarily structured by networks, and motivated by an accumulation of social recognition which is an effect of sharing and generosity such that participants have to give back more than they receive to acquire peer respect (Arvidsson, Bauwens and Peitersen 2008). The ethical economy description is reminiscent of some of the discussions of hospitality and hospitableness (for example, Lashley 2000; Telfer 2000) and perhaps the nostalgic longing for 'real hospitality' in certain economically developed societies is a response to commodification (Ritzer 1996) and the superficial nature of some travel experiences where little cultural engagement really happens and very limited engagement with locals occurs (McIntosh, Lynch and Sweeney 2010). Ben Jelloun (1999: 3) refers to the test of hospitality when someone comes to one's home as being:

Real. There should be no mask, no placating. No question of pretending or forcing oneself. Welcome and feigning are incompatible.

Featherstone (1987) citing Kroker (1985: 80) holds the 'death of the social, the loss of the real' responsible for the emergence of 'a *nostalgia* for the real: a fascination with and desperate search for real people, real values' which the hope of hospitality may embody. By contrast, hospitality as economic exchange locates hospitality as part of the capitalist economy and a concern with profit realization. Here then are yet more dualisms for the hospitality scholar to engage with: social/economic, gift economy/capitalist economy, nostalgia/real.

The precise nature of the exchange in hospitality and the extent to which some descriptions of non-commercial exchange may be overly romanticized is a matter of debate. Sahlins (1965) conceives of reciprocity on a continuum from a unidirectional flow of gifts through balanced (two-way) exchange to negative reciprocity where there is an attempt to get something for nothing. Ben Jelloun (1999) illustrates through a true story concerning a social exchange that hospitality

does not always imply reciprocity. Similarly, Bolton (2009: 554) describes the service encounter as creating 'a distorted relationship'. The paradoxical nature of the relationship has been highlighted, and this applies especially to commercial hospitality. For example, Robinson and Lynch (2007) refer to an exchange paradox in a commercial setting whereby the guest/consumer is enticed to consume hospitality of their own free will but the highly regulated experience may cause a loss of free will. Thus, Dikeç (2002) suggests that the generally held assumption that hospitality implies a desirable quality invites critical reflection. He argues that it is not always liberating and emancipatory; it may conceal an oppressive aspect beneath its welcoming surface. Likewise, Sheringham and Daruwalla (2007) draw out the complexity of the host–guest relationship whereby the host, through the provision of hospitality, imposes their sense of order upon the other. The other, while symbolically elevated, is subject to domination by the host, and to the rules of being a guest. Lashley et al. (2007: 174) prefer the term 'transaction' which is 'interactional' and 'multi-faceted: social, cultural, psychological, economic etc. and captures the idea of a "crossing over" between host and guest'. Such a crossing over is perhaps what Sheringham and Daruwalla (2007: 34–38) refer to as an 'altered state', 'a liminal space' and the 'time out of the everyday' which hospitality brings. Intrinsic to this host–guest transaction is a recognition of the interchangeability of these roles during the course of a hospitality interaction (Lynch, Di Domenico and Sweeney 2007). Lugosi (2008, 2009) draws attention to the importance of guest–guest relations in constructing hospitality with guests taking on roles of hosts in relation to other guests. Indeed, it is perhaps better to conceive of multiple instances of hospitality occurring in many social situations whereby people may be both hosts and guests simultaneously according to the analytical perspective. Bell (2007a) illustrates how mundane hospitality occurs through commuting to work on trains, for example, where the host passenger moves their bag from the adjacent seat to make way for another passenger temporarily transformed into the host's (i.e. the bag-removing passenger's) guest. In fact, it is more complicated than this simple host–guest relationship since, as shown in Robinson and Lynch (2007), the hospitality relationship often involves micro-hosts such as the initial sitting passenger above whose own micro-host is, for example, the train guard and macro-hosts such as the train company.

Ben Jelloun (1999: 1–2) suggests that the act of hospitality involves 'an action (a welcome), an attitude (the opening of oneself to the face of another [...] and the opening of one's door and the offering of the space of one's house to a stranger), and a principle (disinterestedness)'. Likewise, Ben Jelloun (1999: 2) argues that Derrida identifies hospitality as greeting '...another as a face. A welcome is offered simply to a face'. This 'face' makes the conception of the other into 'a living presence [...] an expression [...] a discourse' (Levinas 1969: 66). Telfer (2000: 42) associates hospitableness in the private sphere with requiring 'an "appropriate" motive' and these may include other-regarding motives ranging from pleasing others to being dutiful; reciprocal motives which include both giving and getting pleasure as well as hoping to have the hospitality returned; non-reciprocal motives where the host seeks to benefit in some way. For Telfer (2000: 45), the commercial host may also be hospitable if their motives are appropriate; for example, they may be drawn to the work through motives of genuine hospitality and 'if a commercial host looks after his guests well out of a genuine concern for their happiness and charges them reasonably, rather than extortionately'.

It is apparent that dynamics in spaces of hospitality are critical to understand. Dikeç (2002), whilst recognizing the importance of boundaries in hospitality, argues that hospitality is about opening those boundaries and giving space to the stranger such that mutual recognition is achieved. Hospitality then becomes concerned with provision of the social, cultural, institutional,

ethical and political spaces where participants can learn to engage with and learn from one another. Indeed, hospitality space should facilitate not just recognition but also enable contestation and conflict to occur. Friese (2004) also argues for the opening up of spaces of hospitality and draws attention to the importance of etiquette in regulating hospitality situations. Grit (2010) argues for the need to open up spaces of hospitality to difference in commercial and non-commercial settings in order to facilitate serendipitous and more enriching hospitality experiences. Valentine (2008) reflects upon the geographies of the encounter and argues the need for a greater focus upon socio-spatial inequalities, the insecurities created and the manifestations of power that occur.

While many studies of hospitality centre the host–guest relationship at the heart of the hospitality encounter, such labelling has been challenged in the context of commercial hospitality. For example, as noted above, Aramberri (2001) rejects ‘host–guest’ terminology on the basis that it is not relevant in commercial tourism, suggesting that ‘service provider–consumer’ is more relevant; a consequence of such an approach is to reframe the nature of the relationship to give much greater emphasis to the economic rather than social side of the exchange. Or, to paraphrase Lugosi (2009), to perpetuate a common divide between ‘the social or philosophical dimensions of hospitality from its organizational and commercial manifestations’. One could in fact posit hospitality as operating on a continuum with commercial hospitality at one end, ulterior-motives hospitality a bit further along, reciprocal hospitality somewhere in the middle and genuine altruistic hospitality at the other end. Certainly, we now have enough insights to recognize a variety of motives and ethical positions in relation to hospitality provision.

Nevertheless, commercial settings for hospitality and questions regarding hospitality work and organizations have been and continue to be a major theme of inquiry. For example, hospitality organizations have served as a significant arena of investigation in order to surface broader social themes. For example, Ritzer’s thesis (1996) of the ‘McDonaldization of Society’, or Goffman’s study (1959) based on his work in a small hotel both point to intersections between commercial and social concerns. Hospitality organizations have also been used to highlight labour issues such as poor working conditions (Orwell 1993; Ehrenreich 2001; Wood 1997), as well as significant human relations issues such as work-group behaviour, including inter-group conflict, status within groups, workflow (Whyte 1948); and the significance of emotional labour (Hochschild 1983). Emerging themes of importance in this area include labour mobilities, with particular reference to labour migration patterns, the nature of hosting as work (Veijola 2009) and the labour involved in home hosting. Hospitality, and the related roles of ‘host’ and ‘guest’, thus serve as powerful metaphors for making sense of and critiquing the dynamics of control and exchange that shape economic and social life in an increasingly mobile world.

Hospitality as metaphor

Urry (2000: 21) observes that ‘much of our understanding of society and social life is based upon, and reflected through, various metaphors’. Metaphors convey meaning by linking two different things based on their shared characteristics; they enable ‘the understanding and experiencing of one kind of thing in terms of another’ (Urry 2000: 21). Hospitality, as a metaphor, thus links separate but related worlds of meaning, conjuring up certain assumptions, fantasies, threats and promises in order to make sense of the lived experiences and tangible qualities of human (and non-human) relations. Drawing on the metaphor of hospitality, and related metaphors of hosts and guests, scholars have been able to convey certain meanings of belonging and comfort, protection and inclusion, difference and strangeness, violence and exclusion within everyday encounters between people, objects and places.

It is significant that there is considerable academic interest in the application of concepts of hospitality as a means of examination of a variety of issues, from organizational analysis (cf. *Human Relations* special issue, Vol. 61, No. 7 (2008) on food, work and organization and Peter Lugosi's review in this journal) to the hospitable or otherwise treatment of immigrants (Ben Jelloun 1999), to theological discussions of divine hospitality (Boersma 2003), to the discussion of mobile hospitality as welcome as a means of analysing social interactions (Bell 2007c), to the application of theories of hospitality as a means of analysing academic life (Phipps and Barnett 2007). The use of hospitality as a metaphor fits into a long-standing academic tradition (Morgan 1980; Ortony 1979). In the case of hospitality, it is proving a powerful analytical tool facilitating interdisciplinary engagement in the topic. Burgess (1982) links hospitality and gift exchange, and employs the idea of hospitality as a gift metaphor. Derrida (1992) undertakes a similar analytical focus to reveal the conditional nature of hospitality (i.e. the limits and restrictions that frame hospitality being given and received) counterposed with its ideal unattainable opposition, pure unconditional hospitality i.e. the absolute openness to others (Derrida 2000a). As already discussed, Bell (2007c) employs the metaphor of hospitality as welcome. The metaphor of hospitality is at the heart of analyses by cultural theorists, geographers, philosophers, sociologists, theologians, linguists and other foreign-language scholars all of whom have made significant contributions to advancing the understanding of hospitality. Examples of topics analysed in this way include postcolonial hospitality (Rosello 2001), cosmopolitanism (Derrida 2001) and migrant memory (Cresswell 2007); language as hospitality (Still 2005); the ethics of social relations (Germann Molz and Gibson 2007); and post-conflict reconciliation (Causevic and Lynch 2009).

We welcome the provocative links that scholars make by using the metaphor of hospitality, but we wish to engage hospitality's metaphorical potential in another way as well. To us, the metaphor of hospitality has the power to convey not only meaning, but also to transport intellectual projects across disciplinary boundaries. Despite the advances in the study of hospitality and the application of hospitality concepts, at present the study of hospitality is transacted largely within distinct and separate academic subjects and disciplines, such as anthropology, architecture, art, cultural and media studies, French studies, geography, hospitality management and hospitality studies, leisure, literature studies, linguistics, management, marketing, media studies, organizational studies, philosophy, social history, sociology, theology and tourism.

Current explorations of hospitality range from deepening understanding of its construction and production, to exploring hospitality as a metaphor for social behaviours, to understanding hospitality as a business and cultural phenomenon. Its study is further differentiated according to particular geopolitical regions where specific origins, intellectual emphases and geopolitical perspectives have shaped the study of hospitality. The study of hospitality is therefore fragmented, composed of distinctive communities of hospitality scholars with their own institutional forms (subject associations, conferences and journals) and interaction. According to Dann (2002: 1), the word 'metaphor' derives from the Greek *metaphora*, which means 'the carrying from one place to another'. Indeed, metaphors are often referred to as 'vehicles'. We hope that in this journal the metaphor of hospitality will mobilize meaning not just across a linguistic and conceptual landscape, but across disciplines, geographies and sectors of hospitality studies as well. As Friese (2004: 74) notes, 'what is at stake is not only the thinking *of* hospitality, but thinking *as* hospitality'. In a recent study, Phipps and Barnett (2007) address this notion of academic hospitality. The authors identify not only material hospitality and hospitableness (hosting and welcoming of academics) but also the welcoming of new ideas (the hospitality of knowledge),

virtual academic hospitality (from Internet conferences to access to online knowledge), linguistic hospitality (language employed and translation). Of interest is the simultaneous, multi-layering of hospitality events that emerge from the analysis and its forms, which range from the material to the ethical to the neuroaesthetic to the imaginative.

An agenda for hospitality studies

As our discussion so far has suggested, scholars are bringing innovative theoretical and methodological approaches to bear on the new forms of social and spatial relations made possible by globalization, technology and mobility. In some cases, hospitality itself is the object of study, as in historical accounts of hospitality or studies of hospitality labour; in others, it serves as an analytical framework through which to make sense of other social phenomena, such as migration, imprisonment or urban regeneration. In either case, hospitality serves as a means of understanding society. Hospitality is, as Lashley, Lynch and Morrison (2007) suggest, a social lens. Hospitality thus has considerable potential for analytical development to explore myriad forms of macro-level structures and mundane practices of interaction in an array of settings. As a social lens, hospitality reveals both the large-scale organization of welcoming (and excluding) others at the institutional or state level and the everyday experiences of living with difference.

With important exceptions, existing hospitality studies research have tended to assume a particular context of hospitality as given, rather than accounting for the ways in which academic discourse and hospitality practices both create and are an effect of that context. Rather than assuming that hospitality entails a particular context (such as the home or hotel) or particular objects (such as food or beds) or particular actors (such as hosts and guests), we see hospitality as both a condition and an effect of social relations, spatial configurations and power structures. Hospitality is constructed by, but also productive of, certain contexts, spaces, politics, objects, social roles and relations. We want to encourage contributors to consider the way discourses and practices of hospitality create their own contexts in which certain ways of being together, caring for one another, or excluding the other are normalized and reproduced. At the same time that discourses of hospitality reproduce conventional performances of togetherness, however, they also open up the possibility of doing togetherness differently – of imagining inside and outside, stranger and friend, self and other, host and guest in new, radical and potentially dangerous ways. This is what is at stake in many of the research areas we outlined in the previous sections. Our intention in reviewing these studies has not been to delimit the scope of research on hospitality, but rather to begin to open up new areas for exploration, debate and further scholarly development. Among the research areas that we feel merit further attention and debate are:

- *Historical approaches to hospitality.* Historical analyses bring the incredibly rich and contested legacy of hospitality to bear on contemporary practices. Studies ranging from ancient customs and religious traditions to postcolonial articulations of hospitality help to make sense of the philosophical, political and ethical dimensions of social relations in a globalized world.
- *Narrative hospitality.* The examination of narrative hospitality through, for example, literature, autobiography and travel writing is a rich and under-developed seam that can enhance our understanding of hospitality. Likewise, the study of depictions of hospitality through moving and still images and representations has much to contribute. For example, Treadwell's careful deconstruction (2005) of Edward Hopper's oil painting *Western Motel* (1957) demonstrates the significance of representations of hospitality.

- *The relationship between hospitality and (im)mobilities.* Hospitality offers a distinctive perspective on the way social life is patterned through intersecting mobilities (including the mobilities of tourists and migrants) and immobilities. As noted earlier, the mobilizing and constraining capacities of hospitality merit further scholarly attention. Hospitality research can benefit immensely by engaging a mobilities perspective and, in turn, critical studies of hospitality have much to contribute to the emerging field of mobilities studies.
- *Cartographies and spatialities of hospitality.* Critical geographical approaches to hospitality recognize that hospitality does not just take place in space, but rather produces certain spaces as more or less welcoming, more or less hospitable. In particular, studies of urban and civic hospitality, regional hospitality, the imagined (in)hospitableness of nature, or humankind's (in)hospitableness towards nature and the environment, bring an important spatiotemporal perspective to the way people relate to and in places.
- *Hospitality and virtuality.* As social relations are increasingly conducted in mediated formats, hospitality provides a useful lens through which to explore the way humans interact with each other in virtual spaces and with new technologies in physical spaces. To date, surprisingly little research has applied a hospitality perspective to these emerging phenomena. Those authors who do engage the metaphor of hospitality in this context, however, reveal that bringing hospitality to bear on studies of human-machine interactions, online social networking and virtual communities enables us to ask important questions about belonging, exclusion, power and identity.
- *Hostipitality.* The term 'hostipitality' reminds us that hospitality always entails its opposite: hostility. Acts of hospitality framed as welcoming to some often exclude others. Studies focusing on the way hospitality is enacted often entail acts of violence and exclusion. Such critical accounts of the treatment of unwanted guests enable us to understand how a discourse of hospitality is often marshalled in support of what are, in reality, failures of hospitality.
- *The ethics and politics of hospitality.* The writings of Kant, Derrida and Levinas have recently inspired much philosophical deliberation on the ethics and politics of hospitality. In these philosophical accounts writers have used hospitality to reflect critically on broader questions about citizenship, human rights and the ethical treatment of strangers. The philosophical and ethical implications of hospitality, and in particular Derrida's challenging concept of 'absolute hospitality', may shed light on social relations and encounters between strangers in various contexts.
- *Embodied hospitality.* Even as we pursue the philosophical dimensions of hospitality, we must not lose sight of the fact that it is, after all, an embodied practice that engages multiple senses. Thus studies of food, drink, accommodation and other forms of consumption have important implications for understanding the embodied performances of hospitality. Hospitality is offered to and by embodied subjects. The power relations embedded in the hospitality encounter are often negotiated around embodied markers of difference, such as race, class, gender, sexuality and age, which intersect to shape the practice of hospitality (or hostility) in distinct ways. Furthermore, hospitality may be quite literally embodied in the case of organ or tissue donation. Hospitality implies a politics of comfort that applies not only to the host's and guest's ontological security, but also to their embodied well-being.

- *Hospitality and materiality.* Beyond, but closely related to, the embodied aspects, it is important to acknowledge that hospitality is often constructed, mediated and experienced through material objects, and that ‘things’ have agency. Moreover, materiality is important at multiple scales: for example, clothing, jewellery, electronic devices, glassware, foodstuffs, cutlery, crockery, tables, chairs, lights, doors and decorations enable hospitality to emerge at the micro scale, but walls, roads, streets, buildings and entire blocks are also entangled in manifestations of hospitality. Future work can not only help to appreciate the multifaceted relationship between materiality in hospitality, but can also help to understand how materiality operates at and across different scales.
- *Hospitality as work.* Working within but also moving beyond commercial settings of hospitality, critical studies of hospitality as work call attention to relations not only between ‘guests’ and ‘hosts’, but also between employers and employees (for example, with regard to transformational change, cost-cutting exercises or innovation in organizations) and amongst workers. This perspective also highlights the broader issues concerning the international and migratory labour force that undertakes hospitality work in the neo-liberal global economy. We look forward to engaging with the Critical Tourism Studies Conference 2011 (<http://www3.uwic.ac.uk/english/cardiff-school-of-management/research/critical-tourism-studies-conference/pages/home.aspx>), where a dedicated track on critical hospitality and work will explore such themes as the aesthetics of the hospitality industry; performance, embodiment and emotional labour in hospitality; employee/worker voice and experience; labour mobilities; and new domains of hosting and work. It is anticipated that this track will encourage debates which connect critical hospitality and tourism research and pedagogy.
- *Researching hospitality.* In addition to innovative theoretical interventions, we welcome all methodological approaches to the study of hospitality, although we would particularly welcome new and critical approaches that allow for inter-disciplinary understanding and debate. We consider researcher reflexivity as in need of further examination in the context of the study of hospitality; for example, in relation to *the context* of personal hospitality or with regard to lessons of the reflexive hospitality researcher.
- *Inclusive hospitality.* We are conscious of relying on an overly Eurocentric literature to inform our understandings of hospitality, and this is something we hope that this journal can help to redress, although we acknowledge practical as well as linguistic barriers to doing so. For example, we would welcome studies examining hospitality in agricultural, hunting and gathering as well as industrial societies, which are under-represented in the literature.

Journal ambitions

Against the foregoing background, *Hospitality & Society*’s aim is to be an international multidisciplinary social sciences journal focusing upon academic perspectives on hospitality and hospitableness, however broadly conceived, including their connections with wider social processes and social structures. Our intention is to balance theory and applications; however, it is ultimately concerned with developing theoretical perspectives on hospitality and hospitableness. The journal is consciously seeking submissions from a wide range of disciplines. As stated in the introduction, we aspire to be an inclusive, welcoming forum in which researchers from a wide range of diverse disciplines may interact so as to expand the frontiers of knowledge and contribute to the literature on hospitality social science. The journal will address all aspects of hospitality and

its connections with wider social processes and social structures. The aim will be to consider issues associated with hospitality leading to its advancement and understanding, including developing new approaches to the study of hospitality. The contextual scope for the journal is considerable, addressing hospitality from a macro to a micro level. The journal will serve as a multidisciplinary forum. The journal aims to be international in scope and inclusive in its coverage. We will publish empirical and conceptual research, state-of-the-art reviews, discussion papers seeking to open up new lines of inquiry and highlighting important controversies, short research notes, letters to the editor, book reviews and extended review essays on either particular works or on groups of works published on related themes and reports on conferences. The journal will aspire to high standards of scholarship and aim for articles written in a style accessible for a multidisciplinary audience. The intended audience is that of scholars and researchers with an interest in hospitality, hospitableness, guest and host relations whether the phenomena in themselves or as a means to deepen understanding of society. We believe that the journal has the potential to make a major contribution to hospitality pedagogy through broadening traditional conceptions of hospitality and informing the education and teaching of hospitality studies, as well as infusing the study of hospitality management with more critical perspectives (Lugosi, Lynch and Morrison 2009).

As journal editors we are conscious of the structural challenges posed in reaching out across disciplinary boundaries, overcoming the pressures on academics in some parts of the world where research assessment exercises prevail and are increasingly being linked to employment status, to only aim for publication in certain 'ranked' journals. (Indeed, we believe that the nexus of hospitality, education and knowledge is worthy of study!) However, such concerns are outweighed by the intellectual developmental possibilities for the study of hospitality that may accrue if successful. We have been delighted to receive messages of support for the journal from international scholars representing a wide range of disciplines.

In this issue, we present three refereed journal articles. We have deliberately taken a quality approach with regard to our refereeing process and so for this first issue, all accepted papers have had to pass an internal review by the three journal co-editors before being submitted to external review by a minimum of three reviewers, which sometimes involved three rounds of reviews. A consequence of the rigours of the reviewing process has been that many submissions were either rejected outright as a consequence of the reviewing process, or have been rejected but, where merit has been seen in aspects of the article, authors have been encouraged to consider revision and resubmission.

We see this first issue as a guiding example of the type of interdisciplinary insights and conversations we hope to cultivate in the journal. Though speaking to very different contexts and connotations of hospitality, the three articles and the controversies and reviews pieces included in this issue demonstrate the critical potential of hospitality as a social lens. In the first article, Zampoukos and Ioannides advocate for a political economy analysis of hospitality work and workers to inform a critical understanding of the tourism and hospitality labour geography. Their socio-spatial perspective brings attention to the ways in which reproductive labour is mobilized, internationalized and interlinked with the lives of female and/or immigrant workers. They find that gender, immigration status, race, class and age intersect in ways that lock an already vulnerable workforce into low-paid, high-turnover, dead-end jobs. At the same time, their intersectional approach reveals that this workforce is highly differentiated, not only in terms of

race, class and gender, but also in terms of motivations and long-term career aspirations. In the second article, we see how these precise issues are reproduced in popular imaginaries of hotel work. Harris, Tregidga and Williamson add to a surprisingly limited number of analyses of hospitality in the media through an examination of representations of housekeeping and housekeepers in the popular television series *Hotel Babylon* with a particular focus on identity and role construction. Their analysis resonates with long-standing perceptions of hotel employees as being mainly composed of sexualized victims, migrant workers and denigrated employees. The implications of such representations are discussed with regard to occupational image, service quality and employment relationships. The third article is also concerned with representations of hospitality. Tressider introduces a social semiotic methodology for the analysis of hospitality marketing texts and explores the complexity of reading websites as a sign vehicle. His article adds to the use of qualitative research methods for the study of hospitality. The study gives recognition to how the marketing and interpretation of hospitality within society are influenced by both historical and ideological constructs. In so doing, the article affirms that to understand the practice of hospitality we need to take account of not just its industrial significance, but also hospitality's significance to the culture and society that it reflects or is located within.

This first issue also contains five further contributions, which help to demonstrate the journal's broad scope and intellectual eclecticism. The first is a review essay by Peter Lugosi in which he reconsiders the special issue of *Human Relations* (Vol. 61, No. 7 (2008)) on food, work and organization, guest edited by Rob Briner and Andrew Sturdy. The essay highlights that the special issue's editorial introduction and the five articles contained within examine numerous issues related to the production and consumption of hospitality, but without any acknowledgement of or overt engagement with concepts of hospitality. Lugosi thus reconsiders each of the contributions to the special issue, discussing their relationship with hospitality, while stressing how the themes examined by the authors could be reconsidered through specific concepts of hospitality. The aim is to identify how our understanding of organizations and research on organizations may be enhanced by drawing on hospitality studies.

The subsequent article is a review of the nineteenth annual research conference of the Council for Hospitality Management Education (CHME), by Jill Poulston. Poulston's piece identifies and reflects upon the diverse research themes and associated issues emerging through the CHME conference. This helps to highlight some of the contemporary critical and cultural studies of hospitality phenomena, whilst also pointing to the social and intellectual opportunities afforded by CHME to the readership of this journal. We have also included in this first issue three book reviews: Mustafa Dikeç, Nigel Clark and Clive Barnett's edited volume: *Extending Hospitality: Giving Space, Making Time*, Kevin O'Gorman's *The Origins of Hospitality and Tourism* and the reissue of Gary Alan Fine's *Kitchens: The Culture of Restaurant Work*. The reviews help demonstrate the diverse nature of hospitality research, which, as this editorial introduction has stressed, reaches across disciplinary boundaries of history, philosophy, geography, sociology and anthropology. Moreover, their inclusion in this first issue is a further gesture of hospitality to contributors from multiple fields and disciplines to consider our journal as a critical but inclusive space through which to develop a broad understanding of the complex relationships between hospitality and society.

References

- Adey, P. (2006), 'If Mobility is Everything Then it is Nothing: Towards a Relational Politics of (Im)mobilities', *Mobilities*, 1: 1, pp. 75–94.
- Ahmed, S. (2000), *Strange Encounters*, London: Routledge.
- Amin, A. (2006), 'The Good City', *Urban Studies*, 43: 5, pp. 1009–23.
- Anderson, J.L. (1987), 'Japanese Tea Ritual: Religion in Practice', *Man*, 22: 3, pp. 475–98.
- Aramberri, J. (2001), 'The Host Should Get Lost: Paradigms in the Tourism Theory', *Annals of Tourism Research*, 28: 3, pp. 738–61.
- Aristarkhova, I. (1999), 'Hosting the Other: Cyberfeminist Strategies for Net-Communities', in C. Sollfrank and Y. Volkart, (eds), *Next Cyberfeminist International Reader*, Hamburg: Old Boys Network.
- (2000), 'Otherness in Net-Communities: Practising Difference in Post-Soviet Virtual Context', paper presented at Situating Technologies Symposium, De Balie, Amsterdam, 1 April.
- Arvidsson, A., Bauwens, M. and Peitersen, N. (2008), 'The Crisis of Value and the Ethical Economy', *Journal of Future Studies*, 12: 4, pp. 9–20.
- Bauman, Z. (1990), *Paradoxes of Assimilation*, New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Bell, D. (2007a), 'Hospitality and Urban Regeneration', in C. Lashley, P.A. Lynch and A. Morrison (eds), *Hospitality: A Social Lens*, Oxford: Elsevier, pp. 89–100.
- (2007b), 'The Hospitable City: Social Relations in Commercial Spaces', *Progress in Human Geography*, 31: 7, pp. 7–22.
- (2007c), 'Moments of Hospitality', in J. Germann Molz and S. Gibson (eds), *Mobilizing Hospitality: The Ethics of Social Relations in a Mobile World*, Aldershot: Ashgate, pp. 29–46.
- (2009), 'Tourism and Hospitality', in M. Robinson and T. Jamal (eds), *The Sage Handbook of Tourism Studies*, London: Sage, pp. 19–34.
- Benhabib, S. (ed.) (2004), *The Rights of Others: Aliens, Residents and Citizens*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- (2006), *Another Cosmopolitanism: Hospitality, Sovereignty, and Democratic Iterations* (ed. R. Post), Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ben Jelloun, T. (1999), *French Hospitality: Racism and North African Immigrants*, New York: Columbia University Press.
- Benveniste, E. (1973), *Indo-European Language and Society*, London: Faber & Faber.
- Boersma, H. (2003), 'Irenaeus, Derrida and Hospitality: On the Eschatological Overcoming of Violence', *Modern Theology* 19: 2, pp. 163–80.
- Bolland, J. and McCallum, D. (2002), 'Touched by Homelessness: An Examination of Hospitality for the Down and Out', *American Journal of Public Health*, 92: 1, pp. 116–18.
- Bolton, S.C. (2009), 'Getting to the Heart of the Emotional Labour Process: A Reply to Brook', *Work, Employment and Society*, 23: 3, pp. 549–60.
- Brotherton, B. (1999), 'Towards a Definitive View of the Nature of Hospitality and Hospitality Management', *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 11: 4, pp. 165–73.
- Brotherton, B. and Wood, R.C. (2007), 'Key Themes in Hospitality Management', in R.C. Wood and B. Brotherton (eds), *The Sage Handbook of Hospitality Management*, London: Sage, pp.

35–61.

Browner, J. (2003), *The Duchess Who Wouldn't Sit Down: An Informal History of Hospitality*, New York: Bloomsbury.

Burgess, J. (1982), 'Perspectives on Gift Exchange and Hospitable Behavior', *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 1: 1, pp. 49–57.

Cassee E. and Reuland, R. (eds), *The Management of Hospitality*, Oxford, Pergamon.

Causevic, S. and Lynch, P.A. (2009), 'Hospitality as a Human Phenomenon: Host-Guest Relationships in a Post-conflict Setting', *Journal of Tourism, Hospitality Planning and Development*, 6: 2, pp. 121–32.

Ciborra, C. (1999), *Hospitality and IT*, Working Paper, Amsterdam: Primavera. Available online at <http://primavera.feb.uva.nl/PDFdocs/99-02.pdf>. Accessed 18 November 2010.

——— (2004), 'Encountering Information Systems as a Phenomenon', in C. Avgerou, C. Ciborra and F. Land (eds), *The Social Study of Information and Communication Technology*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 17–37.

Cresswell, T. (1996), *In Place/Out of Place: Geography, Ideology and Transgression*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

——— (2007), 'Hospitality and Migrant Memory in Maxwell Street', in J. Germann Molz and S. Gibson (eds), *Mobilizing Hospitality: The Ethics of Social Relations in a Mobile World*, Aldershot: Ashgate, pp. 47–64.

Critical Tourism Studies IV (CTS 2011), 'Tourism Futures: Enhancing Creative & Critical Action', Welsh Centre for Tourism Research, Cardiff, UK, 2–5 July, <http://www3.uwic.ac.uk/english/cardiff-school-of-management/research/critical-tourism-studies-conference/pages/home.aspx>. Accessed 19 November 2010.

Damon, J. (1997), 'The Oscillations of Hospitality: The Case of Homelesses' Collective Care', *Communications*, 65, pp. 121–29.

Dann, G.M.S. (ed.) (2002), *The Tourist as a Metaphor of the Social World*, Wallingford and New York: CABI.

Derrida, J. (1992), *Given Time: I. Counterfeit Money*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

——— (1998), 'Hospitality, Justice and Responsibility: A Dialogue with Jacques Derrida', in R. Kearney and M. Dooley (eds), *Questioning Ethics: Contemporary Debates in Philosophy*, London: Routledge.

——— (1999), *Adieu to Emmanuel Levinas* (trans. P.-A. Brault and M. Naas), Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

——— (2000a), *Of Hospitality: Anne Dufourmantelle Invites Jacques Derrida to Respond* (trans. R. Bowlby), Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

——— (2000b), 'Hostipality', *Angelaki: Journal of the Theoretical Humanities*, 5: 3, pp. 3–18.

——— (2001), *On Cosmopolitanism and Forgiveness*, London: Routledge.

Dikeç, M. (2002), 'Pera, Peras, Poros: Longings for Spaces of Hospitality', *Theory, Culture and Society*, 19:1–2, pp. 227–47.

Dines, N. and Cattell, V. (2006), *Public Spaces, Social Relations and Well-being in East London*, York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

Douglas, M. (1975), 'Deciphering a Meal', in M. Douglas (ed.), *Implicit Meanings*, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, pp. 249–75.

Ehrenreich, B. (2001), *Nickel and Dimed: On (Not) Getting by in America*, New York: Holt, Henry & Company.

Featherstone, M. (1987), 'Lifestyle and Consumer Culture', *Theory Culture and Society*, 4: 1, pp. 55–70.

Fieldhouse, P. (2002), 'Food and Health in the Baha'i Faith', *Journal for the Study of Food and Society*, 6: 1, pp. 82–87.

Fincher, R. and Iveson, K. (2008), *Planning and Diversity in the City*, Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Foster, H. and Hagan, J. (2007), 'Incarceration and Intergenerational Social Exclusion', *Social Problems*, 54: 4, pp. 399–433.

Friese, H. (2004), 'Spaces of Hospitality', *Angelikai: Journal of Theoretical Humanities*, 9: 2, pp. 67–69.

Germann Molz, J. (2007), 'Cosmopolitans on the Couch: Mobile Hospitality and the Internet', in J. Germann Molz and S. Gibson (eds), *Mobilizing Hospitality: The Ethics of Social Relations in a Mobile World*, Aldershot: Ashgate, pp. 65–82.

Germann Molz, J. and Gibson, S. (eds) (2007), *Mobilizing Hospitality: The Ethics of Social Relations in a Mobile World*, Aldershot: Ashgate.

Gibson, S. (2003), 'Accommodating Strangers: British Hospitality and the Asylum Hotel Debate', *Journal for Cultural Research*, 7: 4, pp. 367–86.

——— (2006), "'The Hotel Business is About Strangers": Border Politics and Hospitable Spaces in Stephen Frears's *Dirty Pretty Things*', *Third Text*, 20: 6, pp. 693–701.

Goffman, E. (1959), *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*, Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Grit, A. (2010), 'The Opening up of Hospitality Spaces to Difference: Exploring the Nature of Home Exchange Experiences', Ph.D. thesis, Department of Management, University of Strathclyde.

Gwiazda, P. (1999), 'The Guest of Literature: The Issue of Hospitality in Literary Translation', *Xcp*, 4.

Hannam, K., Sheller, M. and Urry, J. (2006), 'Editorial: Mobilities, Immobilities and Moorings',

Mobilities, 1: 1, pp. 1–22.

Heal, F. (1990), *Hospitality in Early Modern England*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Higgins, L. (2007), 'The Impossible Future', *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education*, 6: 3, pp. 74–96. http://act.maydaygroup.org/articles/Higgins6_3.pdf. Accessed 28 October 2010.

Hochschild, A. (1983), *The Managed Heart: Commercialization of Human Feeling*, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Kant, I. (1957), *Perpetual Peace*, New York: The Library of Liberal Arts.

Kaufman, E. (2001), *The Delirium of Praise*, London: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Kroker, A. (1985), 'Baudrillard's Marx', *Theory, Culture & Society*, 2: 3, pp. 69–83.

Kuntsman, A. (2009), *Figurations of Violence and Belonging: Queerness, Migranhood and Nationalism in Cyberspace and Beyond*, Bern: Peter Lang.

Kurvet-Käosaar, L. (2003), 'Imagining a Hospitable Community in the Deportation Narratives of Baltic Women', *Prose Studies*, 26:1–2, pp. 59–78.

La Caze, M. (2004), 'Not Just Visitors: Cosmopolitanism, Hospitality, and Refugees', *Philosophy Today*, 48: 3, pp. 313–24.

Laachir, K. (2007), 'Hospitality and the Limitations of the National', in J. Germann Molz and S. Gibson (eds), *Mobilizing Hospitality: The Ethics of Social Relations in a Mobile World*, Aldershot: Ashgate, pp. 177–92.

Lashley, C. (2000), 'Introduction', in C. Lashley and A. Morrison (eds), *In Search of Hospitality: Theoretical Perspectives and Debates*, Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann, pp. 1–17.

Lashley, C., Lynch, P.A. and Morrison, A. (eds) (2007), *Hospitality: A Social Lens*, Oxford: Elsevier.

Lashley, C. and Morrison, A. (eds) (2000), *In Search of Hospitality: Theoretical Perspectives and Debates*, Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Laurier, E. and Philo, C. (2004), 'Cafes and Crowds', Department of Geography and Geomatics, University of Glasgow. Retrieved from <http://mundanebehaviour.prg/issues/v2n2/laurier.htm>. Accessed 28 October 2010.

Lazzarato, M. (1997), *Lavoro immateriale*, Verona: Ombre Corte.

Levinas, E. (1969), *Totality and Infinity*, Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press.

Lugosi, P. (2008), 'Hospitality Spaces, Hospitable Moments: Consumer Encounters and Affective Experiences in Commercial Settings', *Journal of Foodservice*, 19: 2, pp. 139–49.

——— (2009), 'The Production of Hospitable Space: Commercial Propositions and Consumer Co-Creation in a Bar Operation', *Space and Culture*, 12: 4, pp. 396–411.

——— (2011), 'Food, Work and Organization to the Study of Hospitality and Organization:

Reconsidering the Special Issue of *Human Relations*, 61: 7 (2008)', *Hospitality & Society*, 1: 1, pp. 85-89.

Lugosi, P., Lynch, P.A. and Morrison, A. (2009), 'Critical Hospitality Management Research', *The Services Industries Journal*, 29: 10, pp. 1465-78.

Lynch, P.A. (2005), 'Sociological Impressionism in a Hospitality Context', *Annals of Tourism Research*, 32: 3, pp. 527-48.

Lynch, P.A., Di Domenico, M. and Sweeney, M. (2007), 'Resident Hosts and Mobile Strangers: Temporary Exchanges within the Topography of the Commercial Home', in J. Germann Molz and S. Gibson (eds), *Mobilizing Hospitality: The Ethics of Social Relations in a Mobile World*, Aldershot: Ashgate, pp. 121-43.

Lynch, P.A., McIntosh, A. and Tucker, H. (eds) (2009), *Commercial Homes in Tourism: An International Perspective*, London: Routledge.

Mauss, M. (2002), *The Gift: The Form and Reason for Exchange in Archaic Societies*, Abingdon: Routledge.

McIntosh, A., Lynch, P.A. and Sweeney, M. (2010), "'My Home is my Castle": Defiance of the Commercial Home Stay Host in Tourism', *Journal of Travel Research*, first published on 27 August 2010 as doi:10.1177/0047287510379160.

Morgan, G. (1980), 'Paradigms, Metaphors and Puzzle Solving in Organization Theory', *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 25, pp. 605-22.

Muhlmann, W. (1932), 'Hospitality', in E. Seligmann (ed.), *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences*, 7, New York, Macmillan.

Naas, M. (2003), *Taking on the Tradition: Jacques Derrida and the Legacies of Deconstruction*, Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Navone, J. (2004), 'Divine and Human Hospitality', *New Blackfriars*, 85: 997, pp. 329-40.

O'Gorman, K. (2007), 'Discovering Commercial Hospitality in Ancient Rome', *Hospitality Review*, 9: 2, pp. 44-52.

Ortony, A. (1979), 'Why Metaphors are Necessary and Not Just Nice', *Education Theory*, 25: 1, pp. 45-53.

Orwell, G. (1993), *Down and Out in Paris and London*, London: Victor Gollancz.

Phipps, A. and Barnett, R. (2007), 'Academic Hospitality', *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education*, 6: 3, pp. 237-54.

Pohl, C.D. (1999), *Making Room: Recovering Hospitality as a Christian Tradition*, Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Popke, J. (2007), 'Geography and Ethics: Spaces of Cosmopolitan Responsibility', *Progress in Human Geography*, 31: 4, pp. 509-18.

- Pugliese, J. (2002), 'Penal Asylum: Refugees, Ethics, Hospitality', *Borderlands*, 1: 1. http://www.borderlandsejournal.adelaide.edu.au/vol1no1_2002/pugliese.html, Accessed 9 December 2010.
- Ritzer, G. (1996), *The McDonaldization of Society*, London: Pine Forge Press.
- Robinson, M. and Lynch, P.A. (2007), 'The Power of Hospitality: A Sociolinguistic Analysis', in C. Lashley, P.A. Lynch and A. Morrison (eds), *Hospitality: A Social Lens*, Oxford, Elsevier, pp. 141–54.
- Rosello, M. (2001), *Postcolonial Hospitality: The Immigrant as Guest*, Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Sahlins, M. (1965), 'On the Sociology of Primitive Exchange', in M. Banton, (ed.), *The Relevance of Models for Social Anthropology*, London: Tavistock.
- Selwyn, T. (2000), 'An Anthropology of Hospitality', in C. Lashley and A. Morrison (eds), *In Search of Hospitality: Theoretical Perspectives and Debates*, Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann, pp. 18–37.
- Sheringham, C. and Daruwalla, P. (2007), 'Transgressing Hospitality: Polarities and Disordered Relationships?', in C. Lashley, P.A. Lynch and A. Morrison (eds), *Hospitality: A Social Lens*, Oxford: Elsevier, pp. 33–46.
- Shilling, C. and Mellor, P. (2001), *The Sociological Ambition*, London: Sage.
- Still, J. (2005), 'Language as Hospitality: Revisiting Intertextuality via Monolingualism of the Other', *Paragraph*, 27: 1, pp. 113–27.
- (2006), 'France and the Paradigm of Hospitality', *Third Text*, 20: 6, pp. 703–10.
- Sudakov, M. (2005), 'The social significance of mint tea consumption in Morocco: Reflections on its symbolic representation of Muslim faith, gender prescriptions, socio-economics and hospitality', MA dissertation, Las Vegas: University of Nevada.
- Telfer, E. (2000), 'The Philosophy of Hospitableness', in C. Lashley and A. Morrison (eds), *In Search of Hospitality: Theoretical Perspectives and Debates*, Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann, pp. 38–55.
- Toiskallio, K. (2000), 'Simmel Hails a Cab: Fleeting Sociability in the Urban Taxi', *Space and Culture*, 1: 6, pp. 6–20.
- Treadwell, S. (2005), 'The Motel: An Image of Elsewhere', *Space and Culture*, 8: 2, pp. 214–24.
- Urry, J. (2000), *Sociology Beyond Societies: Mobilities for the Twenty-First Century*, London: Routledge.
- Valentine, G. (2008), 'Living with Difference: Reflections on Geographies of Encounter', *Progress in Human Geography*, 32: 3, pp. 323–337.
- Veijola, S. (2009), 'Gender as Work in the Tourism Industry', *Tourist Studies*, 9: 2, pp. 109–26.

Vertovec, S. and Cohen, R. (eds) (2002), *Conceiving Cosmopolitanism*, Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Visser, M. (1991), *The Rituals of Dinner*, New York: Grove Weidenfeld.

Walton, J. (2000), 'The Hospitality Trades: A Social History', in C. Lashley and A. Morrison (eds), *In Search of Hospitality: Theoretical Perspectives and Debates*, Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann, pp. 56–76.

Whyte, W.H. (1948), *Human Relations in the Restaurant Industry*, New York: McGraw Hill.

Wood, R. (1997), *Working in Hotels and Catering*, 2nd edn., London: International Thomson.

Wood, R.C. (1995), *The Sociology of the Meal*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Yegenoglu, M. (2003), 'Liberal Multiculturalism and the Ethics of Hospitality in the Age of Globalization', *Postmodern Culture*, 13: 2. Available from <http://pmc.iath.virginia.edu/text-only/issue.103/13.2yegenoglu.txt>. Accessed 18 November 2010.

Yeoh, B. (2004), 'Cosmopolitanism and its Exclusions in Singapore', *Urban Studies*, 41: 12, pp. 2431–45.

Zeldin, T. (1994), 'How Humans Become Hospitable to Each Other, in T. Zeldin, *An Intimate History of Humanity*, London: Minerva, pp. 426–64.

Zelinsky, W. (1985), 'The Roving Palate: North America's Ethnic Restaurant Cuisines', *Geoforum*, 16: 1, pp. 51–72.

Zlomislic, M. (2004), 'Conflict, Tolerance and Hospitality', *The Philosopher*, LXXXII: 2.