



# Tourism and Hospitality

David Bell

## Definitions and Debates

Hospitality has been one of the most pervasive metaphors within tourism studies, referring in one sense to the commercial project of the tourist industry (such as hotels, catering, and tour operation) and in another sense to the social interactions between local people and tourists—that is, hosts and guests. (Germann Molz and Gibson, 2007: 6)

The last decade has seen a renewed interest in the concept of hospitality, in ways of researching and understanding hospitality, and in the intersections of hospitality, tourism and leisure (Jones, 2004). This renewal sits at the confluence of two intellectual trajectories: (1) a “critical turn” in hospitality studies, away from the solely functional, vocational emphasis of hospitality management or “hotel and catering” education and training, and towards a diverse, social science analysis; and (2) the take-up of the concept and practices of hospitality across a range of social science disciplines, where it is being used to critically explore key contemporary debates, such as those centered on immigration, asylum and refugees, and more broadly to understand diverse forms of “hospitable” interaction. The increasing commingling of these twin tracks means that hospitality is enjoying significant theoretical and empirical attention, and a

blossoming in publication and discussion (Morrison and O’Gorman, 2008). The aim of this chapter is to trace some contours of this commingling, and to connect it outwards to work on tourism by highlighting how debates about hospitality also shed light on some of the cornerstones of tourism studies—to trace, if you like, yet another commingling.

Hospitality studies and tourism studies share a significant number of key concerns and key concepts, especially in regard to ways of relating between “hosts” and “guests” and the problems brought about by the commodification of those ways of relating (Smith and Duffy, 2003). As bodies of knowledge, tourism studies and hospitality studies share that uneasy location between functional, vocational training for particular industries, and social science inquiry that draws on the conceptual and methodological resources of cognate disciplines (and the emerging traditions of hospitality and tourism studies themselves). As Morrison and O’Gorman (2008) show, hospitality studies has been enriched by the wider take-up of the concept across the social sciences and humanities—in history, sociology, cultural studies, anthropology, geography and history, to name but a few. Certainly, in my own adopted discipline of human geography, the concept has attracted

significant attention as a lens for looking closely at key issues such as cosmopolitanism and multiculturalism, urban regeneration, relations between social groups, and feelings, experiences and spaces of inclusion and exclusion (see, among others, Barnett, 2005; Bell, 2007a, 2007b; Chan, 2005; McNeill, 2008b). This disciplinary location also inevitably shapes the version of the “hospitality story” that I present in this chapter—though a wider concern with the sites and spaces of hospitality has been one of the key characteristics of the “critical turn.”

A central theme shared between tourism studies and hospitality studies explores encounters between people who are “strangers” to each other. This encounter involves the movement of a mobile actor (the guest) into the home territory of a static host. The host-guest encounter is also, of course, a power relation, though the dynamics of this relationship and the locus of power are complex issues, as we shall see. Moreover, the idea of hospitality has, like tourism, been used metaphorically as a symbol of broader social and cultural experiences and practices, and enactments of power between unequally situated social subjects. In philosophy, for example, notions of host and guest have been pondered, critiqued, and deconstructed (Derrida, 2001; Telfer, 2000).

While there has been growing cross-pollination between hospitality studies and its near (and some not-so-near) neighbors, it is still necessary to begin with some foundational work: the work of definition. And it should come as no surprise that the “critical turn” in hospitality studies has led to considerable scrutiny of the very object and subject of those studies—hospitality itself. As is commonly experienced when things turn “critical” or “cultural,” nothing can be taken for granted any more, and a necessary “pause for thought” has to take place, to review the past, absorb cognate debates and new influences, before proceeding down a new path (Aitchison, 2006; Morrison, 2002). A certain amount of analysis of key concepts has to occur when things turn critical, and this has

indeed been largely welcomed by scholars in the field (though some are more cautious; see, for example, Ingram, 1999; Taylor and Edgar, 1996).

The hospitality management view of what constitutes hospitality tends to rest on the “holy trinity” of the provision of food and/or drink and/or accommodation—a simple enough starting point, though one that in itself has borne considerable reconsideration and deconstruction (Brotherton, 1999; Hemmington, 2007). Populating the term with actors gives us another troublesome definition, that of the hosts and guests, already flagged. At its simplest, hosts provide the “holy trinity” of hospitality for guests. Keep scratching at this seemingly simple, self-evident equation, and more questions than answers emerge: where does the act of hospitality take place, and when? Does it require the co-presence of host and guest? Do host and guest have to be human? Is the transaction voluntary on both sides? What compels the act of hospitality, and where does power lie?

Brotherton (1999: 165) provides a thoughtful discussion of this problem, asking whether hospitality should be considered “as a product, a process, an experience, or all three,” before working his way through numerous preexisting definitions, both expansive and restrictive, of hospitality and hospitality management (see also Hemmington, 2007). He cites, among countless others, Hepple et al. (1990) who see hospitality as comprising four key characteristics:

- 1 It is conferred by a host on a guest who is away from home.
  - 2 It is interactive, involving the coming together of a provider and receiver.
  - 3 It is comprised of a blend of tangible and intangible factors.
  - 4 The host provides for the guest’s security, psychological and physiological comfort.
- (Hepple et al., 1990, cited in Brotherton, 1999: 166–167).

As with the “holy trinity,” here we have what seems at first glance a relatively commonsense and unproblematic conception, but

which soon begins to come apart at the seams when we begin a critical interrogation: the guest must be traveling, the host at home—what counts as traveling, who gets to travel, where is home? Who carries the identities of “provider” and “receiver,” are these interchangeable, must all moments of hospitality revolve around this couplet? What are the intangible factors invoked here—what does hospitality “feel like?” And must the host provide for the guest’s security *and* psychological *and* physiological comfort? Who can judge what is comfortable?

As Brotherton (1999) acknowledges, every attempt at definition merely opens up new questions, new imprecisions, new ifs and buts. Even the “holy trinity” (food, drink, accommodation) is contestable, since the range of possibilities within each component defies easy categorization. This is perhaps especially true in terms of modern (and, indeed, postmodern) hospitality, where the proliferation of sites of hospitality and of means of giving and receiving it make any simple definition laughable. Exceptions and complications abound. Brotherton’s own delineation of the “dimensions of hospitality” shows that, even having worked through all the problems of previous definitions, cloudiness remains. For him, hospitality can be thought of “a human exchange characterized by being contemporaneous, voluntary and mutually beneficial, and by being based on specific products/services” (Brotherton, 1999: 169). To which we might ask: *Always* human? *Always* voluntary? *Always* mutually beneficial?

The question of definition still hangs over hospitality studies, though a careful invocation of the “holy trinity” might be cautiously used (as it is later in this chapter) to sidestep this seemingly endless problem. Considering the “spaces” of hospitality from a different angle, Lashley (2000) explores three “domains” of hospitality—social, private, and commercial—as a way of unpacking and tidying up some of the inherent complexity of the term. While still resting (albeit increasingly uneasily) on the “holy trinity,” Lashley’s focus on domains

allows him to split apart and make explicit some of the questions that dogged previous would-be definers. He sketches a Venn diagram of partially intersecting domains (private, social, and commercial) while acknowledging that hospitality studies has tended to cluster its attention around the commercial, fixing hospitality as an economic activity—and one in need of *management*. By pulling back the focus, however, he reintroduces broader conceptualizations of hospitality. So for Lashley, an historical view sheds light on the social domain of hospitality, on the development of shared social codes of giving and receiving, welcoming and graciously accepting—codes of civility and trust that sit outside of the commercial context. He is attuned to the ways in which hosting and guesting are embedded in the social order, and carry with them questions of status, obligation, reciprocity, and generosity. Here hospitality studies connects outwards not only to historical analysis, but to foundational work in sociology and anthropology, to explore the social processes of welcomes given and received, issues of reciprocity, rituals and taboos, and forms of exchange relationship such as gift giving. In this social domain, crossovers between hospitality and tourism research are very apparent, not least in their shared interest in sociological and anthropological lenses (Scott, 2006).

The private domain is, as Lashley shows, equally at the heart of understandings of hospitality, whether in terms of the literal hospitality offered by the host-at-home, or in broader, metaphorical terms through the evoking of “homeliness” as a key dimension of the constitution of hospitality. It is in the private or domestic domain, moreover, that Lashley ponders the relationship between hospitality and hospitableness—a pondering of the ways in which a sense of “welcome” is both given and received, and is understood “contractually” (in terms of not overstaying one’s welcome, of knowing what it is acceptable to ask for or take, of knowing how “at home” one can be, and so on). The social bonds and social codes outlined above are equally apparent

here at home. Looking into the private domain enriches the study of hospitality, even as it complicates its definition, not least since the homeliness of hospitality provision is a common benchmark used in the commercial sector. Indeed, areas of commercial hospitality provision trade on this association, as in the so-called “commercial home” sector (see Di Domenico Maria Laura and Lynch, Paul 2007; Lynch et al., 2007).

Finally, Lashley (2000) examines hospitality’s commercial domain—the landscape of the hospitality industry. While on the one hand more straightforward, as we are now in the land of the “holy trinity” offered as an economic transaction, the very economics at work here complicate (and for some critics compromise or contaminate) the hospitality given and received, by making it into a service. The insertion of money into the heart of the hospitality equation thus stirs up questions about motive, about profit and exploitation, which muddy the generosity and reciprocity supposedly inherent in noneconomic definitions. Here we conjure the specter of “calculative hosting,” the cynical performance of hospitality laid on for the sole purpose of getting paid (or getting rich). Here, too, we see “calculative guesting,” whereby guests expect certain levels of service (and servility) simply because they are buying it, and the whole beauty of the pure, open, unquestioning hospitality relationship is sullied and spoiled by being bought and sold. Given the investment of many hospitality scholars in the training of workers and managers in the hospitality industry, such a bleak prognosis might seem counterproductive, and indeed a more nuanced picture of interactions in commercial settings is offered in “critical” hospitality studies. It is nevertheless important to remember the realities of the commercialization or industrialization of hospitality, and to keep a critical eye on topics such as labor relations, even as those at the sharp end of the industry provide evidence of ways of working with, round and against exploitative practice (see, for somewhat different examples, Collins, 2008; Tufts, 2006). The “calculative hosting” witnessed in the commercial domain seemingly

fixes the identities of host and guest, and frames their encounter in particular ways. But one of the key moves of the “critical turn,” already noted, has been to dissect or deconstruct these foundational roles.

### **From Host and Guest to Hostings and Guestings**

As noted above, at the heart of understandings and ways of knowing hospitality, shared with tourism studies, is the seemingly simple but actually complex relationship of host and guest (Germann Molz and Gibson, 2007). This dyad frames the very possibility of a hospitality relation, and frames the polar-opposing actors whose co-presence is seen as necessary for a moment to be defined as one of hospitality. In the conventional formulation, the guest is a traveler, offered hospitality in the host’s home. Expanded out and used metaphorically, the host’s “home” can be scaled up to mean the home village or town, home region, home nation, and the “host” may be the person on the frontline of hospitality delivery, as in commercial settings, or a member of a broader “host community”—as in debates about asylum seekers and refugees, for example (see Gibson, 2007). Similarly, guests can be scaled up and away from the intersubjective, interpersonal encounter, and can be members of assorted groups of travelers, including migrants and tourists.

Germann Molz and Gibson explore the complex intertwinings and the equally complex unraveling of the host–guest couplet, noting that “host and guest [are] fluid, contested social roles that people move into, out of, and between as they negotiate extensive overlapping mobilities and social memberships” (2007: 7). Here they capture succinctly what is at stake—a decentering of fixed notions of who is host and who is guest, a flexible and fluid set of identifications that mean that any person can be both host and guest, changing roles as they move through social space. As Germann Molz and Gibson

put it, a pertinent question to ask in this regard, is “*Where* is a host or guest?”—adding that they see a need to “dissociate stasis with hosts/homes and movement with guests/travel” (2007: 6–7; their emphasis). Inspired by the “new mobilities paradigm” in the social sciences (see Sheller and Urry, 2006), these discussions are more than word play, and require a rethink of the ways we conceptualize the comings-together that constitute hospitality (or for that matter tourism) encounters.

Other tourism and hospitality researchers have pursued the host–guest dyad’s utility and its limitations, with Aramberri (2001) going so far as to state, provocatively, that the host should “get lost”: given the total consumerization of tourism, he argues, it no longer makes sense to talk of “hosts” given what this might imply about choice, about generosity, about hospitableness. As with critics who deny the hospitableness of commercial hospitality, Aramberri suggests we need to talk instead of “service providers” and “customers,” rather than using the freighted (but also idealized) terms “host” and “guest.” Sherlock (2001) provides a different take on this. She notes that, while the terms lose their precision, given the mixing of categories (hosts may also be migrants, guests can settle and become hosts, and so on), the terms still have a commonsense usefulness and, moreover, are used reflexively and contestedly by those who might be labeled as host or guest. Instead of fixed identities, there are multiple hostings and guestings. Sherlock’s study of the complex negotiations of “hostness” and “guestness” in Port Douglas, Australia, gives vivid empirical flesh to these arguments, with migrant workers and vacation workers performing “hostness” for guests but being construed as guests by other locals, and part-time residents (such as second-home owners) seeing themselves as sometimes locals and other times tourists (and sometimes in between, distinct from “local-locals”).

A further insightful study, by McNaughton (2006), shows how migrant workers—in this case rural craft workers in India selling their wares at tourist sites—might be seen as

“hosts” by tourists, in that they constitute part of the tourist workforce, but that they may be seen nonetheless as guests—and in some cases as unwelcome guests—by other members of the host population. For McNaughton, a simplistic use of the host–guest dyad erases the politics and exploitation at work here: not all hosts or all guests are equal. Similarly, work by Parker (1994) shows how people constructed as “guests”—in his work, Chinese migrants to the UK—become “hosts” when taking up jobs in the hospitality industry, for example in Chinese restaurants and takeaways. In this case, their guests (customers) are at the same time members of the “host” (majority white British) population. (On the “guestness” of Chinese immigrant communities in the UK, see Chan [2005].) The “encounters across the counter” in the takeaway reveal for Parker the power dynamics that overwrite this commercial setting. Chan (2006) also complicates the power relations between host and guest in his work on Chinese tourists at the China–Vietnam border, where a “host gaze” meets the more familiar “tourist gaze,” and Vietnamese hosts are seen to flex forms of cultural capital that disdain Chinese package tourists. Such encounters remind us of the complex vectors of power that overlay one another in any moment of hospitality.

Research by Lugosi (2007, 2008) complicates the host–guest dyad further still, by showing how “guests” perform hospitality in commercial settings—the experience of hospitableness in a bar or café may be in part (and sometimes in large part) the result of the “welcome” extended by other guests, rather than the formal host. As Lugosi observed in fieldwork in Budapest, spontaneous comings-together between guests (who are also strangers) can produce moments of hospitality in commercial venues (see also Laurier and Philo, 2006a, 2006b). Finally, there is the related issue of choice: some people freely choose to give their hospitality, while others are compelled to do so—especially frontline workers in the tourism and hospitality sectors, but increasingly too other members of

“host communities” who are expected to extend a welcome to valued guests, as in cities that host so-called “mega-events” such as the Olympic Games (on sports, tourism, and hospitality, see Silk and Amis, 2005). Clearly, then, to talk uncritically of host and guest is highly problematic; but jettisoning the terms altogether seems equally foolish, given their conceptual and everyday utility. It might be better, therefore, to talk of hosting and guesting as *doings*, rather than host and guest as beings: this emphasizes shifting practices and performances, rather than fixed identities. But, to reiterate Germann Molz and Gibson’s key question: *Where* is a host or guest? By turning, not without reservation, back to the “holy trinity” of food, drink, and accommodation, I now want to move to consider more fully some key sites of hospitality.

### Spaces of Hospitality

In applying a spatial analysis, and mapping sites of hospitality through the lens of the “holy trinity,” my aim is to illustrate some ways of understanding how the idea (and ideal) of hospitality is reshaping places. (I am mindful of Lugosi’s [2008] comment that limiting analysis to this trinity ignores issues of entertainment and social intercourse at the heart of hospitality—I shall attempt to bring these vital elements in along the way.) My focus here will be on cities, though the arguments are not uniquely urban. In trying to further interrogate the relations of tourism and hospitality, I will be focusing on cities as tourism sites, but also more broadly understanding cities as nodes of assorted global flows, including flows of different sorts of people—migrants, tourists, and visitors. My analysis will sit within broader debates about the ways in which cities are struggling to position themselves relative to one another, and how they are engaged in various forms of inter-urban competitiveness in the context of post-industrialization. Key to this new way for cities to behave, short-handed by some

critics as “entrepreneurial governance” (Hall and Hubbard, 1998), is the ability of cities to draw in those global flows that have the highest value and to repel those of apparently low value. Positioning a city as a tourist attraction has been one important way of mobilizing these attraction/repulsion effects, though sometimes with unanticipated side effects and after shocks. As I will explore below, urban “foodscapes,” “drinkscapes,” and “restscapes” have been drawn in to the overall “hospitality offer” that packages cities (and neighborhoods) as attractive to certain kinds of guest. The increasingly complex “hospitality infrastructure” of cities, built up to service the needs and desires of valued guests, has reshaped the urban landscape, just as entrepreneurial governance has reshaped how cities behave, indeed what it means to be a city.

### Hospitality Foodscapes

As cities jockey for position regionally, nationally, and globally, they seek to develop attractive “brands” and hospitality offerings to lure valued visitors, either as temporary guests or as new residents. The highest valued guests, members of the so-called transnational business class, to a large extent function as taste-makers able to define what counts as legitimate good taste, and to fashion markers of good taste into lifestyles (Featherstone, 1991). The urban landscape is reshaped to provide high-end consumption experiences for these taste-makers, including foodscapes. Of course, alternative city marketing strategies target different types of prospective visitor, including those whose palates seek familiarity rather than adventure: the choice of which market segment to aim for is part and parcel of the game of distinction played by city managers. Low-cost resorts provision their guests in ways amenable to their dietary requirements, just as high-end gastro-destinations tempt the taste buds of the culinary-cultural elites (Andrews, 2005).

Of course, for most traveler-diners, foodscapes are commercial hospitality venues—cafes, restaurants, delis, trattoria. While the fetish of home-cooked food means that gastronomic delights are available from “commercial home” settings, a more common way in which “home” is parlayed in foodscapes is through the deployment of signs of geographical distinctiveness and localness. Such a taste for the “local” has been critiqued as a depthless engagement with the broader “local” or “host” culture (Duruz, 2000; Hage, 1997); nevertheless, in terms of urban competitiveness, the marketing of locally distinct culinary cultures has considerable potency. Cities with iconic foodstuffs or foodscapes can center their tourist economy on this segment of the hospitality offer, and build a brand from it. At the same time, of course, foodscapes have been globalized (a better word might be “glocalized”), so that locally inflected variants of various national cuisines are routinely available no matter where one is visiting, as discussed in Jackson’s (2004) work on Mumbai, for example.

However, as critical studies have shown, a fine balance must be achieved between trading on culinary cultures specific to place, and the threat to local culinary cultures brought about precisely by their successful co-option into urban imagineering schemes—the loss of authenticity which results in simulacral foodscapes. Nowhere is this anxiety (and the concomitant fetish of the local) more visible than in the Slow Food movement (Miele and Murdoch, 2002), which stipulates produce and processes with the aim of preserving local traditions and keeping the pace of hospitality *slow*. In terms of hospitality, the Slow Food movement favors the home-space and the local trattorie over the burger bar or the flashy restaurant, and the values it espouses emphasize not just food and cooking, but the conviviality of eating and drinking together, the pleasures of taking time. Slow Food recenters the pleasures of generous hosting, too—the giving of time. As Slow Food’s ideas and ideologies spread beyond food to the broader Cittaslow (Slow Cities) movement, we can see

how a certain formulation of hospitable urbanism is being shaped by this emphasis on localness, authenticity, and conviviality (Knox, 2005).

Going Slow is not, of course, the only option for urban hospitality foodscapes—nor is it one universally available. The broader key point is to recognize the ways in which eating places are bundled into the tourism and hospitality offers of cities, and to explore how commercial hospitality venues such as restaurants and cafes are connected to larger narratives and processes of urban renewal. This theme is skillfully illustrated in Latham’s (2003) study of one regenerating neighborhood in Auckland, New Zealand. By talking to bar and café owners as well as customers, Latham showed how foodscape entrepreneurs saw themselves as involved in a “sociocultural project” to reshape the neighborhood, and to contribute to the “feel” or “buzz” that rendered it attractive to certain types of customer (and in-migrant). Latham’s work positions the food sector as a knowing and important player in urban regeneration, not merely as either a victim who will inevitably lose out to property speculation, nor as part of that speculation itself. Instead, Latham shows how “consumption has quite literally helped to build a new world” (2003: 1713) in this neighborhood, through the changes to the foodscape. Crucially, he emphasizes the mixing of new and old eating places, rather than the more familiar regeneration script whereby preexisting vernacular land uses are crowded out by gentrification, as Zukin (1982) described in SoHo, New York. Here a different version of “eating local” has been retained even as it has been reshaped, creating a convivial ecology whereby cafés and bars become the backdrop for other experiments in urban living.

To return to a point made earlier, borrowed from Lugosi (2008), eating places are sites of complex interrelations of hosts and guests, and of guests and guests. The conviviality Latham observed in Auckland is in part practiced or performed in encounters between customers, who signal a welcome (or not)

through gestures and looks as much as through words. Lugosi et al. (2006a, 2006b) have looked closely at interpersonal interaction in eating and drinking places, and witnessed these micropractices that help create the overall ambience or “feel” of a hospitality venue. While previous work has delineated the way that staff are scripted into performances of hostness (e.g., Crang, 1994), studies such as those by Lugosi (2008) and Laurier and Philo (2006a, 2006b) refocus our attention on the “work” of hospitality willingly (and often spontaneously) performed by guests—the handing of napkins to mop up a spilt drink, an impromptu sing along, even just the clearing of space to allow a stranger to share a table. The choreography of hospitality in commercial foodscapes is dense with such detail—though with the corollary that diners can be made to feel out of place, perhaps especially if eating alone (since this re-reduces the dining experience to one of calculative refueling, maybe; Lukanuski [1998]). This focus on the “work” of customers should in no way overshadow the labor of hospitality workers such as chefs and waiters, washer-uppers and cleaners, whose work (sometimes ostentatiously visible, as in celebrity chefs, but frequently invisible) underpins the whole eating experience (Fine, 1996; Pritchard and Morgan, 2006). As Bourdain (2006) writes, we should also remember the global “ethnoscapes” that bring flows of migrant workers into restaurant kitchens. In the USA, he notes, these workers are likely to be from South America, and often work in nonunionized, informal, low-paid contexts. These workers should, Bourdain concludes, receive “the thanks of a grateful nation” of diners (2006: 46).

An important final point about performances of gastronomic hospitality is their *staging*: restaurant architecture and interior design serves to make some eating places tourist destinations, sometimes regardless of the quality of the food on offer (Franck, 2005). As part of its contribution to the hospitality offer, then, we must acknowledge the restaurant as spectacle, both in terms of its location

and design, and in terms of the experience and performance of eating there. Customers, it should be noted, are part of this spectacle, too. In other sectors of the hospitality industry, customers also make a spectacle of themselves, though not always in pre-scripted or desired ways—notably, perhaps, when alcohol is involved.

### **Hospitality Drinksapes**

My discussion of drinking places, hospitality and tourism will be limited to the consumption of alcoholic drinks in urban drinksapes. This is not to deny that other kinds of drinking places, from coffee houses to tea rooms, juice bars to watering holes, are equally important components of the overall experience of drinking in the city—and, indeed, the country. It is, rather, in recognition of an emerging research agenda, concerned with alcohol consumption and the experience of place, or the ways in which drinking and place complexly commingle (Jayne et al., 2006, 2008). My discussion here draws on early stage research into “alcotourism” that seeks to explore the various ways that people travel to drink, drink while traveling, or even drink to travel (Bell, 2008).

This focus has to be set against the backdrop, in the UK, of concerns over the regulation of alcohol consumption, in relation to policies to manage the so-called “nighttime economy” (Bianchini, 1995). The drinkscape is part of the broader “urban nightscape” that Chatterton and Hollands (2003) describe as contributing a new “feel” to cities, a new sense of what urban experience might mean, and a new set of pleasures and problems for city dwellers and visitors. The “relaxation” of UK licensing laws in 2003 marked an attempt to “manage” a culture labeled as binge drinking, and to curb the antisocial behavior associated with “chucking out time” when pubs and bars close. This in itself was one of a raft of urban policy initiatives aimed at addressing various perceived problems in British cities—problems allegedly not



observed in the city centers of the UK's European neighbors. Policymakers (and holidaymakers) had a sense that a "continental" café culture would inculcate British drinkers away from bingeing and towards "responsible drinking." Tourism experiences (and concerns from the tourism industry) certainly had a role to play in comparing UK pub culture with European café culture, in terms of both UK drinking habits when "at home" and those exhibited by "Brits abroad" in holiday resorts (Andrews, 2005).

The desire to promote a new "urban night-scape" was also part of a policy agenda to repopulate city centers, in order to address decades of movement out towards the suburbs. Again, the city centers of the UK were compared unfavorably with those of continental Europe, where a vibrant street culture and vital public realm were observed (Rogers, 1999). As Montgomery put it: "More and more people are inclined to use the cities and large towns at night; people are beginning to live more active social lives. They expect more from their cities. *They've been abroad and seen it working there. Why not here too?*" (1995: 104, emphasis added).

Of course, studies of "alcotourism" reveal more than the vital urban social lives that Montgomery highlights; they reveal a complicated set of practices and imaginings, whereby "local" drinking cultures are selectively appropriated, selectively transformed, and selectively ignored by tourists, while at the same time tourists' drinking tastes and habits remake "local" alco-cultures (Moore, 1995). For some travelers, drink is a taste of home-away-from-home (West, 2006), while for others, drinking "local" drinks is a way of experiencing the exotic. Some cities have traded on their local drinking cultures as symbols of the broader hospitality on offer to tourists—as in the growing phenomenon of "hen and stag party" tourism from the UK to cities of Eastern Europe such as Tallin, Prague, and Budapest (Bell, 2008). Entire national alco-cultures have been cemented to particular notions of conviviality and hospitality, then used to sell places—perhaps the

best known example being the Irish notion of the "craic," a kind of drink-fueled good time sold in images of Ireland itself as a tourism destination, and in the Irish theme pub (McGovern, 2002). Drink undoubtedly has a special place in the "holy trinity" of hospitality, for its ambivalent ability to oil the wheels of conviviality yet also to lead to anti-social and inhospitable behavior. Many cities have found themselves snagged on the horns of this dilemma, as they open up to new drinking venues as part of broadening out their nighttime economy offer, while simultaneously facing problems of regulation of the very consumption practices they have simultaneously promoted. Concerns over "binge drinking" in city centers have been framed in terms of a loss of the hospitality of "traditional" drinking cultures and places, and the ushering in of a new "inhospitable" alco-culture creating, in the words of Bianchini (2006), "alcoholic agoras."

Like restaurants, the story of bar architecture and design speaks volumes about the social codes of hospitality, from the historical moment of the insertion of the "bar" itself as a barrier between staff and customer as a way of framing "frontstage" and "backstage" regions, to the contemporary trend of "vertical drinking" venues which ease the transition from pub to nightclub, and which maximize drink consumption by foregoing chairs and tables and playing music too loud for conversation (Jayne et al., 2006). Detailed analyses of particular drinking places can provide rich ethnographic depictions of how venues are styled to attract certain types of clientele—vividly exemplified in Lugosi and Lugosi's (2008) work on informal, temporary "guerilla hospitality" spaces known as *romkert* (ruin bars) in Budapest, Hungary. Like Latham's (2003) cafés in a regenerating neighborhood of Auckland, the owners and patrons of these bars are engaged in a broader sociocultural project in the city, ambivalently located within broader "official" regeneration schemes. By self-consciously trading on images of urban decay, the *romkert* sell a particular way of relating to and drinking in the city.

In the UK, the proliferation and diversification of types of drinking venue in cities in the space of just a couple of decades has totally transformed the drinkscape, for better and for worse (Chatterton and Hollands, 2003). And in another echo of the foodscape, drinking venues marshal both staff and customers in collective performances of hospitality (and at times hostility). In the new nighttime economy of city centers this “welcome” is extended not only by bar staff but also by door staff, tasked with ensuring certain modes of hospitality between guests (Hobbs et al., 2003). The activities of the nighttime economy bring a different rhythm of hosting and guesting to cities, as drinkers are attracted in to the city center, performing certain modes of guestness—including those that clash with the lifestyles of unwitting hosts such as city-center residents (Roberts and Turner, 2005).

Drinking alcohol therefore has a strange location in ways of knowing and thinking about hospitality, and in ways of practicing it. At once central to the definition of hospitality, and firmly embedded in its history (see Walton, 2000), drinking is now stuck between continuing to deliver those hospitality benefits in cities, and bringing “new” problems (or new ways of seeing things as problems). While there have been significant studies of drinking venues as spaces of hospitality (such as Lugosi, 2007, 2008), less attention has been given to the role of alcohol itself (though see Latham and McCormack, 2004, on alcoholic urbanity). A turn towards the materiality of hospitality, and away from human–human interaction, might well serve to uncover the important (and contradictory) roles of drinking in the practices of hospitality in commercial, private, and social domains.

### ***Hospitality Restscapes***

As Walton (2000) shows in his short history of the hospitality trades, foodscapes, drinkscales, and restscapes share a common heritage in

terms of providing hospitality for travelers, and perhaps no institution better embodies the commercial provision of hospitality—usually offering the “holy trinity” under one roof—than the hotel. Moreover, hotels are stages for numerous other enactments of hospitality between host and guest and between guest and guest. Given the complexity of the services offered by hotels, their management has long been a core concern of hospitality training; yet, as Pritchard and Morgan (2006: 771) note, the hotel as a “cultural product” has been somewhat neglected in the emerging “critical” hospitality studies. As they add, hotels are emblematic of the key issues at the heart of hospitality as a concept, leading them to call upon scholars “to explore the spatiality of the hotel in order to analyze how interior and exterior hotel spaces are made through social relations and how social relations are in turn shaped by those self same spaces” (Pritchard and Morgan, 2006: 770). The focus of their analysis is the ludic and liminal “adventures” that guests may experience in these in-between spaces, which offer selective privacy and anonymity but plentiful opportunities for social intercourse (with friends and with strangers). Iconic in the architecture of the hotel in this regard is the lobby, where outside and inside meet, and the hotel bar, where particular modes of drinking and socializing are mobilized.

As McNeill (2008b) shows in his broad-ranging discussion of relations between the hotel and the city, this internal architecture of hotels delineates private and public in particular ways. Moreover, the diversification of hotels and their targeting of particular niche markets means that ever more attention has been afforded to the design of hotel spaces and the provision of tailored services, for example, the installation of now more-or-less ubiquitous en suite bathrooms, the availability of Wi-Fi not only in guestrooms and business centers but in “public” areas of hotels such as lobbies and coffee bars, and the offer of “pillow menus” and bespoke bedding to make the guest’s stay perfect.

In his discussion of the “public” spaces of the hotel, McNeill (2008b) notes how lobbies and bars have opened out the hotel not only to paying guests but to other visitors, so “locals” can become “guests” and experience part of the spectacle of the hotel. As McNeill (2008b) adds, hotel lobbies and bars are often consciously styled as spectacles, as fantasy spaces that distil the “brand values” of the hotel, both to assure incoming guests that this is the right place for them, and to communicate more broadly the social and cultural positioning of the hotel on the increasingly crowded and competitive restspace. From themed hotels to boutique hotels, capsule hotels, business hotels, and apartment hotels, the differentiation of product in the hotel sector is matched by differentiation in design and in the hospitality offer. In a paper solely focused on airport hotels serving business clients, McNeill (2008a) traces how this particular niche has developed to meet the needs of the business traveler, providing a seamless business space where even the guest room is part of the “exoskeleton” of business-class connectivity. As well as hotel types serving distinct niche markets, distinctive local and national restscapes have developed, even while glocalized hotel brands have spread to new locations (McNeill, 2008b). In Japan, for example, novel forms such as the capsule hotel and the love hotel have appeared. The former offers minimal sleeping accommodation with none of the added extras familiar from standard hotel rooms and suites—“rooms” can be simply “pods” in which to sleep—while love hotels offer discretion via automation and hourly room rates for intimate liaisons (Foster, 2007). Elsewhere, local and national stereotypes and heritage are redeployed to give hotels and destinations a unique selling point, as in some former Eastern Bloc cities, where communism-themed restscapes offer nostalgic and kitsch touristic experiences (Light, 2000).

Indeed, iconic hotels have long been embedded in the place myths of particular cities, even as those myths change with time

(Wharton, 2007). So the exterior architecture also has symbolic importance in communicating certain values, hence the increasing call for “starchitects” to design restspaces (McNeill, 2008b). Moreover, the hotel reads as a microcosm of the city, a kind of distillation of the experience of urban living. This is both consciously achieved through the ways in which hotels relate to the cityspaces around them (the provision of certain vistas, the street-level interfaces, the images of the city used to market the hotel), but it is also revealed in “accidental” ways—in particular, through the composition of the hotel’s labor force. McNeill (2008b: 390) writes that “hotels have always been poised uneasily at the frontline of social interactions between some very differently positioned groups and occupations . . . . Hotels continue to house within one building extremes of wealth and exploited labor that eclipse conditions in many other service industries.” This labor is frequently hidden (except for selective frontline tasks), and hotels have been described as hosting a particularly multicultural invisible labor force, often precariously employed and institutionally exploited (Gibson, 2006). Looking at one element of the hotel workforce, Seifert and Messing (2006) show how hotel cleaners have been subject to both work intensification and casualization, the former at least in part attributed to the “upscaling” of furnishings such as bedding and the latter a result of labor market restructuring and transnational migration. As their ergonomic analysis shows, the demands of this invisible aspect of hospitality provision have serious consequences for the health of workers.

Seifert and Messing (2006) discuss how forces of economic globalization have led to new patterns of migrant labor entering the hotel trades; as Steven Frears’ film *Dirty Pretty Things* (2002) showed, the vast backstage regions of hotels are populated by workers from all over the world, producing hierarchies and stratifications within the workforce but also contributing to the host city’s multiculturalism (see Gibson, 2006).

This theme has been picked up by hotel workers themselves, who in some cases have mobilized to make visible their contribution both to the hospitality offer of the city and to the cosmopolitan cultural life that acts as a draw to visitors. In Toronto, Canada, Tufts (2006) explores trade union organizing that has sought to reposition hotel employees as *cultural workers*:

Immigrant workers employed in the hospitality sector of metropolitan centers not only provide services but also produce the cultural aspects of the city that attract visitors. For hotel workers' unions, promoting the cultural activities of workers as an entry point into debates of what constitutes a successful and authentic tourism industry. (Tufts, 2006: 343–344)

While this attempt to reposition hotel workers on the cultural landscape of Toronto has achieved some of its goals, Tufts acknowledges that the “alienating and seasonal” nature of employment limits workers’ abilities and willingness to “attach any identity to the hospitality workplace” (2006: 358), limiting the transformative potential of this action. Moreover, in “packaging” hotel workers as standard-bearers of multiculturalism or cosmopolitanism, there is a danger of merely further commodifying and “exoticizing” employees in a sector already marked by employment hierarchies based on “race,” class, and appearance. As McNeill (2008b: 393) concludes, “The hotel is a microcosm of the hidden processes of labor exploitation which are central to the consumption experience”—the hotel trades on offering certain experiences of urban heterogeneity and the “frisson of difference” while insulating guests from other encounters with difference, including those embodied by the “backstage” workforce. Such an analysis reiterates a key conceptual point: that hospitality invokes exclusions as well as inclusions, and that latent in the articulation of hospitality is hostility. These issues have been foregrounded in philosophical discussions of hospitality, which we shall encounter in the following section.

## Hospitable Encounters

In a well-known series of meditations and discussions, the continental philosopher and deconstructionist Jacques Derrida has pondered the meanings of hospitality, taking as his starting point a critique of Kant’s (1795/1996) treatise on global rights and citizenship (Derrida, 2001; Derrida and Dufourmantelle, 2000). While there is not time to provide detailed engagement with Derrida here—and this has occupied considerable space in the emerging literature already (see, among many others, Dikeç, 2002; Friese, 2004)—it is nevertheless important at least to *encounter* the Derridean perspective, which to my reading centers on the paradox between the impossible ideal of open, unconditional hospitality offered to anyone and everyone, unendingly and unquestioningly, and the various ways in which hospitality has in reality been made conditional, limited, and exclusive. Toying with the deconstructive possibilities inherent in the etymology and formulation of hospitality (and the hostility latent within it) and the relations of host and guest, Derrida asks us to think long and hard about the ways in which hospitality might be deployed conceptually and practically, and what is at stake in the mode of its deployment. Even the home as the site of “pure” hospitality comes under Derrida’s scrutiny, for its doors may be closed as well as opened, and its walls mark the separation of inside from outside. The host who stands at the threshold becomes a gatekeeper, even a jailer, though by admitting the guest he may end up the prisoner, unable to reestablish the limits to the hospitality he offers to a guest who refuses to leave. The hospitable encounter is, for Derrida, fraught with complexity and ambiguity, which means that it is always already rendered conditional—for to offer absolute, unconditional hospitality would mean the host opening himself up unendingly, unquestioningly, asking nothing of the guest, not even his name (Derrida and Dufourmantelle, 2000).

Perhaps unsurprisingly, Derrida does not consider the commercial provision of hospitality; one can only imagine that such “calculative hosting” (and guesing) would for him show the epitome of conditionality. And he is not alone in dismissing commercial hospitality as the least “pure,” most inhospitable form of “hospitality” (see, for example, Ritzer, 2007; for an alternative view, see Williams, 2000). Hospitality studies is poised at the fulcrum of this problematic, at once wedded to an analysis of hospitable encounters is commercial settings, yet also wanting to show the broader resonance of hospitality as a “social lens” to understand many ways of relating. The current “critical turn” in hospitality studies seems to be making productive use of this position, in opening out multiple ways of knowing hospitality. And, of course, in the realm of practice, there are countless examples of hospitality outside of its industrial manifestation; indeed, practitioners can be observed taking themselves out of what they see as narrowly economic exchange relations, reinserting the generosity and reciprocity of hospitality in their encounters. Germann Molz (2007) provides an interesting case study in this regard, in her work on “couch surfing” websites, whereby travelers exchange local knowledge and information on domestic accommodation with one another. We should also remember here work that highlights how, even in commercial settings, much of the “work” of hospitality goes on between guests—an idea we might extrapolate out to consider the broader network of hospitable encounters between strangers that constitute the experiences of everyday life (Bell, 2007b). Such a move also takes us away from the “holy trinity,” as Lugosi (2008) suggests, to consider how hospitality is made up in all kinds of encounters in all kinds of spaces.

I want to end by considering another instance of hospitable encounter: the encounter between different disciplines and perspectives that share a common concern with thinking about hospitality. As Pritchard and Morgan (2006) rightly comment, research

agendas have been overly compartmentalized, not least in the areas of leisure, tourism, and hospitality studies, each of which has a different theoretical and methodological biography. Yet for them, “the really interesting research problems are to be found when we combine these fields and their alternative research environments” (Pritchard and Morgan, 2006: 763). Opening out the study of hospitality, perhaps even unconditionally, offers the possibility for myriad hospitable encounters—encounters that stand to enrich both the emerging, multi-disciplinary enterprise of critical hospitality studies and the broader intellectual and practical landscape of shared concerns with ways of knowing and doing hospitality.

### Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Peter Lugosi, Donald McNeill and Mark Jayne for reading and commenting on drafts of this chapter, and for providing or pointing me towards additional sources.

### References

- Aitchison, Cara, C. (2006). “The Critical and the Cultural: Explaining the Divergent Paths of Leisure Studies and Tourism Studies.” *Leisure Studies*, 25(4): 417–422.
- Andrews, Hazel (2005). “Feeling at Home: Embodying Britishness in a Spanish Charter Tourist Resort.” *Tourist Studies*, 5(3): 247–266.
- Aramberri, Julio (2001). “The Host Should Get Lost: Paradigms in the Tourism Theory.” *Annals of Tourism Research*, 28(3): 738–761.
- Barnett, Clive (2005). “Ways of Relating: Hospitality and the Acknowledgement of Otherness.” *Progress in Human Geography*, 29(1): 5–21.
- Bell, David (2007a). “Moments of Hospitality.” In Jennie Germann Molz and Sarah Gibson (Eds.), *Mobilizing Hospitality: The Ethics of Social Relations in a Mobile World* (pp. 29–46). Aldershot: Ashgate.

- Bell, David (2007b). "The Hospitable City: Social Relations in Commercial Spaces." *Progress in Human Geography*, 31(1): 7–22.
- Bell, David (2008). "Destination Drinking: Toward a Research Agenda on Alcotourism." *Drugs: Education, Prevention and Policy*, 15(3): 291–304.
- Bianchini, Franco (1995). "Night Cultures, Night Economies." *Planning Practice and Research*, 10(2): 121–126.
- Bianchini, Franco (2006). "Cultural Policy and City Development." Paper presented at the *International Conference on Cultural Policy Research*. Vienna.
- Bourdain, Anthony (2006). *The Nasty Bits*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Brotherton, Bob (1999). "Towards a Definitive View of the Nature of Hospitality and Hospitality Management." *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 11(4): 165–173.
- Chan, Wun (2005). "A Gift of a Pagoda, the Presence of a Prominent Citizen, and the Possibilities of Hospitality." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 23(1): 11–28.
- Chan, Yuk Wah (2006). "Coming of Age of the Chinese Tourists: The Emergence of Non-Western Tourism and Host-Guest Interactions in Vietnam's Border Tourism." *Tourist Studies*, 6(3): 187–213.
- Chatterton, Paul and Hollands, Robert (2003). *Urban Nightscapes: Youth Cultures, Pleasure Spaces and Corporate Power*. London: Routledge.
- Collins, Dana (2008). "When Sex Work Isn't 'Work': Hospitality, Gay Life, and the Production of Desiring Labor." *Tourist Studies*, 7(2): 115–139.
- Crang, Phil (1994). "It's Showtime: On the Workplace Geographies of Display in a Restaurant in Southeast England." *Environment & Planning D: Society and Space*, 12(4): 675–704.
- Derrida, Jacques (2001). *On Cosmopolitanism and Forgiveness*. London: Routledge.
- Derrida, Jacques and Dufourmantelle, Anne (2000). *Of Hospitality*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Di Domenico, MariaLaura, L. and Lynch, Paul (2007). "Commercial Home Enterprises: Identity, Space and Setting." In Conrad Lashley, Paul Lynch and Alison Morrison (Eds.), *Hospitality: A Social Lens* (pp. 117–126). London: Elsevier.
- Dikeç, Mustafa (2002). "Pera Peras Poros: Longings for Spaces of Hospitality." *Theory, Culture and Society*, 19(1–2): 227–247.
- Duruz, Jean (2000). "A Nice Baked Dinner . . . or Two Roast Ducks from Chinatown? Identity Grazing." *Continuum: Journal of Media and Cultural Studies*, 14(3): 289–301.
- Featherstone, Mike (1991). *Consumer Culture and Postmodernism*. London: Sage.
- Fine, Gary A. (1996). *Kitchens: the Culture of Restaurant Work*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Foster, Derek (2007). "Love Hotels: Sex and the Rhetoric of Themed Spaces." In Scott A. Lukas (Ed.), *The Themed Space: Locating Culture, Nation, and Self* (pp. 167–181). Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- Franck, Karen A. (Ed.) (2005). "Food and the City." Special Issue of *Architectural Design*, 75(3).
- Frears, Stephen (2002). *Dirty Pretty Things*. London: BBC Films.
- Friese, Heidrun (2004). "Spaces of Hospitality." *Angelaki: Journal of the Theoretical Humanities*, 9(2): 67–79.
- Germann Molz, Jennie (2007). "Cosmopolitans on the Couch: Mobile Hospitality and the Internet." In Jennie Germann Molz and Sarah Gibson (Eds.), *Mobilizing Hospitality: The Ethics of Social Relations in a Mobile World* (pp. 65–82). Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Germann Molz, Jennie and Gibson, Sarah (Eds.) (2007). *Mobilizing Hospitality: The Ethics of Social Relations in a Mobile World*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Gibson, Sarah (2006). "The Hotel Business is About Strangers: Border Politics and Hospitable Spaces." In Stephen Frear's *Dirty Pretty Things, Third Text*, 20(6): 693–701.
- Gibson, Sarah (2007). "Abusing our Hospitality: Inhospitableness and the Politics of Deterrence." In Jennie Germann Molz and Sarah Gibson (Eds.), *Mobilizing Hospitality: The Ethics of Social Relations in a Mobile World* (pp. 159–177). Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Hage, Ghassan (1997). "At Home in the Entrails of the West: Multiculturalism, Ethnic Food and Migrant Home-Building." In Helen Grace, Ghassan Hage, Lesley Johnson, Julia Langsworth and Michael Symonds (Eds.), *Home/World: Space, Community and Marginality in Sydney's West* (pp. 99–153). Annandale, NSW: Pluto.

- Hall, Tim and Hubbard, Phil (Eds.) (1998). *The Entrepreneurial City: Geographies of Politics, Regime and Representation*. Chichester: John Wiley.
- Hemmington, Nigel (2007). "From Service to Experience: Understanding and Defining Hospitality." *Service Industries Journal*, 27(6): 747–755.
- Hepple, J., Kipps, M. and Thomson, J. (1990). "The Concept of Hospitality and an Evaluation of its Applicability to the Experience of Hospital Patients." *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 9(4): 305–317.
- Hobbs, Dick, Hadfield, Philip, Lister, Stuart and Winlow, Simon (2003). *Bouncers: Violence and Governance in the Night-time Economy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ingram, Haydn (1999). "Hospitality: A Framework for a Millennial Review." *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 11(4): 140–147.
- Jackson, Peter (2004). "Local Consumption Cultures in a Globalizing World." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 29(3): 165–178.
- Jayne, Mark, Holloway, Sarah and Valentine, Gill (2006). "Drunk and Disorderly: Alcohol, Urban Life and Public Space." *Progress in Human Geography*, 30(4): 451–468.
- Jayne, Mark, Holloway, Sarah and Valentine, Gill (2008). "Geographies of Alcohol, Drinking and Drunkenness: A Review of Progress." *Progress in Human Geography*, 32(2): 247–263.
- Jones, Peter (2004). "Finding the Hospitality Industry? Or Finding Hospitality Schools of Thought?" *Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sport and Tourism Education*, 3(1): 33–45.
- Kant, Immanuel (1795/1996). "Toward Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Project." *Practical Philosophy: the Cambridge Edition of the Works of Immanuel Kant*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Knox, Paul L. (2005). "Creating Ordinary Places: Slow Cities in a Fast World." *Journal of Urban Design*, 10(1): 1–11.
- Lashley, Conrad (2000). "Towards a Theoretical Understanding." In Conrad Lashley and Alison Morrison (Eds.), *In Search of Hospitality: Theoretical Perspectives and Debates* (pp. 1–17). London: Butterworth Heinemann.
- Latham, Alan (2003). "Urbanity, Lifestyle and Making Sense of the New Urban Cultural Economy: Notes from Auckland, New Zealand." *Urban Studies*, 40(9): 1699–1724.
- Latham, Alan and McCormack, Derek (2004). "Moving Cities: Rethinking the Materialities of Urban Geographies." *Progress in Human Geography*, 28(6): 701–724.
- Laurier and Philo (2006a). "Cold Shoulders and Napkins Handed: Gestures of Responsibility." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 31(2): 193–207.
- Laurier and Philo (2006b). "Possible Geographies: A Passing Encounter in a Café." *Area*, 38(3): 353–364.
- Light, Duncan (2000). "Gazing on Communism: Heritage Tourism and Post-Communist Identities in Germany, Hungary and Romania." *Tourism Geographies*, 2(2): 157–176.
- Lugosi, Peter (2007). "Consumer Participation in Commercial Hospitality." *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 1(3): 227–236.
- Lugosi, Peter (2008). "Hospitality Spaces, Hospitable Moments: Consumer Encounters and Affective Experiences in Commercial Settings." *Journal of Foodservice*, 19: 139–149.
- Lugosi, Peter and Lugosi, Krisztina (2008). "The 'Ruin' Bars of Budapest: Urban Decay and the Development of a Genre of Hospitality." Paper presented at the *Council for Hospitality Management Education Research Conference*. Glasgow, May.
- Lukanuski, Mary (1998). "A Place at the Counter: The Onus of Oneness." In Ron Scapp and Brian Seitz (Eds.), *Eating Culture* (pp. 112–120). New York: SUNY Press.
- Lynch, Paul, Di Domenico, Maria L. and Sweeney, Majella (2007). "Resident Hosts and Mobile Strangers: Temporary Exchanges within the Topography of the Commercial Home." In Jennie Germann Molz and Sarah Gibson (Eds.), *Mobilizing Hospitality: The Ethics of Social Relations in a Mobile World* (pp. 121–144). Aldershot: Ashgate.
- McGovern, Mark (2002). "The 'Craic' Market: Irish Theme Bars and the Commodification of Irishness in Contemporary Britain." *Irish Journal of Sociology*, 11(2): 77–98.
- McNaughton, Darlene (2006). "The 'Host' as Uninvited 'Guest': Hospitality, Violence and Tourism." *Annals of Tourism Research*, 33(3): 645–665.
- McNeill, Donald (2008a). "The Airport Hotel as Business Space." *Geografiska Annaler*, forthcoming.

- McNeill, Donald (2008b). "The Hotel and the City." *Progress in Human Geography*, 32(3): 381–396.
- Miele, Mara and Murdoch, Jonathan (2002). "The Practical Aesthetics of Traditional Cuisines: Slow Food in Tuscany." *Sociologica Ruralis*, 42(4): 312–328.
- Montgomery, John (1995). "Urban Vitality and the Culture of Cities." *Planning Practice and Research*, 10(2): 101–109.
- Moore, Roland S. (1995). "Gender and Alcohol use in a Greek Tourist Town." *Annals of Tourism Research*, 22(2): 300–313.
- Morrison, Alison (2002). "Hospitality Research: A Pause for Reflection." *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 4(2): 161–169.
- Morrison, Alison and O'Gorman, Kevin (2008). "Hospitality Studies and Hospitality Management: A Symbiotic Relationship." *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 27(2): 214–221.
- Parker, David (1994). "Encounters Across the Counter: Young Chinese People in Britain." *New Community*, 20(4): 621–634.
- Pritchard and Morgan (2006). "Hotel Babylon? Exploring Hotels as Liminal Sites of Transition and Transgression." *Tourism Management*, 27(6): 762–772.
- Ritzer, George (2007). "Inhospitable Hospitality?" In Conrad Lashley, Paul Lynch and Alison Morrison (Eds.), *Hospitality: a Social Lens* (pp. 129–140). London: Elsevier.
- Roberts, Marion and Turner, Chris (2005). "Conflicts of Liveability in the 24-hour City: Learning from 48 Hours in the Life of London's Soho." *Journal of Urban Design*, 10(2): 171–193.
- Rogers, Richard (1999). *Towards an Urban Renaissance*. London: E & FN Spon.
- Scott, David G. (2006). "Socialising the Stranger: Hospitality as a Relational Reality." Unpublished MA thesis, University of Otago.
- Seifert, A.M. and Messing, K. (2006). "Cleaning up after Globalization: An Ergonomic Analysis of Work Activity of Hotel Cleaners." *Antipode*, 38(4): 557–578.
- Sherlock, Kirsty (2001). "Revisiting the Concept of Hosts and Guests." *Tourist Studies*, 1(3): 271–295.
- Sheller, Mimi and Urry, John (2006). "The New Mobilities Paradigm." *Environment and Planning A*, 38(2): 207–226.
- Silk, Michael and Amis, John (2005). "Sport Tourism, Cityscapes and Cultural Politics." *Sport in Society*, 8(2): 280–301.
- Smith, Mick and Duffy, Rosaleen (2003). *The Ethics of Tourism Development*. London: Routledge.
- Taylor, S. and Edgar, D. (1996). "Hospitality Research: The Emperor's New Clothes?" *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 15(3): 211–227.
- Telfer, Elizabeth (2000). "The Philosophy of Hospitality." In Conrad Lashley and Alison Morrison (Eds.), *In Search of Hospitality: Theoretical Perspectives and Debates* (pp. 44–52). London: Butterworth Heinemann.
- Tufts (2006). "We Make It Work: The Cultural Transformation of Hotel Workers in the City." *Antipode*, 38(4): 350–373.
- Walton, John, K. (2000). "The Hospitality Trades: A Social History." In Conrad Lashley and Alison Morrison (Eds.), *In Search of Hospitality: Theoretical Perspectives and Debates* (pp. 56–74). London: Butterworth Heinemann.
- West, Brad (2006). "Consuming National Themed Environments Abroad: Australian Working Holidaymakers and Symbolic National Identity in 'Aussie' Theme Pubs." *Tourist Studies*, 6(2): 139–155.
- Wharton, Annabel (2007). "Commodifying Space: Hotels and Pork Bellies." In Conrad Lashley, Paul Lynch and Alison Morrison (Eds.), *Hospitality: A Social Lens* (pp. 101–116). London: Elsevier.
- Williams, Alistair (2000). "Consuming Hospitality: Learning From Post-Modernism?" In Conrad Lashley and Alison Morrison (Eds.), *In Search of Hospitality: Theoretical Perspectives and Debates* (pp. 217–234). London: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Zukin, Sharon (1982). *Loft Living: Culture and Capital in Urban Change*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.