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Abstract

Lifestyles are continually changing. Whilst eating away from the ‘home’ was traditionally predicated on need; the consumer in contemporary society is eating out more regularly and for an increasing variety of motivations. Thus the operationalisation of hospitality, historically located as central to the provision of food away from home has become increasingly contested. The realisation of hospitality was historically understood to be a function of its structural role as a socio-cultural construction within many culturally ascribed value systems. It was hospitality that enabled the socialisation of the stranger; the stranger defined by exoticism. However improved technologies have altered the consumption landscape. The contemporary consumer (in western countries) is now no longer the stranger to be provided with hospitality, but a buyer of the materiality of hospitality; namely food, beverage, and the spaces of consumption.

There is ongoing debate as to the existence of hospitality within consumer society. As the products associated with hospitality, namely the meal, become increasingly enmeshed within the economic system, the existence of hospitality is called into question. Thus it has been suggested, the notion of hospitality may not in fact exist in a commercial form. It is this statement that is called into question as the central focus of this thesis.

This thesis presents an analysis based upon substantial secondary research carried out across a range of disciplines. The objective was to initiate a process of knowledge synthesis, whereby the episteme of hospitality would be advanced. By reviewing
literature outside of the tourism and hospitality academy, the process enabled the questioning of accepted realities within that academy.

Through viewing a ‘history’ of hospitality across a range of disciplines, it is suggested that the notion of hospitality may be bought into existence subject to a number of criteria. These, it is proposed, do not limit hospitality to the non commercial domain, but suggest that if enacted within these specific parameters, can be realised within the commercial environment. Many of the issues surrounding the performance of commercial hospitality are as a result of its reification. However, whilst the materiality of hospitality is recognised, it is hospitality as act, or way of being that ensures the potential for its realisation.

The provision and consumption of hospitality in the commercial domain is problematic. However, if achieved the performance of hospitality may be recognised as an agent of enchantment, and, as such presents opportunities for mutually fulfilling experiences between social actors.
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Chapter One: Introduction

1.1 Background

An increasing number of individuals in the developed world consume food, beverage and accommodation products outside the home (Cetron et al., 2006). This demand has in turn led to a rise in both the number and style of outlets satisfying our hunger for these products and experiences (Jones, 2006). Restaurants, bars, cafes, bistros and fast-food outlets proliferate. Our choice it seems has never been so varied.

Given that eating within the home is associated with the everyday (Murcott, 1983), it is possible that the growth in eating outside the home is also becoming increasingly routinised. Thus, if this is considered within the context of increased accessibility, eating outside the home is becoming part of the everyday. Where once a visit to a restaurant was considered a special or celebratory occasions, many consumers in the developed world now eat out on a daily basis, if only in a workplace cafeteria. Our expectations and performances therefore become increasingly contingent upon past experiences. Historically, food and beverage as a tangible product and as an essential element for life became a necessary focus that may have dominated our experience. However, increasingly, service and space is considered a characteristic of the
consumption process that offers opportunities for both enhanced experience for the consumer, and competitive advantage for the organisation (Pine and Gilmore, 1999).

When viewed from within the prevailing capitalist economic system, those operators providing food, beverage and accommodation are considered to fall under the umbrella of the hospitality industry. This is a somewhat recent change in nomenclature, from that of the hotel and catering industry which was prevalent to the 1970s in both academia and the industry itself (Brotherton, 2005). This change in naming seems to be contemporaneous with the dramatic rise in eating away from home. Most of us have at some stage provided or been the recipient of hospitality, whether within the commercial context or, within the home. It is from these social encounters that we have constructed our understanding of the present-day meaning(s) of hospitality.

However, the appropriation of the term hospitality as representative of a commercial imperative, may somewhat problematise the cultural values and performances that underpin the traditional (alternative) notions of hospitality through the ages; an issue that becomes a primary focus of this thesis.

1.2 Research Context

1.2.1 Industry perspective

The consumption of food (meals) outside the home continues to grow. Consequently the economic impact of the hospitality industry is becoming more
important to national economies. Sales of food from the restaurant sector in the United States are expected to top US$ 500 billion in 2006, equal to 4% GDP. The industry is also the largest private sector employer, with some 12.5 million individuals being employed on a part, full-time and casual basis (National Restaurant Association, 2006). Within the United Kingdom, some 1.6 million people are employed within the hospitality sector, which in conjunction with tourism related employment constitutes some 4.3% of the total workforce (United Kingdom Government, 2004). The importance of the hospitality sector to the tourism industry is indicated in a Government strategy document, *Tomorrow’s Tourism Today* developed in conjunction with key industry stakeholders, including the British Hospitality Association (BHA). In it Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport, Tessa Jowell states amongst her key objectives ‘sustained and sustainable growth… [a]nd – most of all…the customer at the very heart of all we do’ (United Kingdom Government, 2004 pg. 2). The report specifically recognises the ‘accommodation and hospitality providers’ as part of the tourism industry whilst restaurants are considered as part ‘of the attractiveness’ (United Kingdom Government, 2004 pg. 9), of Britain to both domestic, and international tourists. However the industry both within the United Kingdom (UK), and globally faces a number of issues.

Perhaps the most significant of these issues is that increased demand from consumers has resulted in staff shortages in many parts of the world. For example, the Hotel Association of New Zealand (HANZ) suggests the most significant issue facing the hospitality industry in New Zealand is ‘finding, training and retaining appropriate staff’ (HANZ, 2005 np.). Similarly, within the UK issues relating to product and service quality
in the hospitality sector are considered a result of low skill levels, high staff turnover and staff shortages (Cotton, 2002). The Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (QCA) have developed a strategy in conjunction with industry organisations, to combat staff shortages through increased training. Central to the success of the strategy is a workforce that is ‘flexible, skilled and knowledgeable about the industry’ (QCA, 2003 pg. 7).

Increasing tourist numbers combined with a burgeoning domestic market auger well for the economic success of the hospitality industry. However, it is suggested that it is those organisations that develop a workforce that are not only skilled and knowledgeable about the industry, but more importantly understand the nature of hospitality itself that will meet the objectives of sustainability and guest focus (United Kingdom Government, 2004)

1.2.2 Social perspective

Whilst dining out was once seen as an activity limited to special occasions or necessity, it has now become a regular leisure activity. Moreover, eating out is increasingly recognised as a means for establishing social distinction (Warde and Martens, 2000). Dining outside the home may also be recognised as the performance of economic consumption in public and thus representative of Veblen’s (Veblen, 1994) concept of conspicuous consumption, offering up a particularly visible and public display of consumption. The Michelin Restaurant guide recently launched its first New York guide to the delight of the New York industry and restaurant patrons, but to the
consternation of British Chefs (Caterer and Hotelkeeper, 2005). The subsequent furore was directed at the loss of status anticipated by the awarding of a greater number of stars to New York restaurants, than their counterpoints in London.

As the material component of hospitality, the meal, is consumed on an increasing basis, the meanings of the performances associated both with the tangible product and the performance of consumption become open to negotiation. It is the resultant changes that this thesis addresses.

1.2.3 Academic Context

There is a relative paucity of literature regarding the performance of hospitality within the tourism literature as compared to other accounts of travels and behaviours outside of the home environment (Edensor, 2004)). The study of the intersection between food, hospitality and tourism as secondary to the study of other touristic phenomenon may be due in part, to hospitality being perceived as everyday or routinised consumer behaviour within a modern framework, while tourism has often been presented as non-routine, although this notion is increasingly being challenged (Cetron et al., 2006). Moreover, the provision of hospitality and, in particular, food (or the meal) is often regarded as a support rather than primary tourism activity (Quan and Wang, 2004). The study of the phenomena of hospitality within tourism in the commercial domain could be said to be somewhat marginalised. Much of the study of hospitality within tourism literature to date has investigated the social impacts of tourism, (Smith and Brent, 2001,
Tucker, 2003), intercultural behaviour (Reisinger and Turner, 2002) or hospitality as the support and services constituent (Jones, 2006). Food and beverage, as the characteristic of the materiality of hospitality (see Chapter Three) have been recognised as a subject for use as a tourism product in their own right (Boniface, 2003, Hall et al., 2003), resulting in the potential for economic benefits, particularly in disadvantaged rural areas. Whilst there is a relatively recent growth in literature recognising the performance of commercial hospitality in a tourism context (Coleman and Crang, 2002, Lynch, 2005, Lynch, 2005, Tucker and Keen, 2005, Tucker and Lynch, 2005), there remains an opposition to the appropriateness of the host-guest paradigm in a commercial sense (Aramberri, 2001). This perspective, however, fails to take into account the sociological interpretations of hospitality and situates the industry as a service provider, further suggesting that the economic imperative prohibits the performance of “true” hospitality.

It might be suggested that the hospitality academy does itself no favours in this regard, with a research focus dominated by an industry prerogative (Botterill, 2000). This thesis therefore sets out to add to the literature relating to the hospitality ontology, which it is hoped may play some part in enhancing our understandings of the host-guest paradigm within the hospitality industry. Figure 1.1 locates the key dimensions considered central to the hospitality academy; this thesis places its output as adding to the search for theoretical paradigms, which it is suggested may play a role in the ongoing development of hospitality education.
1.3 Rationale

It might be suggested that an increasing aestheticisation of food has led to a dislocation of production from consumption. The consumer is not only able to purchase global foods and products whether in season or not, but they have the means available to (re)process these as numerous cultural expressions. Food is recognised as having the ability to establish identity and congruently, act as a sign value, alerting others to our
place in society (Bourdieu, 1984). Food acts to position us within the world. We become recognised as global citizens or, not, our relative cosmopolitanism marked by our consumption practices.

There has been a marked increase in consumption of meals outside the home, notably in the quasi-public space of the restaurant, café and bistro. Historically access was limited by both capital and ‘taste’. The industrialisation and subsequent rationalisation of the hospitality industry has ensured the massification of eating out. Hospitality as the conduit for the consumption of the meal therefore becomes enmeshed in the commercial paradigm. Analysis thus becomes dominated by an economic imperative. Additionally the routinisation of dining outside the home, places the provision of the meal as everyday, of, until recently, marginal interest for academic study (Wood, 1995).

Whilst the minutiae of everyday behaviour are studied by (some) sociologists, and other social scientists, the have become somewhat overwhelmed within tourism and hospitality studies. Given that tourism may be understood to represent a break from routine, this might be expected. However, as Franklin and Crang(2001)suggest, the boundary between the everyday and the holiday is becoming increasingly blurred. Indeed, where visiting the local Thai restaurant may have been at some stage recognised as the exotic and a break from routine, it is now relegated to the everyday. We demand ingredients from the local supermarket, and soon the exotic becomes consigned to the minutiae of daily life: our shopping baskets replete with kaffir lime leaves, and the loaf of ‘sliced white’.
But what of the human interactions: the *hospitality* prefixing the *industry*? The provision of food and drink outside the home is central to the concept of hospitality. However, the reification of hospitality has resulted in what was once a highly interpersonal relationship between the guest and host becoming one of guest as consumer, the individual becomes located outside the performance, as audience. A further result of globalisation has been the rise of the so-called “non-person”, the host who ‘does not interact with others as a person, and perhaps more importantly is not treated by others as a person’ (Ritzer, 2003 pg. 59-60).

Does this then suggest that hospitality as a way of being within an industrial context is dead? If tourists are, as some commentators have argued, increasingly searching for an authentic experience (Cohen, 1995), what role might (re)construction of hospitality as intersubjective host-guest performance play? Conversely, it might be suggested that international tourism offers opportunities for hospitality to find itself, for although the performance may be scripted as a consequence of globalisation and internationalisation; the performance of hospitality is potentially that between different cultures. Furthermore hospitality is realised within a dynamic system that is subject to numerous influences including the interaction between those peoples with different cultural behaviours (Hofstede, 2001).
1.4 Aims and Objectives

Hospitality has become somewhat of a catch-all phrase imbued with multiple meanings. By undertaking a multidimensional, critical analysis of hospitality this work will seek to move towards a more “inclusive” conceptualisation of hospitality. It is hoped this process will allow hospitality to be recognised as both capable of commercialisation, whilst remaining within its roots as a “way of being”: thereby ensuring that the materiality of hospitality will not necessarily preclude its performativity (see section 4.6).

The dialectical nature of hospitality is used as a point of departure in this work, where the host-guest nexus and the hostility inherent within hospitality become reconstructed within the context of international tourism. In this thesis hospitality is located as the framework within which the tourist as consumer is socialised to become the guest. This framework identifies the contingencies upon which the sovereignty of the host, placed as culturally distinct, will enable hospitality to be performed as intersubjective.

The objective of this thesis is therefore to further our understanding of hospitality within the commercial context and specifically

- To conceptualise hospitality within an inclusive paradigm
- To explore the interiority of hospitality
• To examine the cultural and social influences of contemporary consumer society upon the consumption of the meal outside the home

• To develop a framework that allows the socialisation of the individual as consumer, whilst realising hospitality as a “way of being”

• And to, explore the tensions inherent between hospitality viewed in a commercial context, and, conversely a non-commercial context

The process thus seeks to place the host-guest performance within a theoretical paradigm that is inclusive; one that views hospitality in the commercial sense as both capable of materiality and additionally as capable of becoming a performative (act).

1.5 Philosophy

Whilst this thesis does not contain an empirical research component, it remains important to situate the academic analysis within a methodological framework. Hospitality as a field of enquiry has been chosen as the location from which the analysis will progress. It has been argued that there is a requirement within the field of hospitality to engage in ‘agenda setting [and] conceptual research’ (Jones, 2004). As such, a non-empirical or theoretical research approach has been adopted. It is posited that a contribution to the body of knowledge can be made by:
‘[D]rawing on established ideas and concepts from published and unpublished sources especially the literature, and through a process of reflection and discourse develops, extends or in some other way qualify the previous work to create new explanations, insights and theories which provide better or fuller explanations of the issues and the relationships being studied’ (Remenyi and Mony, 2004 pg. 330).

By approaching the research in this manner it is hoped that the underlying social realities of hospitality will be teased from current thinking across a number of disciplines. Moreover, it allows questions of existence to be posed. Whilst we talk of hospitality within the hospitality industry, the question should be asked, does it, or can it, exist in a commercial sense?

Reification of hospitality, that is, the objectification of hospitality, has resulted in the suggestion that it is able to be “consumed” on a regular basis. It is this understanding of hospitality as the everyday, whilst also offered as mythological and ritualised behaviour, that presents a challenge to the ontological underpinnings dominating the existing tourism and hospitality literatures (see Section 1.2.3). Whilst this ontology encourages a materialist and determinist approach, it is suggested the tourism-hospitality nexus offers an opportunity to use a cultural epistemology to develop an understanding of how hospitality may be regarded as a “way of being”. As has been shown above, the hospitality ontology has been directed by an industry prerogative, resulting in a (necessarily) positivist tradition within the field of hospitality enquiry. However much this somewhat one-dimensional perspective may dominate our understanding of the
hospitality industry; hospitality is in fact a complex and dynamic construction. Moreover, it can be considered to be made up of intersubjective (Crouch, 2002), interpersonal, fluid relationships (Selwyn, 2000). This presents a challenge to current epistemic boundaries, suggesting the need to ‘search for a more satisfactory epistemological solution’ (Botterill, 2001 pg. 212).

A problem with the development of a hospitality epistemology is that it (quite rightly) treats hospitality within the boundaries of structure and agency. However, this neglects the effect of culture and agency (Archer, 1996). Archer further suggests that structure, culture and agency are analytically distinct, although they are intertwined in social life. Hospitality would benefit from analysis as both duality (Giddens, 1984) and dualism (Archer, 1995) for, as Ritzer (Ritzer and Goodman, 2004a) suggests, there are times when it may be beneficial to separate structure and action to investigate their interactions upon one another, whilst at other times look at the inseparability of structure, culture and agency. The focus of this work is therefore on developing an understanding of how cultural conditioning affects sociocultural interaction, and conversely the results of social conditioning (structure) on social interaction. Furthermore, this analysis is initiated from a historical position as it is suggested that ‘both past and future are living in the present. Whatever human beings do in the present is decisively influenced by the past and by the future’ (Markovic, 1974 pg. 10). Time is therefore placed as central to the establishment of theory, rather than something that is allied to the process. Thereby, it is argued by Archer (1996), representing the ‘methodological key to the experiential problem of…being conditioned to do things one way but being able to conceive of doing
them differently’. Cultural action, wherever it is situated historically, takes place in the context of innumerable interrelated theories, beliefs and ideas which have developed prior to it, and as will be seen, exert a conditional influence upon it (Ritzer and Goodman, 2004a). It is possible that hospitality’s antecedents have a priori, legitimised its industrialisation in contemporary consumer society.

This thesis therefore recognises the usefulness of both analytical dualism and duality. A morphogenetic approach (Archer, 1995), is the process wherein complex interchanges lead not only to a change in the structure of the system but also to an end product a “structural elaboration”. Hospitality will thus be located as culturally/socially conditioned and subject to cultural/social interactions that result in cultural and social elaborations. Where necessary these interrelations are recognised as inextricably linked and is thus interrogated within a structural paradigm.

The individual is recognised as both agent and acting within structure that is agential as illustrated in figure 1.2. It is the outcomes of the dynamics within the system that places the individual actor as both influenced by, and in turn influencing this system that this analysis will progress. The meal, as situated in foodways (figure 1.2) and hospitality that are acted upon by both the actor and act within the bounds of the system.
1.6 Thesis Structure

This chapter has discussed the conflict between hospitality as a culturally constructed performance enacted as a value laden response to the hostile potentialities inherent within the unknown. In addition hospitality has been situated as the social construction manifested as rationalised, accessible consumption behaviours. Moreover this chapter has suggested that our understandings of hospitality are further contested by its location as a commercialised practice.
Chapter Two introduces the reader to the centrality of food and eating within society. Food is placed within a structural framework, as representative of binary oppositions between nature and culture. Food when considered from a biological perspective is essential to human survival. Moreover the social construction of the meal will be recognised as situated spatially and temporally as embedded with coded symbols of social meaning and social events (Douglas, 1999).

The theoretical and socio-cultural understandings and meanings associated within hospitality as a construct are introduced in Chapter Three. It is argued that hospitality can be considered both as a philosophy and socio-cultural construction. The discussion locates hospitality as historicised, therefore allowing the interrogation of frequently contested understandings of hospitality. Mobility in various guises has impacted on boundaries of hospitality. The chapter considers the effects that social and geographical mobility have had in developing our contemporary understandings of hospitality. Hospitality is considered a relational reality, and thus, is dependant upon human actors. The performance(s) of hospitality are examined in order to establish under what conditions hospitality can exist, this includes the determination of hospitality as a codified institution.

Chapter Four locates hospitality within contemporary consumer society. Hospitality has not only been impacted upon by globalisation, but in turn has acted as an agent for globalisation. The processes inherent within modernity have facilitated the industrialisation of hospitality. The materiality (product and service) of hospitality has therefore come to dominate hospitality as a way of being. The notion of consumer
sovereignty further problematises the performance of hospitality as established in Chapter Three.

Tourism and hospitality are inextricably intertwined. Chapter Five therefore situates hospitality within the context of international tourism. The provision of food, beverage and accommodation are essential to all tourists, whether this is produced and consumed in a private or commercial sense. However, the provision of food and beverage has been placed as an impediment to travel (Cohen and Avieli, 2004), and merely a function of the everyday, in effect routinized behaviour (Quan and Wang, 2004).

Hospitality is contextualised within the host-guest nexus. Along with the hospitality industry, it is suggested that the tourism industry, subjugates the host and places the consumer/tourist as sovereign. Chapter 5 places the performance of hospitality as central to the interaction between the tourist and ‘other’ or, conversely, host and ‘other’. Issues surrounding how actors are defined is discussed, including the notion of socialisation, host as broker, and ‘host’ as collective and this discussion is extended to include the meanings associated with material hospitality (as the meal) and its consumption.

Chapter Six offers a synthesis of the previous chapters. Hospitality is (re)defined within the parameters of its product and as a way of “being”. Moreover it will be suggested, tourism has the potential to act as an agent of (re)enchantment. When the performance of hospitality is (re)located away from the everyday to the exotic, opportunities arise for spontaneous, rather than tightly scripted, unthinking interaction. The performance of hospitality becomes intersubjective. Tourism offers the spatial and temporal agency to (re)construct hospitality as both material and a way of being. In effect
both the host and guest benefit from the interaction in a meaningful way. A conceptual
schema of hospitality is presented in this final chapter that identifies hospitality as a
dynamic process, able to be both commercialised and realised as a way of being.

By locating the provision of the meal outside the everyday, and with tourism as
agent, it will be argued that (‘true’) hospitality may allow the host-guest interaction, to
become more than a commercial transaction.

The following chapter offers an analysis of the consumption food within a
structural framework. This places the site of consumption both within the public and
private spheres.
Chapter Two: The ‘Meal’ as a way of understanding the world

2.1 Introduction

To identify a food, one has to “think” it, to understand its place in the world and therefore to understand the world.

Claude Fischler (1988 pg. 284)

Using food as a means to understand the world, as suggested by Fischler, follows on from Lévi-Strauss’s (1978) assertion that food can be good to eat only if it is good ‘to think’. The following discussion places food, not only as individual food stuffs that are biologically ingested, but the consumption of food located within the sociocultural construction of the meal. As individuals we are instructed from an early age in what to eat, what foods are healthy, what foods are taboo/unclean and what to avoid. We are also taught how, when and where to eat (see 2.3 for a discussion of how this is realised). Thus a daily regime is constructed around us. For example, individuals respond to the persuasiveness of government advice on what to eat backed up with the (supposed) legitimacy of current medical research - in effect the power and influence suggested by ‘causal consensus’ (Archer, 1995 pg. xviii). Yet our eating habits continue to become less regimented with the development of new patterns of food consumption. It has been suggested for example, that the family meal as everyday, socialised and codified behaviour is disappearing (Mestdag, 2005). The consumption of food has been regarded as mundane behaviour (Schröder, 2003) situated as it is in the everyday. However, eating
as a normative behaviour is being challenged in contemporary society. Food (or the meal) thus becomes a point of reference from which we might view the everyday world.

Whilst the consumption of food and beverage remains essential to the survival of all humankind, the modes of production, channels of distribution and systems within which food and beverages are consumed, are continually changing. This chapter therefore places an analysis of the social construction of the meal as central within this system of consumption.

The meal experience does not exist in isolation and over time has both influenced and been influenced by cultural and social change. Food and cultural identity whilst being inextricably linked are fraught with political tension. Early academic study of food focused upon the meanings and structures, including classification and practices associated with food, located as an object of consumption, and for the most part situated within the domestic environment (Sloan, 2004). This in part may be a reflection of both the industrial epoch, and the anthropological bias of many of the studies on the consumptive practices associated with food. Contemporary (western) culture however elevates the performance (and importance) of consumption (see Chapter Four for a discussion of the role of consumption in contemporary western society). As such the study of food and beverages has developed to include characteristics that acknowledge the act and experience of the consumption performance. Additionally, this includes spaces of performance bordered between private and public spheres, a theme visited in a number of recent anthologies concurrent with this (re)placement of food in contemporary
society including the politics of food (Watson and Caldwell, 2005), and the role of public spaces and messages of taste in culinary consumption (Sloan, 2004).

There are numerous activities and functions associated with the production and consumption of foodstuffs as a process. Yoder (1972) has suggested that these processes represent “foodways”, consisting of ‘activities surrounding the procurement, preservation, preparation, presentation, performance and consumption of food’ (Long, 2000 pg 144). Along with the performance and consumption of food this chapter will ‘sketch out’ key themes relating to the consumption of food including both materialist and structural viewpoints and following Scholliers (2001), the role of company, the location, the meaning and the art of eating and drinking (Scholliers, 2001).

That food and its consumption plays such an important role in our everyday lives, both at home and away from home is undisputed. By developing an understanding of this contested behaviour this chapter posits a framework that facilitates the realisation of the meal experience as a lens through which other social phenomenon might be studied. The chapter concludes with a proposition that the meal experience in its commercial manifestation, external to the private sphere, is firmly located within the bounds of commercial hospitality. It is this phenomenon (of hospitality), which is further interrogated in Chapter Four.
2.2 Food in Society

One of the fastest growing topics in sociology is the study of food systems (Germov and Williams, 2004). This dramatic turn of interest is readily observed in contemporary society through the rise of food to the vanguard of popular culture, manifest through the myriad of omnipresent television programmes, film, publications and food images (Dicks, 2003). The ethical dilemma of what to eat, when to eat and with whom and where, are constantly being reappraised. Whether watching television or reading print media, contested images are apparent. Juxtaposed with images of excess; ‘buckets of chicken’ and unlimited buffets, are those promoting the ‘guilt of excess’: Jenny Craig vies against images of poverty broadcast on the nightly news (often watched whilst eating dinner). As a result we are continually expanding the reference groups to which we approve (willingly or not) access, in turn leading to pluralistic consumption (Bauman and May, 2001).

That the academic study of food and its consumption is in its infancy may be put down to its perceived lack of legitimacy (Germov and Williams, 2004). This may in part be considered allied to the twin issues of food as the everyday, and the overtly (historically) feminine focus of its production in most societies, both considered as lacking in academic authority until recently (Germov and Williams, 2004). Previous studies focused on the communicative properties of food. Among such studies was the understanding of food as a language, situating food as an unconscious mental structure (Lévi-Strauss, 1964). Likewise Douglas (1984) viewed the meal as a series of codes with
respect to the messages related to normative beliefs, social constructions and the crossing of boundaries.

The consumption and performance of food does not exist in a vacuum. The performance aspect of the consumption of food has become both a social marker (Barthes, 1997), and recognised as a harbinger of cultural change. Manners and the construction of etiquette, along with the development of “rules of engagement”, are regarded as signifiers of the process of civilisation (Elias, 1978, Mennell et al., 1992), and situate the consumption of food directly in the social milieu. Visser (1993) argues that the consumption and behaviours associated with food are socially constructed and that subsequent codification has established these as sets of rules that exist within the cultural system. It can be suggested that these exist due to the essential nature of food to human existence, and thus security is to be maintained through structured and culturally controlled processes (Beardsworth and Keil, 1997). Whilst these processes apply to security, they can also be considered to act as channels of communication.

2.3 Food for thought: understanding food and eating as discourse

The notion that food is central to sustaining humankind has been influential in the search for a ‘universal characteristic’ (Wood, 1995) through which to develop a structural analysis of differing cultures. Whilst Levi-Strauss (1965), produced a pioneering treatise on the study of food in culture, it might be regarded as somewhat limited in respect of its strong grounding in structuralist theory. The “Culinary Triangle” (Lévi-Strauss, 1964),
central to Levi-Strauss’s thesis of food as a language placed the binary linguistic oppositions of ‘raw and cooked’ to translate those of ‘nature and culture’. Wood (Wood, 1995) infers that this consequently resulted in a tool to facilitate interpretation of cultural constructs, such as foodstuffs, while (Ashley, 2004 pg29) suggests that using these binary oppositions implies that structuralism posits that ‘divergent cultural phenomena enjoy common structural features’.

Food and the performance of the meal might also be presented as discursive communication in the Sausserian sense. If a structuralist perspective is developed further, by a (re)appropriation of food as *langue* (as a system of language) and the performance of food (eating) as *parole* (the act of speaking) (Saussure et al., 1960), food as mental structure (Lévi-Strauss, 1964) is realised as language, with eating recognised as *parole*. Food thus becomes a language, communicated with others through eating. Thus food and eating might be seen as ‘the indispensable duo capturing the distinction between objects and objectives’ (Gordon, 2004 pg. 85), of consumption analysis. If parole is further taken as ‘being nonreversible’ (Lévi-Strauss, 1963 pg. 203), then outside of biological intervention the social processes inherent within the consumption of food are also irreversible. As a result, it might be suggested that this further strengthens the structuralist interpretation of foodways. The detritus from the breaking down of the cultural and social structures surrounding the consumption of foodstuffs could therefore be considered associated with the mis-understanding of eating (as) language.

Whilst the work of Levi-Strauss is considered an important contribution to the structural analysis of food (Mennell, 1985), a suggested weakness is the assumption that
society and cultures remain static, while his thesis also neglects the ‘biological, geographical and technological factors that… [are] seen as necessary to any abstract ‘symbolic’ associations attached to food within a given social context’ (Wood, 1995 pg. 6). What is more, the structuralist position tends towards being ahistorical, neglecting the processes that have led to the development of these structures. Moreover, in attempting to search for universalities between cultures, Levi-Strauss and other structuralists neglect the celebration of difference, positioning objectivism as dominant and as a result, minimising the role of agent and agency (Ritzer and Goodman, 2004a). As Derrida (1992 pg. 9-10) suggests, there is ‘no culture or cultural identity without this difference with itself’, this is extended by (Saint-Paul, 1997 pg. 122) whereby, in effect it is culture of itself, that creates difference. The cultural structure within which food and eating are located is porous (Ifversen, 2002), and as such the systems of food and eating should be considered heterogeneous, subject to both external and internal agents (There are issues associated with the fixity or stasis of culture when food and eating is located within the context of tourism, this is discussed in Chapter Five).

It is these social contexts or ‘small scale relations’ that are both a result of codification, and in turn sustain the meal, that is the basis of Douglas’s (1999) analysis of the meal (Douglas, 1999 pg. 232), questioning why the meal is enacted in one way rather than another. Douglas suggests that the meal ‘like talking is a patterned activity, and the daily menu may be made to yield an analogy with linguistic form’ and as such can be placed in a framework of categories (Douglas, 1999 pg. 232). This supports Saussurean notions of structural linguistics put forward earlier in this discussion. However, this also
raises issues of what Gross (1980) has labelled as ‘spatialisation of thought and experience’ (Felts and Jos, 2000 pg. 524) resulting in the loss of historical context, where there is an immediacy of behaviour as eating moves from performance to performance without a sense of continuity. The focus of understanding becomes one of now, without understanding how shared histories and experiences have impacted on, and resulted in the contemporary experience.

Although food as a product differs between (and increasingly within) cultures, there are a remarkable number of semantic similarities. Research carried out by Rozin (Pliner and Rozin, 2000), on 18 differing native speakers, across a range of language and geographical areas suggested 17 of 18 had a term for meal, and the majority have corresponding terms for the recognisable (western) components of the meal experience.

Food is also the focus of many recent sociological studies that have illuminated broader themes in contemporary sociology literature. Ritzer (1993), drawing heavily from Weber, in developing his McDonaldization thesis, which posits the role fast food processes may play in the rationalization of contemporary society. Moreover, he argues that these processes have ‘penetrated most nations’ (Ritzer, 2001 pg 163). The suggestion that social structure is dominating individual agency however, is relegated to the realms of industrialization. Beck (1994) suggests that such arguments support the notion that ‘in reflexive modernity, individuals have become even freer of structure’ and are required to ‘redefine structure…reinvent society and politics’ (pg. 176).
To suggest that there may be somewhat of a polarization in the literature is aptly demonstrated by Wood’s (1995) in depth analysis of the key early protagonists in the debate on food and socio-cultural issues. Wood’s highlighting of societal fluctuations and how structural analysis may or may not allow for such fluctuations is central to the current theme of this thesis as it offers a framework from which to analyse the changes in social institutions dealing with food. Wood (1995 pg. 36, after Mennell 1985) suggests that ‘tensions exist between complex social trends and phenomena, and that it is difficult to delineate a neat, uniform model or description of what is going on’ thus leading to the conclusion that a structuralist interpretation of food consumption may be too simplistic, if not fundamentally flawed. Wood quite rightly argues that there must be a compromise whereby ‘… [a] theoretical resolution, or at least development should be achievable’ (Wood, 1995 pg 43). Central to the continuing debate on the role of food in contemporary society is the problematic nature of the consumption of food as combing both the material and cultural worlds, thus making claims on structuralist, materialist and developmentalist theoretical positions.

If one is to accept this supposition, does it then suggest that the consumption of food in both its materialist and structural guise, play a supporting role in the construction (and maintenance) of Weber’s notion “iron cage” (Weber, 1930/ 2001)? Or might it be that food may indeed encourage the freedom of individual determination? In order to understand how the tensions implicit in both the consumption of food, and more specifically the construction of the meal experience may be interpreted, it is necessary to understand the meanings both placed on, and taken from, these processes.
To date the discussion has followed a primarily (and necessarily) structuralist perspective. Whilst the discussion has oscillated between food as a language and the understanding of food situated within cultural boundaries, to legitimise the meal as an experience within contemporary society it is essential to understand the basis from which a meal is socially constructed.

Whilst an analysis of the underlying structural language of food is of interest in the wider sense, for the purpose of this thesis, the focus must turn to developing an understanding of the wider cultural processes involved in the consumption of the meal. If the meal may be seen as representative of the home and formation of identity, including gendered relationships, between public and private domains (Ashley, 2004), then the meal might rightly be considered a barometer of social circumstance and change. Subsequently, the discussion now turns to an analysis of the meal as both an entity, and as an experience.

2.4 Construction of the Meal

The meal may be considered to be firmly fixed within the minutiae of the everyday (Korthals, 2004). This section seeks to analyse the boundaries of the meal experience as the everyday, and conversely as the extra-ordinary, located in time and space.
Whilst many of the theoretical concepts relating to the understanding of the consumption of food are associated with individual food products, until recently few concepts have been developed that involve the consumption of these products in the most common form, that of the meal. As discussed above Douglas (1999) defined the meal from a grammatical context, thus situating the meal as rigidly defined; the performance of the meal proscribed by structural power. However, it can be suggested that when analysing the meal, it needs to be viewed as situated within a framework including cultural, structural and agential imperatives as shown in Figure 2.1. Structural characteristics include biological requirements, including the nutritional guidelines, advice and education, as well as ascribed behaviours within which the meal is consumed. These include accepted notions of meal ‘times’ and how we differentiate between a meal and a snack for example.

Figure 2.1 Analytical Framework
It is suggested that defining a meal is problematic in part due to the varied understandings ascribed across disciplinary boundaries. Mäkelä (2000) argues for the role culture plays in legitimizing nutritional attributes of meals. However, this must be understood within the context of time and ongoing cultural change (Crotty and Germov, 2004), as can be seen with contemporary nutritional ‘fads’. Likewise, the notion of history may be affixed to the ‘proper’ meal, through both notions of tradition and heritage. Murcott (1983), in her study on meal preparation in South Wales, associates the continuity of the meal to both notions of social bonding (the family) and physical components of the meal, and suggests that a ‘proper’ meal is limited to a single course within socially constructed norms. Similarly, Douglas (1999) again, as discussed above, deconstructs the meal from its base as a socially constructed experience with strong structurally bound signifiers, based primarily on her observations, she suggests that there are ‘right’ and ‘wrong’ connotations of the meal. This may include elements extraneous to the food itself such as the requirement for a meal to have at least ‘one mouth-entering utensil per head’ and additionally the place of consumption ‘require[s] a table’ (Douglas, 1999 pg 236), as well as elements of the meal experience itself. Structures of the meal itself include that the meal consists of a beginning, middle and an end. The meal can also be considered to exist within a defined temporal dimension, thus structured temporally. As such ‘it can’t be lunchtime [as] I haven’t had breakfast yet’ (Douglas, 1999 pg 235). Nicod (Mäkelä, 2000), further distinguishes between a meal and other forms of eating, suggesting that meals did not include minor ‘eating events’ such as snacks and drinks.
Undoubtedly culture is affected, and further, altered by what might be considered the vagaries of food and the meal. Whilst the use of the term ‘ethnic’ might be considered problematic when considering foodstuffs (Warde et al., 1999), the acceptance (and increasing range) of ethnic foods eaten both in and away from the home are evidence of cultures adapting to changing foodways. Social change however continues to impact on what we accept as constituting a meal, and to other structures historically connected with the meal experience, including both temporal and spatial constituents. Also apparent are the impacts of changing social dynamics as evidenced in the changes in structural concepts such as gendered structures associated with eating in the home, including provision of the meal by ‘female labour’ (Ashley, 2004 pg 133). Moreover, these changes are reflected in the deconstruction (and reconstruction) of previously culturally bound identities formed through the production and consumption of the meal.

The meal if cooked by a man for example, may be seen as either leisure or alternatively, creating a new identity for the male, as caring and ‘motherly’ (Bugge, 2003). As these breaches of social boundaries, or the ‘moral economy of the household’ (Chaney, 2002 pg 71), affect individual gendered identity (Sullivan, 2000), so then do they allow repositioning of the entire meal experience. This is demonstrated in the privileging of convenience in contemporary society. This is manifested in the rise of “ready prepared” meals suggested as a response to dual income households (Ahlgren et al., 2004). However, this rationalisation of food and meal production and consumption is problematic and as a result has, to an extent, been ‘hidden’ to maintain the images of propriety associated with tradition and heritage associated with the ‘proper meal’ (Warde,
1997). Indeed, Douglas suggests that ‘whilst the cultural environments afford an ambient stream of symbols, capable of differentiating and intensifying … [the lack of a]… stable social base’, further interpretation is prevented (Douglas, 1999 pg 239). The traditional understandings of the performances of the meal experience within the home are increasingly contested, as has been discussed. There are also implicit tensions in the structure and consumption of the meal brought about as a result of the spatial disengagement of the performances within the home.

2.4.1 Eating ‘à la maison’

The dinner table is the centre for the teaching and practicing not just of table manners but of conversation, consideration, tolerance, family feeding and just about all the other accomplishments of polite society except the minuet.

Judith Martin, “Miss Manners” ( in Rattiner, 2002)

The meal experience is rich with social meaning. Murcott (1983), and Pliner and Rozin (2000) suggest that the meal experience is shared amongst those with close or familial bonds. Similarly, Douglas (1999, pg 236) emphasises the social nature of the experience by suggesting ‘meals are for family, close friends and honoured guests’. These and other researchers (e.g. Charles and Kerr 1988, Kemmer, Anderson and Marshall 1998), place emphasis on identity created through the complex mechanisms and
languages that make up the meal experience. Subsequently, ‘commensal politics’ (Long, 2000), play a socio-culturally important, if un-reflexive, role in the formation of the meal experience. Whilst acknowledging the un-reflexive nature of the mundane, each meal ‘carries something of the meal before’ (Douglas, 1999 pg 240) and thus the next meal is both reflective of the previous meal, and, in turn is, reflected in the next.

From a developmentalist perspective, ‘commensalism was seen as the great promoter of solidarity, community; the communion of brethren establishes and reinforces [the] common tie’ (Goody, 1982 pg 12). Furthermore, the meal experience in the home has been constructed as a strictly regulated structure, excluding the unknown ‘other’ (Valentine, 1999). It could be suggested that this has led in part to the relegation of the meal to the mundane, elevated to the extra-ordinary only at times of the ‘ritual feast’, and the crossing of the private boundaries by invited friends and guests (Long, 2000).

Viewed critically however, these links (of the everyday meal) to tradition may be somewhat limited. If one is to consider the construction of the nuclear family as subsequent to the industrial revolution (Goode, 1982), then the family meal becomes a myth constructed to promote the concept of the nuclear family and the individual rather than as a (historical) wider communal grouping. Be that as it may, eating/dining habits may be seen as informed and influenced at both cultural and social levels. This is evidenced in the changing family and individual structural dynamics, including the fragmentation of the meal as a ‘group’ activity, the rise in single person households (Sobal, 2000) and the dramatic rise in eating outside of the home (Brookes, 2004).
The networks of institutions that bounded early modern social processes such as eating (Korthals, 2004), have given way to post-modern deconstructions of the cultural project as grand narrative and the replacement of these structures with post-modern notions of authenticity. Thus the previously accepted structures are contested by new “worldviews”. Whilst the provision of the meal has been considered the everyday in the home environment, eating outside of the home, until relatively recently was considered extraordinary and associated with travel or ritual.

2.4.2 Eating ‘en dehors de la maison’

A requirement of understanding the concept of eating out is to understand the processes involved. How for example do the meanings and performances differ from the home environment? How do opportunities for eating outside of the home arise and, as Beardsworth and Keil (Beardsworth and Keil, 1997 pg 100) ask; ‘how are these opportunities perceived, used and experienced by consumers’? Although eating outside the home is based on historical precedent, it is only in modern times that this process has become embedded in consumer society. In pre-modern times eating outside the home was primarily a need of those travelling away from home, or through the necessity of work, As Jacobs (2003) suggests, not ‘all people working outside their house, [could] go home’ (Jacobs and Scholliers, 2003 pg 2). When an individual eats away from home, other than at an invitation from close friends or family, there is a constant reminder that the individual is “not home” and this is heightened when dining at a place or in a space
representing a “different” culture, a culture “not from here” (Hanne, 2004). Eating outside of the home environment increases both the real and perceived risks associated with eating. At a tangible level the consumer looses security as they relinquish control of production of the meal, increasing the associated risks of ingesting ‘poisons or contaminants’ in (Sobal, 2000). Meanwhile psychological processes may be set in train with increased opportunities for the onset of neophobia, the fear of the unknown, prioritising prudence and resistance to change (Fischler, 1988). Whilst generally associated in this context with the ingestion of food objects, the concept may also be considered applicable to the social dimensions that differentiate eating at home and away from home. Typical of these are the social “risks of performance” associated when eating with “others”. Whilst there is an element of “control” when the meal is produced in the home, eating out places the meal as produced by the other. Equally, the social mores surrounding individual and group performances are subject to different civilising processes (Coveney, 2000). Furthermore, the consumption of the meal becomes a public display of *habitus* (Bourdieu, 1984), and thus presents elements of social risk.

The meal in the home environment develops spaces for performances of consumption that is ‘front stage’ and performances of preparation or ‘back stage’ (Goffman, 1973). These ‘social establishments’ (Goffman, 1973 pg 239), allow the actors (group members) to pass between the back and front stages. The tensions between the front and the back stage are evident within contemporary structures, as can be seen in the increasingly blurred boundaries between front and back stage in the home environment. As an example the family meal is prepared historically in the kitchen (back stage),
presented to the family at the dinner table (front stage). The social performances scripted to fit the traditions of the family unit (Beardsworth and Keil, 1997). These barriers are now eroded with the introduction of convenience foods, and the eating of the communal meal in front of the television. In contrast the individual when eating outside of the house is primarily restricted to the front stage defined by its use as a space for consumption.

However these spaces are increasingly contested as a result of the rise of contemporary consumer society. The introduction of open plan kitchens is symptomatic of the blurring of ‘front stage’ and ‘back stage’ boundaries (Chapter Four discusses this in more detail). Furthermore, the introduction to the performance of consumption is the interaction with ‘others who may not be seen as desirable or discreet meal partners’ (Sobal, 2000 pg 122). Therefore, adding to the contested enactment of the meal, as a result leading to the potential for incivility within public spaces of consumption such as the restaurant (Finkelstein, 1989).

Eating behaviour in the home environment has evolved through contact within, and between known reference groups. Paradoxically however, the meal has been used to reaffirm the unity of the group (Seymour, 1983). When crossing the boundaries to the public space, there is an element of uncertainty and risk. Not only is the individual entering a space of differing social frameworks, where individual identity is be called into question, but where the (re)construction (limited or otherwise) of new identities is open to individual choice, free of previously normative social constraints. Wood (1995), suggests that the provision of food in the ‘public domain is very closely linked to domestic food systems’ (pg 81). This might indeed prove accurate if changes in the domestic food
systems were reviewed to include growth in convenience food, including takeaways (including from restaurants), the influence of the cult of the TV chef, and eponymous restaurants and the growth in food products in supermarkets linked to both commercial institutions and individuals.

It is not only the act of eating that is meaning laden, spaces for the experience of dining are likewise socially and culturally bound. The reasons for eating outside of the home are as numerous as the spaces for consumption themselves. Defining eating out is problematic (Warde and Martens, 2000), as the food eaten may be through necessity, as in eating in a work cafeteria, or eating in a local brasserie motivated purely by leisure needs. Furthermore the product consumed may include anything from a snack eaten whilst walking (in itself subject to contested meanings), to a sit down banquet.

Historically food and its consumption have also been used as a measure of class and taste (Goody, 1982). Whilst the quality of the product signified the individual’s place within society (Greico, 1999), the availability (or lack) of food shaped social and cultural behaviour. Access to eating out was in the past controlled through cultural and social capital, including time (Spang, 2000). However, industrialisation created both a demand for increasingly diverse foodstuffs (Goody, 1997) and opportunities to eat outside the home. Goody (1997), describes the role that industrialisation played in the development of both new foods and consumption patterns. It is suggested, as the working classes no longer had access to primary produce through subsistence living, the need for alternative foodstuffs grew, thus creating a demand for the products that had previously been inaccessible for the masses (Goody, 1997). Not only have food habits engendered cultural
change, but concomitant with the increased demand for eating outside the home has been the dilution of traditional markers of social distinction. Bourdieu (1984) suggests that cultural capital defines social classes and, as such, it restricts access to lower classes through the notions of taste (Bourdieu, 1984). However, the ability to access products through economic capital has furthered the realisation of Fischler’s construct of the ‘omnivore’s paradox’ (Fischler, 1988 pg. 277), whereby variety is needed, the increased variety offers increased potential for biological (and it might be suggested social risks. That being said, eating outside the home suggests that human autonomy, freedom and adaptability (Mennell, 1985), are able to be enacted in the individuals ability to consume the meal.

The contemporary restaurant is a site of contested social behaviour. On the one hand it is a historical marker, recreated in its new guise as representing developments of the late modern age, including the loss of social memory (Gross, 2000). This is aptly demonstrated by the democratization of eating out, and the subsequent erosion of previous social structures. On the other hand it is a site for the performance of the post-modern. Menus are written on flavoured edible paper thus becoming of itself, the hyperreal (surreal) meal. Additionally food now becomes de-constructed to molecular level: reconstructed as Smoked Bacon and Egg ice cream (Fort, 2005), or the nostalgic gaze as a search for the past in Fergus Henderson’s *Nose to Tail* eating (Henderson et al., 2004).

Whilst the production of the meal within the restaurant takes centre stage, the performance of the meal is relegated to a support act. The social boundaries inherent
within consumption on modernity, dismantled to be reborn as the potential for rationalised incivility (Finkelstein, 1989).

2.5 Conclusion

This chapter set out to develop a broad understanding of the structures surrounding the consumption of food and, more specifically, the meal. It has been acknowledged that food plays a central part in the everyday life of all cultures. Debate continues however on the extent to which food and its consumption can contribute to a universal language, or can be considered a normative cultural behaviour. Although a structuralist orientation has historically dominated the study of food, the role of food as a key to understanding groups and individuals within these cultures is recognised through the materialist/developmentalist literature. Eating after all, is more than mere nourishment; it plays an important role in identity formation of the individual, the establishment of social relations, is a central and highly symbolic element of ritual and acts as a maker for cultural distinctions (Bentley, 1994).

In the past, the privacy of the home environment has legitimated the consumption of the meal as somewhat of an everyday, mundane activity, albeit laden with cultural meanings. The changing (and fragmented) socio-cultural structures associated with a move towards reflexive modernity or late modernity, and post modernity, has influenced these processes in the home. These include (re)allocation of gendered roles both within and outside the home, as well as allowing access to multiple reference groups through
increasing technological developments, including mass media, and the rise of production technologies. Such changes can be seen to have somewhat of a snowball effect, in that they have both influenced the development and growth of eating outside of the home, and in turn influence the consumption processes within the home. The result of this relocation of consumption of the meal from the highly structured space of the private to the seemingly unstructured vulnerable space of the public has resulted in a highly charged socio-cultural struggle that leads to the undermining of ‘ontological security’ (Kaspersen, 2000).

It has been previously suggested that food systems in the public sphere do not differ substantially from the private (Wood, 1995). This might be contested on the assumption that, not only have our reference groups been expanded, but an everyday activity that has previously not been called to account - the process of eating - has now become somewhat problematic. Whereas the biological processes remain (in the main) unchanged, we are required to undergo a process of social “defamiliarisation” (Bauman and May, 2001). In entering the public domain to eat, we are in fact entering the unknown. We become subject to the notion of the fear of the unknown.

Whilst the notion of eating in the public sphere has been introduced in this chapter, Chapter Three develops this concept further to introduce the structure of the contemporary commercial (eating) environment as a space of consumption, and a place for consumption. Furthermore, it is the provision of commercialised provision of food in these spaces that is credited with changing our eating habits (Beardsworth and Keil, 1997). It is suggested that the restaurant by definition is located within the hospitality
industry (Wood, 1995) and Chapter Three further places the provision and consumption of the experience within the bounds of ‘the philosophy of hospitality’. The development of underlying structures of food habits is essential to an authoritative analysis of what is a central tenet of the act of hospitality.
Chapter Three: (De)Constructing Hospitality: informing the process of socialisation

3.1 Introduction

When food is eaten outside of the home the spaces/places of consumption, the behaviour of the actors and the products consumed become open to potentially greater contestation than when eaten at home. It might be suggested that within contemporary society, eating out has become symbolic of individualisation, the creation of personal identity, manifested through the growing options available for general consumption. Furthermore, the social interactions played out within the performance of the meal experience have expanded to include notions of the “public”; open viewing of what is a fundamental biological process – eating. Chapter Two argued that eating is representative of a “cultural language” subject to both values and beliefs, which are transmitted within the performance of the meal that is staged within the home. Chapter Three locates the performance of the meal within the notion of hospitality.

The provision and consumption of food and beverage within the construct that is hospitality is as old as recorded history (Browner, 2003, Walton, 2000). As a result, over time multiple meanings have been placed upon, and interpreted from, the act and provision of (commercial and non-commercial) hospitality. This work argues that the ritualised and mythologised constructs that have placed hospitality as central to the value systems of many (and varied) cultures are central in furthering our understanding of hospitality. To conceptualise hospitality it is necessary to interrogate hospitality as both
ritual and myth and ask how these have contributed over time to the characteristics of hospitality within contemporary society.

For many people the use of the term hospitality is commonly associated with invitations from friends and relatives (Telfer, 2000) or, alternatively (in the developed world), the provision and consumption of food and beverage (or accommodation) in a commercial sense (Williams, 2002). This seeming dichotomy indicates that our symbolic beliefs of hospitality have unknowingly become objectified, while at the same time our understanding of hospitality is becoming increasingly contested. Implicit in this understanding are the tensions between hospitality as a private transaction, amongst/between friends, the fundamental belief of ‘archaic hospitality’ as the socialisation of the stranger, and commercial hospitality as the economic value added to the provision of food and beverage or accommodation. Furthermore, is the suggestion that hospitality as act may offer an opportunity of re-enchanting increasingly rationalised performances of consumption.

In response to these issues and through a discussion of the cultural and social construction of hospitality, this chapter examines the notion of hospitality as a “way of being”. Furthermore, hospitality is also placed as an agent of transformation, both with regard to bordering social, cultural and geographical spaces, and its potential as a performative “act”.

Our understandings of hospitality are regarded as being highly contestable with dialectical hospitality being understood as an embedded cultural value and,
simultaneously, the process of the socialisation of the ‘other’ (Pitt-Rivers, 1963). This chapter thus begins by developing an understanding of the concept of hospitality through a deconstruction of the cultural and social values that have been placed upon hospitality over time. In order to situate contemporary behaviours within the sphere of hospitality it is necessary to understand what has passed and how the past has influenced current thinking. In other words, what influences have traditional and cultural values played in shaping the contemporary scene? Therefore, to establish the cultural and social signification of hospitality the chapter will begin by situating the ‘idea’ of hospitality within a historical context.

It will be argued that the processes of the Modernity Project (Habermas, 1981), have resulted in the destructuration of hospitality. Hospitality remains embedded within a cultural system; however the values of hospitality have been challenged and de-placed by the influences of mobility as a principle of modernity. Hospitality thus becomes contingent upon individual agency.

Central to the performance of hospitality are the aforementioned individuals, social actors, both as recipients of tangible aspects of hospitality such as food and beverages and the processes involved in the socialisation of the so called ‘stranger’. It is to develop an understanding of both the individuals and processes that the chapter subsequently focuses. The dialectical nature of hospitality is further demonstrated by locating hospitality as performed in space and time. This includes establishing hospitality as embodied performance and thus performed individually as a ‘way of being’ and hospitality as located within bordered spaces and places. Furthermore hospitality, it is
argued, can act simultaneously as an agent for both developing boundaries and conversely, permeating borders. This will include discussing the concept of hospitality as subject to the processes of globalisation, and, the role of hospitality as an agent of not only globalisation, but it will be suggested, cosmopolitanism.

3.2 Exploring the meanings of Hospitality

It has been suggested that hospitality is a ‘simple idea’ (Jones, 2006 pg. 191). To suggest that this may be, or indeed is naïve, would it is suggested, in itself be an underestimation of the complexities underlying the reality of hospitality. That the notion of hospitality is given the status of becoming what could be considered a throwaway line, can be considered symptomatic of the issues facing the performances associated with hospitality – not least of which is the superficiality associated with the commercial imperative.

In order to develop a more appropriate interpretation of hospitality this section discusses the cultural construction of hospitality as a philosophy separate from its praxis as the provision of food and beverage.
3.2.1 Demystifying Hospitality

The provision of, consumption of and access to, hospitality has been subject to the erection over time of multiple mythological frameworks. Moreover, the myth of hospitality as ‘universal and powerful’ (Haughton, 1997 pg. 191) is manifest in historical narrative, none more so than individual and collective obeisance to ancient gods (Reece, 1993) and its construction as a moral virtue (Telfer, 2000). It can be suggested that the myth of hospitality presents a naturalised version of social reality (Barthes, 1972), which, as with other myths, has served to inform hospitality’s ideological role. As Barthes (1972) argues, myths tend to be ideological in that they systematically uphold certain interests. Indeed, the myth of hospitality in contemporary society might be considered contested, as there appears to be two dominant, yet conflicting, ideologies. The interests of the capitalist firm and consumer interests as envisaged in commercial hospitality, which, whilst considered within the overarching social institution of hospitality, can be considered to override the pre-modern ideology of hospitality as political and moral. These contested understandings of hospitality are also realised in the discourses applied within academic disciplines. The economic imperative, as an outcome of modernity, has ensured the dominance of the materialist ideology in disciplines which profess a link to the institution of hospitality, namely tourism and hospitality studies (Ioannides and Debbage, 1998, Slattery, 2002). Additionally those academic fields associated with the concept of value added to the commercial activities related to the provision of hospitality, such as marketing and management, have privileged the discourses of contemporary hospitality (Coles et al., 2005). Whilst an understanding of the myth of hospitality as
grounded within moral virtue and political relations, has been recognised, and indeed resulted in a growing literature: for example in *Tourism and postcolonialism: contested discourses, identities and representations* (Hall and Tucker, 2004), and in the field of hospitality specifically, *In search of hospitality: theoretical perspectives and debates* (Lashley and Morrison, 2000); it can be offered that the dominant discourse and indeed mythology is that represented by the appropriation of hospitality by economic hegemony.

If, as Levi-Strauss (1963 pg. 229) argues ‘the purpose of a myth is to provide … [a] model capable of overcoming a contradiction’, then it is suggested the aporia that is hospitality might be better understood through analysis and synthesis of the ideas and indeed ideals within the mythology of hospitality.

### 3.2.2 Mythologies of hospitality

Heal (1990 pg. 403) has suggested that ‘a return to the mythical past of [hospitality’s] open generosity’ can be offered in opposition to the lived experiences of hospitality as proscribed by the market place. Whilst this suggestion of rhetoric as a weapon is placed within the early modern period, it might be considered equally applicable within the fragmented, hyperreal/(sur)reality that surrounds post-modern society (Aramberri, 2001). This can be recognised in the disembodied performances within themed restaurants, situated against the embodied performance of the interaction between a hosts and guest in a family operated restaurant in Greece. It can be offered therefore that myth plays a central part in the past, present and future.
Whilst the argument of myth may be susceptible to sophistry, it is suggested that myth is representative of social structures and is therefore not a new phenomenon. The origins of the myth of hospitality lie hidden in the depths of human history, in the interpersonal relationships between those who were the ‘known’, and the ‘unknown’ - the stranger. The legacy of hospitality is therefore one of the formation of a cultural structure, in effect guiding the behaviour of ‘us’ in the interaction with the ‘other’ - those who are not us. If one is to consider interaction an ‘act’, then the act of hospitality became a bedrock upon which ancient cultures developed. Indeed Reece’s (1993) analysis of Homeric hospitality demonstrates that hospitality was recognised as a way of ‘living’. The building of bonds between families and individuals, and the turning of strangers into friends (see 3.3.1), became fundamental to the ancient Greek notion of hospitality or xenia. Such was the importance of hospitality that its power was ascribed to the god, Zeus. Thus violation of the behaviours associated with the interaction would incur the wrath of the greatest of the deities (Euripides and Morwood, 2000).

Furthermore, it is suggested that the myth of hospitality became one of social control. One never knew who the stranger was, their social standing, background or employment. The idea of the face of the stranger being ascribed to the god of gods, in turn ensured the enforcement of the moral duty of hospitality (Pitt-Rivers, 1963).

The placement of hospitality as a principle characteristic of cultural development is established further when considered in the context of politics. Whilst in the Homeric era hospitality (or xenia) was considered a private institution, Herman (1987) develops an argument for the transition of xenia, to proxenia. In effect the appropriation of the...
hospitality as a ‘way of being’ for the individual to one that represents society as a collective. Thus it is argued that ‘[t]he earlier institution was xenia, the new circumstances were the self-conscious communities of the city-state; and the result was proxenia’ (Herman, 1987 pg. 132). Hospitality in effect can be considered to have acted as a central mediator within the civilising process (Elias, 1978). Indeed, Derrida (2005 pg. 6) argues there is ‘no cultural or social bond without hospitality’.

The key role of hospitality in a Homeric philosophy, continued to act as a defining characteristic of social behaviour for many centuries. For example, hospitality in Chaucer’s England is exemplified in the behaviour of Saint Julian, considered patron saint of hospitality. Chaucer (1998 pg. 9/10) suggests that St Julian’s’ behaviour is the personification of Epicurus’ own son, writing; ‘in his (St Julian’s) home it snowed with food and drink’ appropriately demonstrated by his lavish wine cellar and elaborate meals. It has been suggested that Saint Julian was in fact a mythical saint, who turned to looking after strangers, offering hospitality to atone for causing the death of his parents (Cooper, 1996). Thus, it is suggested, reinforcing the virtuous nature and characteristics implicit within the notion of hospitality. Where this representation of hospitality is based on core cultural values rooted in Homeric notions of hospitality, further, somewhat contradictory characterisations have been represented within Chaucer’s England. Notable is the concept of hospitality, eulogised for its extravagance. Hospitality was seen as a ‘kind of social performance, seeking social advancement for the family if not the individual person’ (Lynch, 2002 pg. 123). It might be pertinent to suggest this interpretation of hospitality is as relevant today as it was in Chaucer’s time, and might be considered to be
representative of what Telfer (2000) characterises as inhospitable behaviour. Moreover 
this suggests that there is an operationalisation of hostility contained hidden within 
hospitality or, as Adorno (1997 pg. 9) argues, through ‘the hostility inherent in the 
principle of entertainment’. Hospitality is thus realised as a social construction, 
performed and interpreted as a social reality inheriting a reality, albeit ‘constructed 
without [the individuals] participation’ (Firat and Schultz II, 1997 pg. 188).

During the Elizabethan era, hospitality was regarded not only as the ‘chiefest 
point of humanity which an householder may show’ but also as ‘an excellent Christian 
practice’ (Palmer, 1992 pg. 1). Within more recent cultural history, Lee (2003 pg. 241) 
posits the development of the Enlightenment Project in France only advanced as a result 
of hospitality being ‘inscribed in the national character by the Court of Versailles… [and] 
considered a contribution to the civilising process in Europe, only equalled by English 
liberty and philosophy’.

Whilst hospitality as a cultural construction has developed over time, the key 
characteristics of morality, virtuousness and humanity have persisted throughout. As 
such, Haughton (1997 pg. 11) suggests that by perceiving ‘hospitality as a key cultural 
myth’, it may be used as a principle against which contemporary society can be re-
imagined.

That the myth of hospitality can be treated and interpreted in this way is not new. 
Placing hospitality as the micro-macro sociological nexus is to locate hospitality at the 
centre of the ‘global cultural process’ (Silverstein, 2004 pg. 650). Immanuel Kant
proposes a rule or law such that: ‘The Third definitive article of a perpetual peace’ is predicated on the understanding that ‘cosmopolitan right shall be limited to conditions of universal hospitality’ (Kant and Humphrey, 2003 pg. 15). By this he argues the right of mankind to safety when crossing national borders. Contextualising hospitality as meaning ‘the rights of an alien not to be treated as an enemy on arrival in another’s country…as long as he (sic) behaves peaceably he cannot be treated as an enemy’ (pg. 15).

Although Kant’s philosophies related to the nation as host, the ideals of hospitality previously discussed remain, on the whole, the same. A notable difference is the stated clause that allows the stranger to be ‘turned away’ contingent upon the safety of the stranger. In other words the host country has a moral obligation not to turn away the persecuted or asylum seeker. Within Homeric hospitality the turning away of any stranger was discouraged through the appropriation of the role of guest by any number of gods (Pitt-Rivers, 1963). Whilst Kant’s understanding and use of the notion of hospitality is recognised as both idealistic, and a philosophical positioning, similar (if somewhat simplified) sentiments are visible and performed within codified hospitality. Although myth is representative of literatures offering historical aetiology, it could be suggested that they are merely representative of the mystical or spiritual connotations of hospitality.

However Cassirer, it is suggested by Schultz (2000 pg. 88) argues that myth has just as much legitimacy in explaining or describing the present as does the commonsense of the everyday, additionally offering that ‘myth belongs in a system of knowledge culminating in modern day science’. Accepting that this is the case, it is possible to explore the notion of contemporary hospitality, through its precedent in historical myth.
The (cultural) construction of the *idea(l)* of hospitality can therefore be acknowledged as, at least in part, a belonging of its mythological origins.

As has been discussed with regard to food (see 2.2) the performance of hospitality does not exist solely as a culturally bound notion. It is also open to manipulation through social mores and behaviours, both individual and structural. In turn these may become conventions or ritualised. Further, it is argued by Levi-Strauss (1963), that myth may form the basis of both ritual and ritualised behaviour.

### 3.2.3 Ritualised Hospitality

Understanding ritual as a concept is problematic. However Quantz (1999) suggests that, if ritual is understood to be formalised symbolic performance, it allows the interpretation of the world in which we live. Distinguishing between ‘certain socially expressive acts of cultural politics [and] other more mundane instrumental actions not particularly relevant to understanding the cultural politics of the situation’ (Quantz, 1999 pg. 512), allows the analysis of hospitality as other than the everyday.

Hospitality has historically provided an institutional framework within which social behaviours were controlled through ‘downward conflation’ (Archer, 1996, Archer, 1995), recognised as the imposition of values on the individual through the power of social structures. Individual agency was overrun by cultural control inherent within value systems. Arguably the controlling mechanisms and representations of hospitality apparent
in its mythologised narrative have ensured the survival of ‘symbolic (or Homeric) hospitality’. As a result the treatment and welcome of the stranger has become embedded in the ritualised performance of hospitality.

Additionally, it may be suggested that the rituals of hospitality have aided in creating and maintaining collective identity, in effect creating a socialised ‘us’ and an unknown ‘them’. The survival of ritualised hospitality can be posited on society wanting it so. Indeed, it may be, as Visser (1993 pg. 20) argues, that it is ‘culture, not instinct, [which] determines a good deal of what we do’. Hospitality can therefore be attributed with creating imposed values within cultures and societies, represented by the performance of hospitality without the knowledge of the recipient.

That hospitality transgresses the boundaries between the stranger/unknown and us/known, may be attributed to the use of the rituals of hospitality as a means of communication. These messages ‘communicated by ritual, use such systems of bounded and transcended categories [stranger- friend] to promote the continuity and the flexibility of the social order’ (Bell and Valentine, 1997 pg. 65). Whilst hospitality as ritual provides an idealised ‘way of being’, it also allows for the reshaping of social order (Geertz, 1975) and places hospitality as a “social fact” (Durkheim and Giddens, 1972). By this it is meant that hospitality acts as a constraint on social or moral behaviour.

The provision of hospitality can therefore be seen as more than a practical activity, not merely the provision of food, drink or accommodation, but as also consisting of ‘symbolic performances, marked by affective and expressive acts’ (Bugge, 2005 pg.
5). Hospitality not only provides physical requirements for the stranger but also recognises their common humanity, placing the guest as sacred. It can be suggested therefore that hospitality, whilst consisting of sets of belief, also comprises ritualised performance. However the performances inherent within rituals are dynamic (Rappaport, 1999) and respond to socio-cultural change (Bell, 1997).

3.3 Mobilising Hospitality (or Mobilities of Hospitality)

Mythology is conventionally associated with notions of tradition (Csapo, 2005), whereas modernity might be considered its antithesis. This work has so far located the discussion of hospitality primarily within the historical, traditional context. Moreover, this has resulted in an understanding of hospitality as a cultural value, a controlling mechanism ensuring social conformity, and in effect a system closed to change. However, whilst hospitality can be considered in its ritualised guise as a culturally constructed set of practices, these practices have changed over time, subject, as they are, to the influences of wider social development. It is argued that these changes may be considered as having occurred in conjunction with the ‘project of modernity’ (Habermas, 1981). Morley (2000 pg. 42) argues that the processes associated with modernity have the ability to ‘sweep away tradition, prioritising mobility over stasis’, thus resulting in the ‘forced’ changes within the rituals of hospitality. The tensions within structural conflation: notably the individuals agency within the structure or the effects of social
structures which impress themselves on the individual (Archer, 1995) are manifest in the practices of hospitality within contemporary society. No matter whether these are the ever-changing, highly charged and disputed spaces of hospitality (both internalised and externalised), for example the home, or the meanings associated with the commercialisation of what was (is?) considered a moral virtue. It is these changes in the priorities of hospitality, as central within value systems, modified by developments within society that are discussed in following section.

3.3.1 Bordering Hospitality and the Stranger

The historical antecedents of hospitality place its performance within the domain of what might be considered the ‘home’ environment. This can be regarded as a metaphorical understanding of the home, an intellectual understanding ‘of “home-as-community” rather than “home-as-house”’ (Deloria, 2003 pg. 677).

This analysis of hospitality is facilitated by acknowledging the roots of archaic hospitality as in its primacy within the physical (both personal and individualised) space of the home, developing the broader concept of home as a bordered community, a place where hospitality is the manifested reality of Deloria’s “border-crossing dialogue” (Deloria, 2003), a part of ones nature and substance. The transformation of the stranger that is central to the performance of hospitality takes place within this defined space (see 4.5.2 for discussion on borders and globalisation). The stranger is the stranger precisely because they are not recognised as from within the socially constructed space that is
‘home’. Hospitality thus acts as cultural agent, facilitating the (re)negotiation of both collective (social) and personal identity. Historically (and still?) the concept of a bordered space ensured the notion of hospitality was considered a collective ideal, conditioning individual behaviour and ensuring the domination and continuation of structural power. The notion of bordering is both a defining characteristic of, and space of, tension between the ideal of hospitality and its performance as practice in contemporary political and social reality (Rosello, 2001). Borders furthermore create dialectical constructions within hospitality and, as such, it is through these borders that hospitality exists: a notion of bordered space such as ‘home’ and ‘away’; embodied borders such ‘self’ and ‘other’; borders of social identity such as ‘host’ and ‘guest’; or, as O’Connor (O’Connor, 2005) suggests, ‘hostility’ and ‘friendship’. It can be argued that none of these constructions may exist in isolation from the other (Ritzer and Goodman, 2004a). Therefore, it is through borders that hospitality maintains its ascendancy. In other words hospitality would not be, either as practice or moral virtue, but for the contested space brought about by border transgressions. Therefore, if one is to analyse the practice of hospitality, question the reason for its existence, at its root one would encounter human displacement. It is to the concept of the geographical mobility as rationale for hospitality that the discussion now turns.
3.3.2 Socialising the Stranger: Mobilising Hospitality

It has been suggested that stability, rather than mobility, was central to pre-modern societies (Bedford and Pool, 2004). The collective focus of society was one of immobility dictated by ‘notions of stability and unchangingness, respectively, [and] immobility dominate[s] social situations and contexts’ (Bonß et al., 2004 pg.11). In effect a locus of society was the notion of ‘local belonging and social status’ (Bonß et al., 2004 pg. 11) whereby hospitality acted as the system through which social integration was enacted.

The practice of hospitality is thus predicated on the cultural obligation to offer succour to the stranger. Hospitality becomes an initiation of the process that would result in the socialisation and thus integration into the ‘local’ society. The stranger was regarded as the outsider or foreigner. As the stranger was from a “different place” his or her potential is either, that of wanderer - a stranger who may be passing through - or one who has the potential (and inclination) to stay (Simmel and Wolff, 1950). Furthermore the stranger may be considered as the ‘other’ who has just come into contact with “us” (Frisby, 2002). Simmel (1950) further posits the notion of the stranger as an individual who is fixed within a spatial circle, or within a group whose boundaries are analogous to spatial boundaries.

In the past the circumstances leading to the need to ‘socialise’ the stranger were somewhat limited due to the tyranny of distance (Blainey, 1968). Mobility was controlled both within the structural context (e.g. extended families), and by limited access to the
means for mobility (e.g. lack of appropriate technology) this tyranny of distance might be considered to be a key contributor to the concept of hospitality as central to the value system not only of cultures, but more importantly, across cultures.

A notable value energising the system of hospitality is the understanding that at some time in the future an individual or society providing hospitality may require the same (see 3.5.2). As such in pre-modern society the provision of hospitality was regarded as unlimited, the host or host society was obliged to provide hospitality to all-comers: the process of socialisation acting as the deterrent to the would-be enemy. The offer of hospitality was also reflective of the potential future needs of a social group. It is possible to speculate that remnants of this understanding of hospitality exist in those cultures considered to be in the processes of modernising (e.g. Vietnam). This discussion will not attempt to interrogate issues of modernising and the tensions inherent within the context of developed and developing countries. However, it can be suggested that the processes of modernisation have impacted on hospitality as a concept.

3.4 Modernity, globalisation and cosmopolitanism

It can be suggested that the demarcation between the present and tradition is made visible within modernity. Moreover, ‘[m]odernity revolts against the normalising functions of tradition; modernity lives on the experience of rebelling against all that is normative’ (Habermas, 1981 pg. 5). As such, the moral virtues of hospitality as a normative behaviour are cast aside. Culture in its modern form, it is suggested by Weber,
rebels against the mores of everyday life, which ‘have become rationalised under the pressures [of] economic and administrative imperatives’ (Habermas, 1981 pg. 6).

As a result, hospitality is de-placed, removed as a value within the cultural system and consigned to a nostalgic gaze. Hospitality is viewed as the object of romantic idealised Homeric heroics, where the “charm” of hospitality is provided by the exotic “native” (Hall, 1995): a discourse of exoticism expounded in the narrative of 19th century travel writing (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, 1998). The implication being that within modern(ised) cultures the moral imperative of hospitality has been set aside, the praxis of hospitality resituated within the economic system.

Whilst ancient hospitality was a relationship enacted between strangers, the individualism associated with modernity has appropriated hospitality as an encounter amongst the known, reinforcing our familiarities (Wiltshire, 1989) rather than regarded as the process of socialisation. Hospitality may be considered both agent, and enabler of interiority; the border of inside and outside. Within pre-modern society, cultural and social structures reinforced the concept of community as inherently stable, coherent and embedded (Wittel, 2001). Modernity challenges this notion of the collective. The individual is recognised, and her/his identity brought into doubt. Giddens (1999 pg. 180) argues that “[m]odernity confronts the individual with a complex diversity of choices…at the same time offer[ing] little help as to which choices should be selected’. Traditional notions of hospitality are thus made redundant as an agent of any significance within society. Perceived freedom from the cultural system allows the individual agency to
choose to provide or not provide hospitality. Whilst the moral imperative might be considered to remain, the social obligation is weakened.

The “release” of hospitality from its place as a fundamental cultural value is illustrated in Figure 3.1. The arrows are representative of the move away from hospitality as embedded within the value system. The influence of mobility as agent is recognised by the dimension of changing world views. Thus 1 shows the movement of modernised societies both away from the centrality of hospitality as virtuous and agent of structuration. Additionally, this movement flows through the worldviews of the premodern and modern. In other words the processes involved are a result of actions inherent in early modernity. Such processes include increasing mobility and the resultant growth in demand for hospitality. Whilst an understanding of the implications of modernity have been discussed in modernised cultures, it is those developing cultures that are considered to be in the process of modernising (Cuesta, 2004) that are represented by 2. The flow and direction of the arrow is suggestive that hospitality will be affected in a similar manner to modernised cultures. This places modernity as a key influence in the destructuration of hospitality.

3 represents the (re)appropriation of hospitality, if only in a metaphorical sense, as a central concept within the philosophical analysis of key thinkers (Lévinas and Poller, 2003, Derrida and Dufourmantelle, 2000, Kant, 1992). Hospitality is re-structured as a macro- sociological agent. Hospitality becomes more than a structural institution, but rather a philosophy of being. The scape along which the three aspects of hospitality diverge and flow is considered the continuum from ‘hospitality as hostility’ (Derrida and
Caputo, 1997) to ‘hospitality as virtue’. Hospitality can be considered to carry hostility within “itself”. Thus, suggesting that “hostility/pitality” is inherent within all hosting and hospitality (Derrida, 2000). Therefore modernity is considered to move the notion of hospitality closer to that of its ‘sibling’ hostility.

Figure 3.1 Three Dimensions of Hospitality

Mobility, considered a ‘general principle’ of modernity, is reasoned by Bonß (2004) to be further characterised by the idea of physical mobility, recognised as movement, and motility, or the potential for mobility. In the case of hospitality, motility
is manifest in the embodied rejection of the notions of hospitality as culturally obligated and structurally proscribed behaviour. It can be argued that mobility as movement had a dramatic, if not equal, influence on the restructuration of hospitality. Mobility in pre-modern times was somewhat limited, both by the cultural importance of stability, and the means (or motivations) for movement (see 3.3.2). However as a result of the process of modernisation, there was a new imperative for travel. This escalation in movement saw an increased need for hospitality (Heal, 1990 for an in-depth discussion of the effects of early modernity on hospitality in England). The mobility of societies not only reduced space on a macro scale, but also on a metaphorical level, leading to coalescence between Cartesian space and social space (Pred, 1981, Price, 2004). The performance of hospitality underwent a paradigm shift, where time and space became in effect, its defining characteristics.

3.5 Performing Hospitality

No knowledge of persons is required of the guest who has a patron to protect him, but to fulfil the role of guest he must at least understand the conventions which relate to hospitality and which define the behaviour expected of him.

Pitt-Rivers (1963)

The previous section established the centrality of hospitality within social structures, through the contingencies of ritual and myth. Whilst these are acknowledged
as important concepts in establishing hospitality as a key value within many cultural systems, it is to the performance - the doing of hospitality - that this section turns. Whilst performance crosses the borders of commercial and non-commercial hospitality, the discussion within this section is limited to the contextualising of performance within hospitality in the non-commercial environment (see 4.6 for analysis of performance in commercial environment).

3.5.1 Performance

Goffman (1973 pg. 15) suggests ‘a “performance” may be defined as all the activity of a given participant on a given occasion which serves to influence in any way any of the other participants’. If a particular individual and her/his performance are delineated, others that interact may be considered co-performers, audience or observers (See section 4.6 for discussion of commercial hospitality as observed behaviour). The performance of hospitality is predicated on the basis of interpersonal relationships, with socially prescribed roles of, for example, the known and unknown. These roles enact rights and duties (Goffman, 1973) that are inherent within hospitality as central to the cultural value system. This being said, it may be pertinent to recognise that ‘being’ can be considered performance in that it represents the performance of existence itself (Schechner, 2002). As such, the cultural values ascribed by hospitality as a “way of being” are interiorised. It is this interiority that (McCarthy, 2005) suggests acts in a manner of both drawing closer, and authorising, the boundary between inside and
outside. The creation of the other (outside) on which the interiorised values are enacted, both ensure the continuation of the value of hospitality and authorise the boundary across which the process of socialisation will occur.

Viewed historically, the performances within hospitality are based on its cultural power ascribed through social structuration - the highly scripted interaction based on the moral imperative associated with ancient/archaic hospitality. Thus ‘we’ welcome the ‘stranger’ with open arms. Without the knowledge of individual background, each and every performance is essentially unique, the script ‘written’ as the performance unfolds, and the stranger reveals themselves. Even if the process within the performance may appear the same, the stranger, as an unknown quantity, will ensure that each performance is different. In other words, ‘even though some “thing” may be the same, each event in which the “thing” participates is different’ (Schechner, 2002 pg. 23), for instance the space of performance, or the morality of hospitality itself is represented as différence. The morality of hospitality remains.

However the manner in which hospitality is communicated, and furthermore the transmutation of the stranger (from stranger to guest), is contingent on the interpersonal act between the host and the stranger. In other words, it is not the unique characteristics of the material world, the provision of food and drink for example, but the interactivity within that world that create the uniqueness of the individual performance.

This interaction does not happen in a vacuum and, despite the fact that the performance of hospitality is based on the interactions between individuals, the manner in
which the hospitality is enacted is concomitant with the culture in which the performance of hospitality is played out. As such, hospitality is a dynamic interpersonal performance that can be considered part of that, which Soares (1998) suggests, is stage-managed within cultural boundaries. Hospitality can thus be regarded as at the intersection of cultures, the mobilising of distinct sets of rules of hospitality. Moreover it is in performances such as hospitality that cultural forms find articulation (Geertz, 1975). In this sense, referring to the laws of hospitality (hosts) and cultural behaviours to which the stranger must subscribe (Rosello, 2001), the performance of the interaction.

The stranger is therefore socialised anew in each future interaction. Furthermore the realisation of hospitality is dependant upon these social actors. Hospitality cannot exist without the enactment of these processes of the “socialisation of the stranger”.

However there are tensions within the interaction of the actors. The performance is contested by its dialectical nature, which is the potential for the realisation of its antithesis in all its forms.

3.5.2 Defining the actors

Not only is the performance of hospitality predicated on the communication or enactment of hospitality between individuals, but hospitality contains its “own” other. The dialectical nature of hospitality is not limited to the notion of hospitality itself, but also to the actors involved. Hospitality and guest derive from the same from the same root, hospes; itself a combination of hostis, the stranger (from where we acquire the
potential for hostility) and *petr* (*potis, potes, potentia*), the recognition of power (Derrida and Caputo, 1997). Section 3.51 has posited that hospitality cannot exist without the ‘other’ and that it is contingent upon dyadic performances: an understanding that the performances can be considered as being negotiated. However, the performance between the host and the guest should not be considered as being equal. Whilst there exists a mutual obligation (Pitt-Rivers, 1963) between host and guest, the host is established as sovereign: his or her hegemony (Heal, 1990) revealed through the authority of the “gift of hospitality” (see 4.6.1, 5.4 for a discussion on the sovereignty of the guest as consumer).

In hospitality, the “act” of welcome becomes a function of the power of the host to remain master of the house (Derrida and Caputo, 1997). The host offers up hospitality to the “other”, whilst at the same time remaining in control. Therefore hospitality can only be provided with the power of authority as it is imposed by ownership and, as such, one would not consider the offer of a meal that was not prepared or conceived at some cost, as exhibiting traits of hospitality (see Chapter Four for a similar process regarding economic ownership). Offering someone else’s food in someone else’s home is not hospitality. Hospitality can thus be considered authenticated by the power within the performance, only by the authority of the host.

As stated previously (see 3.3.1), there is the potential for the stranger to be (or become) hostile. The interaction between the guest and host is one of cultural confrontation, which is manifest in the tension-filled dynamic of the performance. Therefore a key role in the offering and enactment of hospitality is to ensure the stranger becomes ‘known’, transmuting from friend from foe. This process of change may be
considered to be a “process of socialisation”, of transmitting rules and behaviours through the performance of hospitality (Figure 2).

**Figure 3.2 The Process of Socialisation**

In this process the unknown, potential “hostile”, becomes the socialised guest (Figure 2). The bordered space of identity is represented by the circles, the identity of the stranger being both *recognised* within the performance of hospitality and being *transmuted* to that of the guest. It is important to recognise that this places the guest in a space that is neither one of strangeness (stranger) nor one of community member. As Pitt-Rivers (1963) suggests, the process of socialisation is that of practicality rather than one of morality. It is not a process that is performed to turn the stranger into a friend, but to maintain the *status quo*, and maintain social and cultural controls.
A fundamental constituent of this process is acknowledging the unknown quality of the stranger. The stranger has the potential to be anything (including hostile), ‘valiant or worthless, well born, well connected, wealthy or the contrary… in any case his (sic) social standing in his community of origin is not necessarily accepted by those of another’ (Pitt-Rivers, 1963 pg. 16). The process of socialisation is thus dictated by the host/community/subculture/culture rather than the stranger.

While hospitality in its various guises is recognised as gift, it is from whom the gift is given and who receives it that that is contested, as gift giving is a highly contested performance. In particular, Mauss (2002) concluded that, in ancient cultures at least, gift-giving is a self-perpetuating system of reciprocity based on three types of obligation: to give, to receive, and to repay. This however suggests that hospitality is conditional on these obligations. If hospitality is regarded as the performance of humankind’s humanity towards humankind then it might be considered unconditional. This could be seen as ‘ideologically close to sacrifice’ (Osteen, 2002 pg. 55), where the ‘host must in a moment of madness, tear up the understanding between him and the guest, act with “excess,” make an absolute gift of his property’ (Derrida and Caputo, 1997). The gift of hospitality can never be absolute as this is, of course, acknowledges Derrida impossible and therefore the performance of hospitality as reciprocity in Mauss’s sense does seem problematic. If, as Pohl (1999 pg. 6) suggests, ‘ancient hospitality recognises the strangers’ worth and common humanity’, then this would suggest that we all exist with a debt of hospitality and we therefore owe hospitality. The result is that, if the guest reciprocates the hosts’ absolution of debt, then the host regains the debt. Hospitality as a
“way of being” thus recreates itself through reciprocity of action creating its own momentum.

Hospitality has been established as a “way of being” manifested in the inter-relational performance. To give the gift of ‘hospitality as embodied’ may be considered as giving part of ones-self ‘a part of ones nature and substance, whilst to receive something is to receive a part of someone’s spiritual essence’ (Mauss, 1967 pg. 10). The notion of hospitality as gift therefore serves to problematise its existence in modernity, as hospitality responds to the commercial imperative and becomes enacted within the economic system.

If hospitality is, as suggested, gift, then as Levi-Strauss (Butler and Pearce, 1995) suggests ‘this relation of exchange [is] not only cultural and economic at once, but … the distinction [is] inappropriate and unstable: exchange produces a set of social relations, communicates a cultural or symbolic value’ and moreover, gift establishes the limit of materialism. It may be that to overcome this hurdle, hospitality as gift is treated as Derrida would have: ‘that it must be what it ought not to be’ (Derrida and Caputo, 1997). In reality, then, the gift is not recognised as gift and hospitality is performed when it is not expected.

The materiality of the hospitality is apparent in our understanding of the meal and accommodation. Whilst the notion of hospitality as a way of being has been established as problematic, one might be considered to be providing hospitality through the provision of product as gift, as it is suggested that gift may take multiple forms (Komter, 1996).
It is proposed therefore that the gift of hospitality may act as enchantment; through its unexpectedness, the surprise of hospitality (representing the gift). Additionally, the authority imparted by the host as owner, or in other words the recognition of the host’s power by the guest is argued to impart enchantment (Mauss, 2002). In other words, if hospitality is provided by an individual or group with the power inherent within authority, then this hospitality acts to enchant the receiver. This power may or may not be real, but it is suggested that this power must be at the very least perceived to exist by the guest. In reality the authority may be real or merely ascribed to the host.

3.6 Summary

This chapter suggests that hospitality is a highly contested concept. It can be considered performed collectively, and was central to many cultural value systems; acting as a structural agent and yet simultaneously recognising ‘plurality in the world’ (Komter, 2005). By the social structures such as home, in the literal and metaphorical sense, the ‘other’ is identified, hospitality enacted and the stranger socialised.

Hospitality is much more than the provision of food, drink and accommodation to the wanderer. It is at once a performance and a space for performance. The host can enact hospitality through scripted and un-scripted performances. However hospitality should be considered as a way of being: hospitality embedded in the performance, the act of
hospitality both interiorised and exteriorised; hospitality the stage for intersubjectivity and empathy. Hospitality thus comes into being by doing.

The mythologised and ritualised characteristics of hospitality have been established and in doing so it has legitimated the analysis of what hospitality means. Central to this understanding is knowing the powers appropriated by, or ascribed to, hospitality. Hospitality cannot exist in the absence of power. For hospitality to come into being, the host must be acknowledged as master, as sovereign authority. This is a condition of hospitality as the host must act from a position of power to be able to offer hospitality to the “other” as stranger and thus the beginnings of socialisation. Thus the contradiction inherent within hospitality is to offer, is to offer to destroy.

Through this analysis the key notions of hospitality as act, and way of being have been situated in the performance(s) of hospitality. The common humanity of man is relocated as central to our understanding of hospitality. However, it might be suggested that in thinking of hospitality in this manner, results in “its” objectification, viewed as “thing” thus resulting in its reification (Ball, 1978). It is proposed that we need to analyse and think of hospitality through the logic of relationships or performance, and thus conceptualise hospitality as a relational social reality, rather than a naturalised social reality. In other words, hospitality cannot exist in isolation; it “exists” only through a complex set of relationships – hospitality is a relational reality.

Culture and society do not stand still. The understanding of culture as located within a system suggests hospitality’s bordered nature. The notion of borders suggests
permeability, thus they are able to be crossed and the behaviours and structures within altered. Moreover cultural systems are considered to have their ‘own logic of function, change and destiny which is a result not only of (and regularly not so much) of the external conditions, but of its own nature’ (Sorokin, 1957 pg. 18). Thus hospitality may act upon and change the cultural system. Whilst hospitality acts as a structural mechanism it simultaneously presents the cultural system with the means for its own demise. The stranger is invited into the cultural system in order to socialise. Although the outcome of recognition of otherness is that of socialisation, the system becomes vulnerable to internal change. Whilst a premodern society (in the main) was predicated on immobility, moving for necessity rather than choice, the Modernity Project has resulted in the destructuration of hospitality by increasing mobility and contact with the ‘other’. Where hospitality previously acted as an agent within the sense of downward conflation, the results of modernisation (motility and movement) acted together to both weaken (or potentially remove) hospitality as cultural value, and restructure hospitality within the economic system.

Essential to the performance of hospitality is the concept of ownership. To offer hospitality is to imply the power to provide hospitality but it is the host who must remain sovereign. Furthermore this power must be recognised by the guest. Moreover if the host devolves or delegates power as master this must acknowledged by the guest for the process to occur. This is recognised at the micro scale as the invitation of hospitality by the owner of the house, to the macro scale, whereby society recognises the ‘other’ manifest in the refugee. Hospitality is proffered through recognition and the offering of
asylum. Although this may appear on the surface somewhat distant from providing the stranger with sustenance, it is emblematic of the identities created in the performance of hospitality. The enchantment of hospitality is thus predicated on the power inherent in the authority of those offering “up” hospitality.

The praxis of hospitality can be considered dialectical in nature. The guest cannot exist in the absence of the host. The unknown cannot exist in the absence of the known. Whilst the guest/host can be considered a duality (Giddens, 1984), there is an inherent weakness in the analysis of the performers of hospitality in this way. Therefore a morphogenetic (Archer, 1995) approach was adopted to analyse the actors within hospitality. By adopting this approach it created a framework from within which socialisation concomitant with hospitality can be deconstructed. The inter-relational performances that involve the identification and recognition of known and unknown analysed and how the interplay might convert the stranger to guest. However hospitality is by its very (dialectical) reality might be considered a social paradox. Ultimately, hospitality is a celebration of difference. This approach has suggested the existence of intersubjective performance is necessary for hospitality to be successful.

As stated above hospitality as situated within a cultural system is susceptible change. Chapter Four investigates changes that have occurred within the performance of hospitality overtime. The commercialisation of hospitality can be considered the most fundamental change, affecting both how it is performed, and why it is performed. Chapter Four thus develops the placement of hospitality within an economic system as its focus.
Chapter Four: Consuming Hospitality

4.1 Introduction

Our understandings of the meanings associated with the notion of hospitality have changed over time; from the morality with which we act towards our fellow man, to its aggrandisement as a globalised industry. At the heart of hospitality is the provisioning of the ‘other’, the welcome, an offer of shelter and the tendering of food and drink. Whilst Chapter Three developed the concept of hospitality as a “way of being”, including notions of authority, identity and gift, Chapter Four develops an understanding of the consumption of the material concerns of hospitality. The concept of the meal as discussed in Chapter Two is (re)introduced as a lens through which the concept of commercially consumable hospitality will be examined. The meal includes those products and services that have come to be recognised in today’s society as core components of the hospitality industry. More specifically this chapter interrogates the praxis of hospitality as conceptualised in Chapter Three, the realisation of hospitality within the commercial domain. This chapter therefore situates the consumption of the contemporary meal experience within the hospitality industry.

Understanding the consumption of hospitality has become somewhat problematic in contemporary society (Telfer, 2000). The processes can be seen as both the consumption of products associated with the hospitality industry, such as food and drink and, at the same time, the consumption of experiences associated with ritual and
mythology associated with hospitality as embodied (see 3.3.1). Consumption therefore must be viewed as both economic and social. This is further established in this chapter with an analysis of the intersection of commercial and private hospitality. The spaces of consumption of hospitality are contested. For example, an individual may share hospitality with friends or relatives within the home, and its attendant performances, then the next day consume what could be considered the same products (as food and drink) in the commercial environment. This can be further confused through the provision of private hospitality within commercial setting as, for example, an individual invites a guest but offers hospitality within the commercial space.

This chapter conceptualises the extent to which ‘apparently different hospitality situations are...generic or contextually different’ (Brotherton, 2003). The tensions inherent within this performance of consumption introduce contemporary theories, through which consumption of material hospitality has become disenchanted; the antithesis to hospitality as discussed in Chapter Three. Increasingly mobile lifestyles and globalised experiences have resulted in the use of technology as means of (re)enchantment of the hospitality performance. A key output of this chapter is to determine to what extent this may in fact be self-defeating and whether it has led to a de-humanised experience, representing the hostility inherent within hospitality: therefore necessitating the continual (re)enchantment of the experience, *ad infinitum*.

The chapter initially locates the process(es) intrinsic to consumption within a conceptual framework. A number of key themes from Chapter Three are reintroduced and analysed from within this framework. Critical to the processes of consumption are
the actors as individuals. If one is to consider the outcome of hospitality as the transformation of the known to unknown, through the process of socialisation, how might economic exchange mediate and influence this process?

Hospitality, as discussed in Chapter Three, is understood to be dialectical, thus production and consumption are considered central to the performance. The remit of this chapter however is primarily situating and discussing the processes and performances of food and beverage consumption within the hospitality system. Further, this chapter places the spaces of consumption within the local/regional/national nexus. Thus hospitality is viewed as consumed within the metaphorical home, bordered within the nation. Hospitality in the international context is the focus of Chapter Five.

The commercial provision and consumption of food and beverage is intrinsic to the performance of material hospitality and might be considered essential to the lifestyles of many contemporary consumers (Warde and Martens, 2000). As commercial spaces for consumption of food, it is proposed that one ‘think[s] of restaurants in a new way, as part of the social life of the future’ (Skidelsky, 2004 pg. 56). As eating in the home has declined, there has been a corresponding rise in consumption of foodstuffs in the public, commercial sphere.

Notably, within the United States the amount spent on commercially prepared meals as a percentage of total food and beverage expenditure has doubled from 20% to 40% over the 40 year period, 1960-2000 (Kant and Graubard, 2004). It is notable that this figure does not include ready prepared meals purchased for consumption in the home,
such as those found in supermarkets, and increasingly offered by restaurant operated delicatessens. In the United Kingdom research carried out by the Department for Food, Environment and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) to determine expenditures on food purchased for consumption outside the home, shows a weekly spend of £10.93 per person in the 2004-2005 period. Further analysis has shown a range of expenditure when measure against income quintiles of £5.14 to £15.80 (DEFRA, 2005). In New Zealand approximately 25% of household food expenditure is spent on food outside the home (Statistics, 2004). Whilst all of this expenditure is within the public sphere, namely outside of what is commonly understood as the home, much of this consumption can be considered to have taken place within quasi-public spaces such as restaurants, bars, cafes, hotels. The extent of this expenditure and utilisation of commercial spaces of, and for consumption clearly suggest a legitimate field of enquiry with respect to understanding hospitality through the consumption of food outside the home. Therefore, in order to understand the processes at work underlying the consumption of hospitality, there is an imperative to establish an understanding of the act of consumption itself.

4.2 Consumption

Chapter 2 outlined the consumption of food and beverage and established the concept of the meal as socially and culturally situated. This section defines the processes involved in consuming food and beverage from within the framework of the economic system that supports the consumer society.
4.2.1 Defining ‘Consumption’

Etymologically ‘consumption’ has two distinct roots and, therefore, understandings (Clarke et al., 2003): Destruction - the use of a produced commodity, as when one consumes a meal or food and beverage item, and; creating - as can be envisaged in the relationships established, memories created from the shared meal (Clarke, 2003). Somewhat paradoxically then, consumption is recognised as creating and destroying. Both these meanings can be seen as embedded in hospitality, through the consumption or destruction of material hospitality and thecreational outcomes of the process of socialisation

Consumption as a term is also suggested as ‘semantically too limiting’, as it has the connotation of the act ‘of taking’, rather than an act ‘of participation’ (Lynch, 2005). Lynch goes further to suggest that if hospitality is viewed as a transaction rather than consumption, the ‘phenomenological experiential reality’, of hospitality may be realised. Although this may describe the procedural component of hospitality, the relation between producer and consumer, it does not adequately place the performance of hospitality. How do we consume the experience?

Analysing consumption as a dichotomy therefore, provides numerous difficulties. The consumption of the meal for example can be both de-structive and con-structive simultaneously. Further tensions become apparent if the hospitality (as the meal experience) is analysed from the perspectives of materiality and “being”. Whilst de-structive and con-structive consumption of food and beverage products are readily
apparent, the same is not the case for the relational and experiential phase. Whilst one might consider an experience as a consumer to be con-structive, through, for example, memories created: alternatively, if one were to consider the relation dynamics of the host/staff and guest/consumer nexus, one might consider the performance de-structive, if the interaction was not intersubjective. In other words, for con-structive consumption to occur, both actors must “create” the performance, whereby it then becomes mutually constructed. Therefore the hospitality experience can be con-structive or de-structive, but not simultaneously con-structive and de-structive, as are the material components of the meal. Whilst the consumption is destructive, it also remains constructive in that it provides nourishment.

Consumption is embodied in the everyday activity of eating for survival, in ensuring existence. Conversely it can also be considered as central to the wants and desires of individuals when eating for leisure purposes. Clarke (2003) suggests that consumption is better viewed as a continuum, rather than a dichotomous process. The consumption of the meal becomes both/and, as opposed to desires/wants or in other words, the choice between basic foodstuffs versus luxury foodstuffs. Consumption of the food and beverage experience and product for the purposes of this discussion will therefore be located as on a continuum. This is recognised in the consumption of the meal outside the home.

Whilst food and beverages are consumed outside the home in the commercial context, this consumption can be regarded both as need (sustenance) and want (desire). The business person in choosing to lunch in an exclusive restaurant eats simultaneously
for survival, both nutritionally and economically, whilst potentially choosing the
restaurant based on desire. Moreover, hospitality is seen as a medium through which
consumption may both create individual identity and act as a space for self expression
(Gillespie and Morrison, 2001). In Chapter Three, hospitality was established both as a
form of, and subject to, symbolic exchange. The suggestion is however, that symbolic
exchange in consumer society has been superseded by that of sign recognition, where
consumption of objects is predicated on the need to (re)establish increasingly remote
relationships (Clarke et al., 2003). Rather theatrically, Baudrillard (Baudrillard,
1981/2003 pg. 255) argues that it is somewhat nonsensical to analyse consumption as it
appears, and therefore it is time to:

‘deconstruct all the assumptive notions involved - object, need, aspiration, consumption itself - for it would make
little sense to theorise the quotidain from surface evidence as to interpret the manifest discourse of a dream: it is rather
the dream-work and the dream-processes that must be analysed in order to recover the unconscious logic of a
more profound discourse’.

Material hospitality can therefore be considered as grounded in the consumption of
everyday objects. Furthermore the spatial and temporal context of hospitality may render
its performance as increasingly everyday. Hospitality as act becomes mindless, non
thinking behaviour, as it becomes intertwined with eating out as an everyday activity (see
4.5). Thus whilst commercial hospitality is considered by some to retain elements of the
extraordinary, the remainder of this chapter will argue that the opposite may be the case.
By viewing commercial hospitality within a broader ontological perspective the
consumption of commercial hospitality will be suggested as mindless rationalised behaviour.

4.2.2 Commensality: issues of sharing

Chapter Three established hospitality as dialectical (see 3.3.1), that is, the notion of host/guest, hostility/hospitality and known/unknown, amongst other oppositions. It was further suggested that without these relationships, hospitality would cease to exist. Furthermore it is submitted that the performance of hospitality creates ‘community solidarity’ (Bell and Valentine, 1997 pg. 96).

In consumer society, commensality might be considered of central sign value. As Sobal (2000 pg. 123) puts it, ‘you are who you eat with’. More specifically, commensality has been described as a ‘gathering aimed to achieve in a collective way some material task and symbolic obligations linked to the satisfaction of an individual biological need’ (Grignon, 2001 pg 24). Grignon further suggests that commensal encounters may be further defined by their temporal characteristics. “Encounter” commensality, for example, is one that is of limited duration. An example of encounter commensality used to create sign value would include those tour groups requesting specific tables in restaurants with prominent signage to identify to other competitors their primacy. Tables set with the tour group name, in what is seen by other individual as the prime restaurant location. Whilst the food consumed may be the same with both the signed and unsigned groups the focus becomes one of recognition and prestige. Although
the discussion of commensality might appear somewhat obscure, it places social interaction (Mennell et al., 1992) at the centre of the consumption of hospitality.

Commensality might be considered unavoidable in the provision of the meal in the commercial semi-public space. Commensality defines and borders immediate spaces of consumption and provides social signification as ‘insiders are [considered] socially different to outsiders’ (Mennell et al., 1992 pg. 117). Moreover commensality can be regarded as an agent of social change (Mintz and Du Bois, 2002), as it defines and (re)defines what is acceptable in social situations. Finkelstein’s (1989) concept of the restaurant as space for eating, which then becomes also a site of incivility, has been criticised, as it is suggested that the notion of people enjoying themselves is central to the restaurant experience (Ashley, 2004). However, commensality, by its very nature, creates incivility in the quasi-public space of the restaurant. It creates bordered spaces of exclusion, which by their very social nature look inwards. Thus the shared space of the restaurant in reality becomes a site or space of incivility which at times becomes contested. It can be suggested that this contestation becomes manifested in the interaction between the consumer (as potential guest) and the service staff (as potential or de-facto hosts).

4.3 Hospitality: product and service or experience?

There are multiple and sometimes contradictory understandings of hospitality (see Chapter Three for definitions of hospitality). In contemporary society, the term
hospitality has, in many ways, become synonymous with the products and services associated with material hospitality - food and beverage or accommodation and service as the provision of these objects. This is reinforced if one considers what is regarded as the dominant exchange values in consumer society, that of economic (monetary) exchange. However, whilst the physical product is consumed as an economic good, the performance of hospitality itself is also open to consumption. As established in Chapter Three, hospitality is constitutive of two distinct characteristics, namely material and act (performance). It is the embodied character of hospitality “as act” that is suggested as capable of symbolic consumption. The intersubjective performance of the ritual and myth of hospitality becomes consumable as experience.

The emergence of the services marketing paradigm (Vargo and Lusch, 2004) has led to the recognition of services in achieving comparative advantage in many industries (Laws, 2004). Whilst service is used with increasing abandon in the marketing discipline specifically (Vargo and Lusch, 2004), it is felt pertinent to define service, within a hospitality context. In the contemporary commercial environment, service and hospitality may be seen as interchangeable. Although service can be defined as food and beverage delivery, it is also considered to represent the relational component of the host guest interaction, the performance (Wood, 2004). Moreover, the host – guest nexus within hospitality as “way of being” is necessarily intersubjective, thus the host (as individual or community) might also be regarded as a consumer of the performance.

A recent, rather fractious debate between Brotherton (2003, Brotherton), Jones (2004b), and Slattery (Slattery, 2003, Slattery, 2002) highlights the tensions in defining
hospitality within the commercial domain. The change of accepted nomenclature from that of hotel and catering industry to the hospitality industry (Guerrier and Adib, 2000) has, it is suggested, resulted in contested views of hospitality within the industry preview. The contretemps is based on the publication of *In Search of Hospitality: theoretical perspectives and debates* (Guerrier and Adib, 2000), a rather timely publication that has attempted to explore our understandings of hospitality as an industry from a social scientific perspective. Thus *hospitality* is placed as central to understanding consumption and production within the industry. The performance of hospitality as an experience and performance is given primacy.

Slattery (2002) proposes the importance and dominance of *industry* over hospitality situated within an economic system, value added, and primarily focused on goods and services, both measurable and quantifiable business components. He further suggests that the “act” of hospitality can ‘only be regarded as gossip and of no value to professionals in the hospitality business’ (Slattery, 2002 pg. 21). Slattery’s approach it is suggested reminds one of why globalisation is so powerful, his views of the dominance of material hospitality enable the purveyors of hospitality, and specifically trans-national corporations, to legitimately focus their productive capabilities on mass production, internationalisation and standardisation. Thus it is not only tangible products open for standardisation but also the service delivery.

Many definitions of hospitality are predicated on the notion of the service as added value, but it is proposed that within the hospitality industry it is the service product that is being promoted and consumed (Burns, 1997). By associating service with a
tangible product it is suggested that it is placed in the realm of material hospitality, thus able to be operationalised, managed, and measured (Crang, 1992). Thus the organisation places the experience of hospitality up for sale.

4.4 Commercialised Hospitality (or normative consumption: home or away!)

Chapter Three introduced the reader to the hospitality as a concept, hospitality as a way of being, a performance between individuals for mutual benefit. The exchange was one of gift or reciprocity rather than of economic exchange. This section will establish hospitality located as an agent of the economic system.

The provision of hospitality in pre modern times was based on mutual benefit, where there is potential for the host to one day require food and drink or accommodation, and the apparent need of the stranger for sustenance determined by distance from “home”. Although it is not in the remit of this thesis to establish a historical grounding for the commercialisation of hospitality, it is considered useful to acknowledge that the commercialisation of hospitality goes back to the establishment of early Latin hospitality (Pitt-Rivers, 1963). The exchange value was placed in tokens that were given by travellers to their host (Browner, 2003). Upon production of this token, hospitality was returned. It is notable that use of the token was not limited to the use of the host, but was able to pass through generations.
Heal (1990) suggests the increasing commercialisation of hospitality, whilst driven by increased propensity to travel, was also influenced by notions of familiarity. Increasingly the relationship between villagers and travellers became one of commercial transaction and the decreasing value placed on the ‘praise from the stranger’. In the early part of the 15th century Dalechamp commented on the decline in private hospitality as the ‘abundance of Inns and Alehouses…convinces the World of inhospitalitie’ (Heal, 1990 pg. 395). Not only does this statement recognise the transfer of the provision of travellers’ hospitality from the private to commercial sphere, it also suggests an acceptance of consuming food and beverage outside the home environment. Hospitality also became used as currency in itself and as symbolic capital, where on completion of a job, tradesmen were partly paid with a “celebratory meal” (Bourdieu, 1977). This notion of hospitality is still recognised, albeit in a rather more negative connotation, especially within the public sector, where hospitality is linked to corruption (Oliver, 1997). Hospitality through its implied reciprocity acts as a form of *quid pro quo*.

Hospitality, both as cultural construction (materialist) and culturally proscribed behaviour that ensured spiritual well being and social cohesion thus underwent a paradigm shift. Contemporary commercialised hospitality and the materialism of consumer society has created a notion (philosophy) of hospitality where the spiritual (moral and ethical) constituents have succumbed to one of consumerism.
4.4.1 Industrialisation of hospitality

Whilst hospitality has a long history of commercialisation, the processes associated with industrialisation came relatively late to the hospitality industry. This may be due to hospitality as situated within the service sector. Further the consumption of the meal within the restaurant environment is considered to be a simultaneous co-production between the consumer and producer (Williams, 2002). Thus mass production was considered to be problematic, with a key concern being the resultant standardisation of products and experiences inherent within the Fordist paradigm. The service offering is also potential perishable and intangible and this is also considered to be problematic in the industrialisation of hospitality (Fuglsang, 2002 pg. 177). It is suggested, however, that services are susceptible to some ‘flexible standardisation’. Levitt (Levitt, 1976) discusses the ability of the United States to increase efficiencies within service organisations, unlike the British, whom Levitt suggests are tied to historical precedent. In particular the idea of the servant and that the notion to ‘serve’ (pg. 64) results in resistance to industrialisation. This also suggests that these traditional structures are wasteful and present opportunities for efficiencies available within a Fordist paradigm of mass production. It might be suggested that Levitt proposes a model of rationalisation prior to Ritzer’s (1993) McDonaldization thesis, albeit focused on production and economic issues, rather than the sociological slant of Ritzer (see section 4.5 for a discussion of rationalisation and technology).
The notion of industrialising *hospitality* might be said to appeal to some (Slattery, 2002) who view hospitality as merely the production and consumption of tangibles, which are more than capable of mass production. Slattery further suggests that the consumer is not a *guest* but rather a buyer and the resultant transaction is purely economic, a perspective that appears to be dominated by the North American schools of hospitality (Barrows and Bosselman, 1999). This has in turn encouraged the use of practices that maximise the economic returns gained through commercial hospitality organisations, in turn offering legitimacy to practices used in other industries.

4.5 Rationalisation of Hospitality

The everyday consumption of food and beverage can be considered a normative action (Newman and Harper, 2004). Normative actions can further be considered as creating a dominant view of ‘human nature and social order’ (Finkelstein, 1998 pg. 211). The habituation of eating outside the home suggests therefore that our understanding of individual behaviour when eating away from home may not be the reality it seems. Whilst one might consider eating out as representative of individualised performances of pleasure and personal taste, we are blinkered by our cultural belief in individualism, to the received notion that cultural and entertainment industries shape our understandings (Finkelstein, 1999).

If this is the case then it might suggest that the performance of hospitality is little more than a pseudo-event (Boorstin, 1964). As discussed previously hospitality can be
considered as material or performative. It is suggested that the increase in eating out as entertainment, rather than necessity, has privileged material hospitality. This section discusses how growing demand in conjunction with the increasing industrialisation of the industry has resulted in the subjugation of hospitality as “way of being”.

4.5.1 McHospitality Industry?

Rationalisation is a term that is enjoying increasing currency in the study of contemporary consumer society (Fine, 2002). However it is a term that has multiple meanings and can be subject to misinterpretation when discussing the processes of consumption (or production). Within this thesis rationalisation is representative of the processes that have become recognised as characteristic of modernity. Rationalisation is considered to have five key characteristics: efficiency, calculability, predictability, control though the replacement of human by non-human technology, and the irrationality of rationality (Ritzer, 2002). Rationality is therefore understood as a set of values in which these processes are accepted as being beneficial for society (Chaney, 2002).

When Ritzer introduced “McDonaldization” (1993) to the lexicon, his focus was on the application of the processes inherent within McDonalds to wider sociological issues. Moreover it was suggested that McDonaldization was (and most likely still is) a growing trend in contemporary society. In response to criticism Ritzer (1999a, 1993) argues that McDonaldization is contingent upon a combination of material and ideal factors, factors inherent at that time within the fast food industry. These processes were
dependant on both technology and a willing consumer, dependencies that were not applicable to other sectors of the hospitality at the time. A combination of technological advances and the increase in dining out, however, place dining out capable of rationalisation.

In a rather critical response to Ritzer’s notion of McDonaldization, Finkelstein (Finkelstein, 1999) argues eloquently that restaurants are unable to be considered sites of rationalisation. She goes on to suggest that historically restaurants were, rather, the space for social change and that the apparent individualisation of the restaurant prohibits the rise of McDonaldization. The coffee houses of Seventeenth Century England are specifically mentioned as the precursors of the fast food industry, but, whilst considered the providers of goods and services, were also the site of human interactions, spaces for spontaneous social exchange. It might be suggested that Finkelstein’s argument is based on the ubiquity of taste, the fact that taste becomes a marker of habitus (Bourdieu, 1984). However, this does not preclude the argument for the rationalisation of the restaurant sector.

Historically the provision of hospitality was predicated on necessity rather than choice. As Chapter Three discussed, increased mobility has resulted in the increased demand for those products and services associated with hospitality. Essential to both the provision of the performance of hospitality has been the interaction between the host and guest. It is this performance that has historically restricted the rationalisation of the hospitality industry. The guest remained unknown, a stranger in the performance of socialisation. If one is to follow Ritzer’ characteristics of rationalisation, it might be
suggested that hospitality has been in an ongoing process of rationalisation. Increased
demand for food and beverages through mobility ensured the commercial imperative, the
maximisation of profit. As a caricature of the landlord in the musical adaptation of Victor
Hugo’s *Les Miserables* shows, hospitality’s opposition (hostility) was apparent in the
commercial imperative.

Master of the house
Keeper of the zoo
Ready to relieve 'em
Of a sou or two
Watering the wine
Making up the weight
Pickin' up their knick-knacks
When they can't see straight
Everybody loves a landlord
Everybody's bosom friend
I do whatever pleases
Jesus! Won't I bleed 'em in the end!

Inn keepers in early modern England were adept at maximising profitability
through the adulteration of ales and foodstuffs (Hackwood, 1909), a result in part of
demand exceeding supply. However the opportunities for rationalisation have been
restricted in two respects. Firstly, the industrialisation of the meal has been limited
somewhat by the perception of the restaurant as a socially stratified site of consumption
(Spang, 2000). Additionally, Finkelstein (1999) suggests that restaurants, as sites of
sociability offer the potential for social crossover to create new social identities, thus
offering the potential to prohibit its rationalisation. Furthermore, it can be suggested that
the notion of social and cultural capital have acted as resistance to the process of
rationalisation. Access for the masses has been restricted through knowledge of
behaviours and skills, rather than through access to economic capital, as food practices and taste might be considered to be class specific (Bourdieu, 1984). Thus food (and the meal) is ascribed with terms denoting its applicability to social groups - peasant food, rich food, luxury item amongst others. Similarly the meal experience has been discussed as a form of art (Hegarty and O'Mahony, 2001) and as such it represents a cultural boundary accessible to the select few with the cultural capital necessary to “understand” it. This can also be seen as a reliance on human labour, suggesting that food as art is incapable of being technologically replicated. Barthes (1997) also posits the meal as a cultural entity and thus incapable of fulfilling the characteristics of rationalisation demanded by Ritzer.

Material (and indeed all) hospitality therefore remains tied to the notion of human capital, the control of which is limited by access to the human skills associated with the level at which the restaurant is targeted would require a highly skilled chef (e.g. Haute cuisine). Thus the application of McDonaldization through de-skilling and standardisation is restricted.

Until recently the use of technology to replace human involvement has likewise been limited. Both the production and service of the meal have been regarded as labour intensive. Moreover, the industry has been highly regulated through established hierarchical practices, such as kitchen and restaurant brigades as codified by Escoffier in the Nineteenth Century (Jacobs and Scholliers, 2003). More recent attempts have also been made to introduce new technologies to the restaurant sector, in particular the use of sous vide in the mid 1980’s, where high profile chef Albert Roux opened the first sous
vide factory after extensive consultation with Bournemouth University (Whitworth, 2005). Subsequent issues with the technology resulted in legislation in the United States restricting its use (Ghazala, 1998).

To this point the discussion has centred on potential reasons that might explain why McDonaldization is seen by some as not applicable to the commercial provision of the meal outside of fast food restaurants. A key focus in the McDonaldization thesis has been that of massification, both of audience/market and of production (Fine, 1999). The use of buffets within the restaurant fulfills multiple roles in the rationalisation of the meal.

As the consumer reads the semiotic narrative as one of excess, the buffet in fact becomes a site of multiple controls. The consumer gazes upon what may seem excess and the aesthetic becomes dominant (Urry, 1995). Furthermore, in many cases the illusion is intensified through the use of apparent “luxury” foods, such as seafood and extravagant ice displays, suggesting the use of highly skilled personnel. In reality ice moulds have often been used and foods imported from developing countries. Additionally the consumer becomes subject to Foucauldian surveillance (Foucault, 1977). Control is exerted both by structural agency, where the censure of fellow guests becomes apparent and by the control exerted through the interaction of staff. As part of the buffet “experience” the consumer fulfills the requirements of McDonaldization through carrying out tasks normally considered work of the staff (Ritzer, 1993). In effect the consumer becomes the deliverer of their own meal. In some cases this process is taken further, as in the case of barbeque or grill restaurants where the consumer must cook their own food.
Recent advances have overcome previous issues with *sous vide* technology discussed previously. This process is now being used with success in creating what is perceived by the consumer to be a product of the standard normally associated with highly skilled kitchen staff. “Gastro pubs” in the United Kingdom are increasingly using this technology to offer the consumer products that were nominally beyond their reach (Rowan, 2005). The increased availability of technology, rationalisation of operating procedures and the dismantling of social structures of consumption choices (Beck, 1992), has resulted in the democratisation of dining out. The limits on access have been lifted. Consumer taste is also increasingly mediated by television and magazines with the result that there is a reduction in the need for cultural capital to gain “admittance”.

Access to spaces for eating out has come to be dominated by the right of access through economic capital (Spang, 2000). Whilst the sign value associated with cultural capital and social capital remains, it can be suggested that the democratisation of eating out has increased led to increased demand. This in turn, has legitimised the rationalisation of operational procedures, resulting in the restructuring of hospitality organisations (Go and Pine, 1995). For example, front of house technology allows the instant processing of orders to the kitchen and, thus, restaurant managers are replaced by supervisors and experienced career staff replaced by part time students (Lucas and Ralston, 1996). This is clearly an indication that the characteristics inherent within the notion of McDonaldization are beginning to appear.

A key factor in McDonaldization is the irrationality of rationality (Ritzer, 2001). This relates to the inefficiencies brought about by supposed efficiencies. The buffet as
symbolic of McDonaldization, for example, results in additional waste to that of traditional a la carte restaurants. This occurs despite the fact that usage can be anticipated and the over-supply of food minimised, as the use of aesthetic requires the buffet to be maintained at suitable visual level throughout service. Hygiene regulations in many countries then require this food to be discarded as a potential health risk (Kovats et al., 2004).

The understanding of hospitality established in Chapter Three is predicated on hospitality not only as product and service but also as act. However rationalisation has led to a number of negative aspects that have resulted in the subjugation of hospitality as way of being. Hospitality is dependant upon the intersubjective relationship between host and guest. McDonaldization, however, has resulted in higher levels of unskilled staff and increased turnover (Lucas and Ralston, 1996). The levels of emotion that such staff can sustain are limited and thus potentially lead to unsatisfactory encounters (Grayson, 1998). The rationalisation of managerial positions has resulted in junior staff accepting more responsibility. This has the potential to impact on the interpretation by the consumer of the role of the host. Staff are empowered to act on behalf of management and, whilst it has been shown that this results in faster response to complaints, greater commitment and lower turnover (Lashley, 1999), it may affect the power within the host-guest dynamic. Whilst this is efficient for the organisation, the same may not be the case for the consumer. There also remain highly structured parameters in which staff must perform. These include restrictions on what changes may be allowed to the organisation’s product
for example. Thus there is conflict between guest expectations and organisational goals (Bowen and Ford, 2004).

It is also apparent that, while traditional hospitality was based on necessity, the growth in demand in the contemporary hospitality industry is a result of eating out as choice, the situating of eating as a legitimate leisure activity (Warde and Martens, 2000). Thus the provision of the meal becomes entertainment or, as has been suggested by Ritzer (1999), “eatertainment”. The performance of hospitality thus becomes disenchanted and becomes subject to reclassification as Boortsin’s (1964) pseudo-event. The use of the term hospitality linked to the hotel and catering sector suggests the performance of hospitality and its attendant benefits, whereas in reality it may be considered a performance of hostility.

The objectives of rationalization have been to remove opportunities for intersubjective performance from the consumer (and the risk therein for the organisation). Although hospitality is characterised by the notion of simultaneous production and consumption, rationalization has (re)situated the individual as consumer of heavily scripted and controlled performances. As Lashley (2002) suggests, the staff performance becomes one of the deployment of emotional labour. The emotional labour performed in the restaurant encounter, as Mann (1999) proposes, ‘involves the faking of emotion that is not felt, and/or the faking of emotions that are felt’ (Lashley, 2002 pg. 256). Although the organisation maintains control, it may also result in an unconvincing performance and thus perceived falsity by the guest.
Globalisation and the processes of rationalisation are intertwined (Ritzer, 2003), however the analysis of the impact of these processes requires the dissection of both constructs. This section therefore, discusses interconnectedness of the meal (as hospitality) and the ‘global processes’ (Urry, 2000 pg. 13) associated with globalisation. Globalisation is about borders; about time and space; about the influences of mobility. Hospitality therefore might be seen as both a result of, and an agent for, the processes involved. As Beck (Beck, 2002 pg. 17) suggests ‘[g]lobalization is a non-linear, dialectic process’, which furthermore offers ‘combined and mutually implicating principles’. These processes it is suggested are apparent within the consumption and provision of hospitality.

The products associated with hospitality that one consumes (eats) on an everyday basis might be said to be symbolic of the process of globalisation. Many of these are consigned to the daily minutiae of unthinking consumption. Whilst we valorise the exoticism of imported “ethnic” food products, we forget that in time they become part of the culture of the everyday. Likewise the concept of hospitality, both commercial and private, has both influenced and been influenced by globalisation. Hospitality is the socialisation of the stranger: the individual who crosses the threshold of our “home” is welcomed (see 3.3.2). By its nature, hospitality opens us to the influence of outside cultures, whilst at the same time presenting the stranger with performances of the host
culture through the meal, representative of place, both natural and cultural (Lévi-Strauss, 1963).

The expansion of hospitality is inextricably linked with the mobility of humankind. Increased mobility (see 3.3) has impacted directly on the philosophies underpinning hospitality. If one is to consider food as representative of place and symbolic of local difference (Haukeland and Jacobsen, 2001), then the processes of globalisation act as an agent of internationalisation. This creates global similarities, both of place and material hospitality.

Globalisation in the context of the meal can be defined by three key characteristics: notions of place associated with food products and cuisines (Cook and Crang, 2005); the structural systems associated with the delivery of the meal experience (Bryman, 2004); and cultural factors in the process of globalisation (Robertson, 1992). Chapter Two discussed the meal (and food) as a linguistic system, and it is developing an understanding of the communication (and interpretation) of the meal that is central to understanding the role of food, the meal and hospitality in the processes of globalisation.

Food has always played an important part in global exploration, but foodstuffs that returned with explorers tended to remain exotic for long periods of time. In England, for example, it took more than 200 years before ‘potatoes, tomatoes, peppers and haricot beans…were ever eaten, except as rare, exotic ingredients on the tables of the wealthy’ (Spencer, 2000 pg. 1221).
A result of the globalisation of culture has been the appropriation of hospitality, where hospitality as a way of being is used in everyday discourse. Once hospitality was performed in a culturally specific manner, but it is now suggested as potentially standardised. It can therefore be suggested that the hospitality industry has appropriated hospitality as a ‘scape’ for the development of transnational, globalised organisations. In other words, the organisation uses cultural conditioning to offer a homogenised welcome, culture of hospitality and process of social interaction.

In response to globalisation, old conventions of hospitality and sociability were (and are being) redefined in consonance with the imagined global ways of doing business and consuming time (Zhen, 2001 pg. 135). Our views of the world define what we “see” and define as hospitality. Service methods applicable in the United States become de rigueur in European restaurants (Levitt, 1976). The myth of hospitality as an agent of (micro) cultural socialisation has been rejected for that of (global) socialisation.

### 4.6 From Actor to Observer

It is argued that historically the socio-economic relationship between buyers and sellers has resulted in the known/unknown relationship becoming somewhat of a paradox. The process of supply and demand have somewhat limited the intersubjective nature of the performance in that the actors are constituted separately (Fullbrook, 2002). This suggests a high degree of disparity, and indeed distance, between producers and consumers. Hospitality however is predicated on the simultaneity of production and
consumption (Brotherton, 1999). In other words, there must be some form of social interaction between the producer of the meal and the consumer of the meal. Furthermore, the deconstruction of hospitality has established a dyadic relationship between material hospitality and hospitality as “act”, or the “doing” of hospitality (performative hospitality). One might therefore consider the consumption of the commercial meal as the intersection of hospitality understood in its traditional role as “act” and the contemporary understanding as material hospitality, an intersection undergoing constant mediation.

The objectives of rationalisation are to remove the consumer from the opportunities for intersubjective performance. Although hospitality is characterised by the notion of simultaneous production and consumption, rationalisation has placed the individual as consumer of a scripted, controlled performance, rather than as co-creator of their individualised experience. The experience is reduced to that of voyeur.

The relational performance of the meal experience is problematised through a modern reading of the roles of buyer and seller. This relationship is central to the realisation of the culture of consumption.

4.6.1 Culture of Consumption

As has been discussed previously, a material reality of hospitality is manifested through the production and consumption of food and beverages associated with the meal. It is this understanding of hospitality that may be recognised as situated within
contemporary consumer society. This can be further defined as material culture which is considered as the objectification of social consciousness (Lee, 1993), the production of food and beverage as tangible creations that ‘society makes uses and shares’ (Mansvelt, 2005 870 pg. 9). Thus, it is this public consumption of material culture, symbolic of the culture of consumption that allows consumer behaviours to be studied and understood (Firat and Venkatesh, 1995).

Firat (2003 pg. 2) has suggested that the contemporary consumer ‘becomes the representation of the individual’. Moreover, the processes inherent within consumption are the means by which one establishes a place in contemporary society (Schor and Holt, 2000). Thus, to establish both identity and position, there is an inherent need for the consumer to be recognised as having some semblance of control within the consumptive experience. Therein lies a paradox of consumption and, more specifically, the consumption of material hospitality.

The mass consumption of manufactured goods was posited on the temporal and spatial barrier between consumption and production (Clarke et al., 2003). However the consumption of hospitality as an experience is predicated on the notion of simultaneity. It is argued that this results in the potential for both consumer and producer conflict. As Korczynski (2004) suggests, there is a cultural contradiction between traditional notions of production driven rationalisation and the market orientated consumer-centric paradigm. This is further problematised if one is to accept Bauman’s assertion that:

The *spiritus movens* of consumer activity is not a set of articulated, let alone fixed, needs, but *desire* – a much more
volatile and ephemeral, evasive and capricious, and essentially non-referential phenomenon: a self-begotten and self-perpetuating motive that calls for no justification or apology either in terms of objective or cause.

Bauman (2001 pg. 13)

The management of the hospitality experience is based on the premise of assumed consumer needs, rather than ever-changing and unquantifiable desires. The result is a rationalisation of the processes of archaic hospitality, the subjugation of the relational reality of hospitality in favour of the material. The process of consumption is based on the irrationality of individualised actors (Bauman, 2001). Furthermore, the consumer is placed as Queen/King, usurping the previously discussed notion of the host as master (see 3.5.2).

The tendency for the consumer to go along with the practice of enchantment that is inherent within the rationalisation of experiences, whilst remaining aware of its underlying falsity (Korczynski and Ott, 2004), becomes an everyday transaction within consumer society. The consumer is led to believe that they are sovereign by a marketing dominant ideology. There is a merging of subject and object as production and consumption come together. The role of (continual) spectacularisation removes the individual from the process of merging, placing the consumer as a disengaged spectator (Borgmann, 2000), whilst still retaining the guise of sovereign. The performance of hospitality becomes a passive encounter between service personnel and consumer (rather than host and guest). Moreover this interaction is brought to fruition in the performance of informational sociality rather than relational sociality. That is the interaction is based
on the consumers need to obtain information (e.g. menus, placing an order or finding out about local attractions) rather the interaction with the host or, in the case of most commercial hospitality, the service provider.

4.7 Conclusion

The reification and subsequent objectification of hospitality is problematical. The meal experiences (as food and beverages) are interpreted as material reality, which together with the spatial and temporal characteristics of hospitality gain sign value. It is suggested that this is one of the desired outcomes of contemporary consumer society (Barthes, 1997). However this has led to the relational reality at the heart of archaic hospitality to be overwhelmed by the production/consumption centred paradigm.

Improvements in technology have resulted in the increasing ability to industrialise and hence rationalise the processes associated with the production of hospitality. This has impacted on the previous placement of hospitality as predicated on the simultaneity of production and consumption, which placed human interaction at the centre of the performance of hospitality. However it is suggested that a consumer-centric focus based on anticipated consumer needs, rather than desires (Bauman, 2001), undermines hospitality as a ‘way of being’. This process has further facilitated the rationalisation of hospitality leading to the subversion of spontaneity, emotion and interiority by the spectacularisation of the experience (Debord, 1977). The performance becomes exteriorised and the guest (re)situated as voyeur. Hospitality, it is suggested, becomes a
dehumanised activity, the antithesis to its roots. Ritzer (2001 pg. 33) postulates that it is this process of McDonaldization which may result in a system that is ‘antihuman or even destructive of human beings’. It becomes the hostility inherent within hospitality that gains ascendancy. The performances of dining out become, in effect, an act of incivility (Finkelstein, 1989).

The discussion within this chapter has placed the consumer as ‘known’. That is performance is one that is both routinized (of the everyday) and within a known spatial environment. Chapter Five introduces hospitality within the context of the tourism phenomenon – the opportunity to experience the extraordinary in a potentially unknown environment. Therefore hospitality will be considered as consumed by the individual-as-tourist.
Chapter Five: Tourism as Agential

5.1 Introduction

This chapter (re)introduces previously discussed notions of hospitality, situated within the cognate field of tourism studies. The objective is to suggest that, whilst remaining commodified and essentially commercial; hospitality performed within the context of a tourism experience may regain its moral imperative (see 3.2). Moreover, this chapter argues that the intersubjective nature of hospitality allows a state of cosmopolitanism to be realised in the touristic performance. Borders and boundaries not only become permeable but, it will be argued, in the interrelational performance they become eroded through the act and consumption of hospitality.

To state that hospitality is essential to the continuance of tourism as a social activity might seem somewhat superfluous. In reality almost all tourists are dependant upon the hospitality of others at some stage of the tourism process. In fact Cohen (1984 pg. 375) posits the inseparability of tourism from hospitality, by suggesting research into the tourism phenomenon could be conducted using ‘tourism as commercialised hospitality’ as an analytical framework.

Viewed economically, tourism represents an essential component of many regional and national development strategies. Tourism as an industry is widely regarded as labour intensive and, as such, represents opportunities to (re)locate employment (Hall,
lost through outcomes of the Modernity Project. The Hospitality Industry is central to the performance of tourism as an economic activity, both as a labour intensive sector and as a supplier of key products and services for consumer consumption. Moreover, the tangible product associated with hospitality (notably food and beverage) are being increasingly recognised as a viable tool in destination marketing strategies (Law et al., 2004, Selwood, 2003). It has been suggested that the effectiveness of a city brand is based on a strong hospitality and services sector (Bennett, 2005). Furthermore, food and its consumption are increasingly viewed as implicit in the travel decision making processes. This may be in the choosing the destination based on hospitality infrastructure (Sparks et al., 2003) or food and beverages as a primary motivation to travel (Haukeland and Jacobsen, 2001, Hjalager and Richards, 2002, Mitchell and Hall, 2003). The latter may be interpreted as a condition of contemporary consumer society and the placement of food as both ‘serious’ leisure activity (Mitchell and Hall, 2003) and its increasing use as a social marker (see 2.2).

This chapter begins by offering a framework from which further discussion of the performance of hospitality can be situated. Hospitality is thus recognised as a necessary condition of the survival of the tourist as an individual and therefore realised as a key component of the tourism economic system. Inherent to the performance of hospitality (as is discussed in previous chapters) are individuals as actors, located at the nexus of the hospitality-tourism encounter. The tourist-provider dichotomy is also analysed from within the bounds of previous identification of hospitality as one of a process of socialisation. Central to this argument is the contestation between ‘modern code[s] of
efficiency and the traditional code of hospitality’ (Soares, 1998 pg. 292). Thus the analysis distinguishes between hospitality as located within the economic system and hospitality as located within a socio-cultural system.

Recent discourse suggests the conventions of hospitality have become somewhat “irrelevant” within contemporary mass tourism (Chambers, 1997) and this chapter argues that this view may be a result of consumption practices manifested in late modernity. However it is suggested that this is not inevitable. This is illustrated through a discussion of hospitality as an agent of globalisation via the destructuration of borders both real and imagined. The realisation of hospitality is, however, predicated on the acknowledgement of borders, the localisation of performance and maintenance of individual identity. This chapter places hospitality under analysis using tourism as an optic. The proceeding discussion therefore examines elements of the relationships between tourism and hospitality.

5.2 Situating Hospitality within Tourism

The understanding of hospitality developed thus far is predicated on the notion of human mobility (see 3.3). Originally, hospitality was an imperative to provide succour to the stranger, both from a moral perspective and as a means of maintaining social structures through the socialisation of the stranger. The stranger was therefore educated in the ‘ways of life’ applicable within the host community. Hospitality can thus be considered a manifestation of human mobility, subject to changes brought about through
technological, social and cultural development. Within many pre-modern communities, immobility was considered a central structural characteristic and as such hospitality played a central role in the value system. However as Stefansson (2004 pg. 184) argues, contemporary notions of fixity are:

characterised as leaving behind the narrative of (em)placement (or sedentariness), in which the theoretical gaze was pointed at immobility, stability, boundedness and cultural continuity, and adopting a new narrative of mobility, emphasising aspects of physical movement, globalisation, transnationalism diaspora, cultural creolization, and socio-cultural construction.

Thus, hospitality is contested by contemporary understandings of mobility. No longer is human movement limited both by technology and cultural constraints, but is brought about, from within itself, by ‘travel as culture’ (Clifford, 1992 pg. 103).

Where, in pre-modern times, travel was based on necessity, it has developed over time to become one of the world’s most economically successful consumer experiences, increasingly viewed as an essential leisure activity. This has necessarily resulted in its reification, a consequence of ‘separation and compartmentalisation’ considered as ‘concurrent to the processes of commodification and rationalisation’ (Jameson et al., 2000 pg. 17). Thus the growth of the tourism industry places the sign value of travel as separated from its origins as signifier of cultural stability. The tourist is no longer one who requires socialisation (as was a necessary outcome of archaic hospitality; see Chapter Three), but has become somewhat of a paradox. On the one hand considered sovereign as consumer, to whom every whim is met (see 4.6), but also considered by many as a dupe, subject to the manoeuvrings of the organisation (Ritzer, 2004). The
individual is thus conditioned by the diverse practices that are inherent within our understanding of tourism (Edensor, 2001). The traditional power dimensions in the performance between host and guest become contested.

It has been suggested by (Giddens, 1981 pg. 154) that everyday life can be understood as the ‘routinised day-to-day activities in which routinisation of those activities is not strongly embedded normatively…but the moral bindingness of traditionally accepted practices is replaced by one geared extensively to habit against a background of economic constraint’. The consumption of the meal both within and outside the house can therefore be considered as having the potential to be situated as performances of the everyday. Within the tourism system, hospitality thus provides the mechanism for the continuity of the everyday, in effect an extension of everyday experiences (Josiam et al., 2004). The hospitality industry can thus be considered as providing the ontological security that is required within the tourism experience (Quan and Wang, 2004). However the performance of the everyday remains problematic as it can ‘become relatively fragile as a result of the purely habitual character of the routinisation of everyday life’ (Giddens, 1981 pg. 154). This is further contested by the processes of globalisation.

The material component of hospitality is subject to rationalisation (see Chapter Four), as a consequence of globalisation and internationalisation. It can be suggested that this process is enhanced through the spatio-temporal characteristics of tourism, including necessary involvement with spaces of consumption, and adaptations to consumption patterns. The provision of food, beverages and services becomes standardised, in addition
performed in standardised spaces. Conversely the increased demand for the provision of opportunities enabling the consumer to repeat the ‘exotic’ holiday experiences within the wider home environment (Mitchell and Hall, 2003, Scarpato and Daniele, 2003). Furthermore, this rationalisation of material hospitality (as service delivery) offers the potential to subsume performative hospitality. The ‘professional practice of welcoming guests contests the cosmopolitan practice of welcoming the foreigner, performed through local means, by local actors, according to local languages’ (Soares, 1998 pg. 292). Therefore, at the macro level, the ethics of cosmopolitan hospitality interrogate the rights of globalised, rationalised material hospitality (Venn, 2002). Hospitality, once the prerogative of the stranger, now becomes a key support activity (Quan and Wang, 2004), additionally acting in a normative role.

If tourism is considered as located within the bounds of social life it can be viewed as a “front stage” performance where behaviours are a negotiation wherein ‘performers, stages and audience are locked in a concentrated communication to manage meaning, value and identity’ (Pearce, 2005 pg. 142). As a result, the provision of material hospitality as support activity is relocated to the “backstage” a place of normative performances, the everyday domestic routines of eating and sleeping (Edensor, 2000). Hospitality is thus codified as a commercial activity predicated on the sovereignty of the consumer. The performances of hospitality are consequently proscribed by its realisation as a support activity to be globalised, standardised and rationalised. It is argued that hospitality therefore becomes a touristic metonym for the consumers’ ontological security.
Defining hospitality from a tourism studies perspective is somewhat problematic. Hospitality can be considered as the tourist consuming her “own” products. The product is similar (if not the same) those that would be consumed at home (Chambers, 1997). This understanding is enhanced by notions of consumer sovereignty and is manifested in the internationalisation of organisations within the hospitality industry. In opposition is the analysis of the impacts of actors within the performance of performance of tourism.

The host-guest paradigm central to the enactment of hospitality is appropriated to represent the dynamic between tourists and destination inhabitants, including the ‘socio-cultural impacts and the downside to the commodification of the host-guest interaction’ (Smith and Duffy, 2003 pg. 16). However this approach of defining local populations is suggested as problematic, especially given increased levels of population mobility in many tourism destinations (Sherlock, 2001). Moreover this view prioritises discourse on the degree and nature of involvement of local communities and places much less emphasis on the active creation and performance of interrelational aspects of commercial hospitality. It is further claimed that from within a Marxian and post modern perspective ‘...the commoditising process that accompanies [hospitality] reinforces the subjection of traditional communities to external forces and the logic of capitalist domination, whether directly political or mainly symbolic’ (Aramberri, 2001 pg. 757). This is a position that, as the basis for hospitality, is untenable.

Commodification of hospitality is inherent within its reification, as social relations escape the control of individuals as actors in society (Giddens, 1981). The
ontology of hospitality is therefore both challenged over time and by the impacts of an increasingly mobile population.

Providing food and drink to the tourist is a function central to the economic success of the hospitality industry. However, as Chapter Three has established, hospitality can also be considered a “way of being”. As the importance of tourism to nations’ economies increases, so the role of hospitality might be suggested as becoming merely the ‘trade of feeding the tourist’ (Belasco and Scranton, 2002 pg. 86) and the role of (performative) hospitality as an enabler of the socialisation of the stranger is subverted.

5.3 Locating consumption of hospitality in the tourism system

The globalisation of material hospitality as realised in the proliferation of ethnic dining opportunities offers ample scope for pre-experienced, tutored authenticity (Turgeon and Pastinelli, 2002). It can be argued that this results in a ‘relationship between travel performances and the conventions guiding their production and interpretation [that] is variable and ranges from ritualistic adherence to deliberate challenge’ (Alder, 1989 pg. 1369). The rituals of tourism remain superficially unchanged to ensure the maintenance of a facade of exoticism, the rituals of the everyday mediated and performed in extra-ordinary places (Couldry, 2005). Thus the ideal of tourism allows the tourist to perform beyond their everyday domestic life. Meanwhile the structure and meanings of hospitality are challenged by the economic system, standardised and internationalised performances, predicated by the expectations of “seasoned” consumers.
Subsequent worldviews yield observations, encounters and episodes that function as fairly abstract signifiers (Alder, 1989). The tourist’s movements in time and space become structured not by the performance of tourism itself, but conditioned by the structures imposed by hospitality. Mealtimes become symbolic of the continuity of everyday life and, whilst travel landscapes become embedded in memory, unsuitable as spaces for the performances of the everyday; sites of hospitality consumption are represented as globalised and trans-nationalised spaces for cosmopolitan consumption of the everyday.

However, space is, by definition, a bordered entity (Appadurai, 2001). Whilst this chapter has so far discussed space generically, the focus now turns to tourism as a space for the realisation of hospitality.

5.4 Hospitality as bordered tourism experiences

Hosts and tourists are considered to be a binary construct (Sherlock, 2001). The spaces of performance of hospitality thus become challenged by the opposition of these socially constructed identities. The materiality of commercial hospitality (as discussed in Chapter Four) is a contemporary construct predicated on the supply of food and beverages produced and consumed within the framework of an economic system. It is during this commercialised transaction that potential intimacies are enacted, the crossing of social boundaries. The role of material hospitality is to provide the personal service of the consumers’ daily requirements - the meal. Whilst different organisations will provide
varying levels of service or delivery of the product, these remain representative of the intimacies of everyday life (Selwyn, 2000). It is further suggested that the rationalisation of hospitality has resulted in a sense of consumer security through degeneration of interiorisation of spaces of consumption. An element of predictability has been constructed through ‘repetitive and consistent imaging and the cloning consequent of a [globalised] mentality’ (McCarthy, 2005 pg. 117). This is not only represented by the physical characteristics of global hotel and restaurant chains, but also in the mannerisms and language conditioning of staff members. The staff are uniformed and perform within corporate guidelines. Additionally this might be seen as symptomatic of the post-modern dissolution of (cultural) borders between the domestic and international (Craik, 1997). Rationalised hospitality creates a sense of familiarity and predictability demanded by many tourists (Cohen and Avieli, 2004). Thus the performance between tourist and service personnel is regulated. Standardised service performances create an abstract border between staff and consumer. The performance limited to the delivery of product and ‘staged friendliness on the part of the touristic service personnel’ (Cohen 1987), which in effect, offers the opportunity for service personnel as hosts to be relegated to “non-people” (Ritzer, 2003). Moreover the tourist is relieved of agency in the performance of hospitality and is, at best, surrounded by the myth of customer sovereignty (Korczynski and Ott, 2004). Furthermore it is suggested that the success of this enactment of customer power rests on the historical legacy of the staff – servant relationship, performed in an appropriately deferential and servile manner (Guerrier and Adib, 2000, Paules, 1991).
Pearce (2005) suggests that the anthropological understanding of the host-guest paradigm may not be a suitable candidate for the interrogation of tourist behaviour. Moreover, Pearce (2005 pg. 125) suggests that it is merely a ‘simple integrative label referring to both service providers and other community members’. However, viewing the relationship as primarily one of tourist-service producer locates the hospitality performance as one between buyer and seller. This presents opportunities for a marketing dominated focus, linked to the economic potentialities of the organisation, on the one hand, and the realisation of these through a consumer centric logic, on the other. Furthermore, the focus of a marketing management approach to understanding the tourist as an individual, places her/him as an actor, categorically located in contemporary consumer society (Quan and Wang, 2004). It is argued, however, that by viewing hospitality simply through its material reality - the provision and consumption of products and services - the potential for hospitality to act in the co-creation of experiences is neglected.

5.5 Redefining the tourist

The previous section situated the performance of hospitality firmly within an economic system. Additionally the tourist has been placed as a consumer of material hospitality: the provision of food and beverages as a support activity or everyday experience. It is suggested, however, that the subsequent focus placed by organisations on operational procedures to ensure service and product quality may be somewhat
misguided (Johns, 1999). Such a focus negates the possibility of the adversarial (hostile), or chance (socialisation), interactions that may be inherent within the interaction and which may be at the core of the service encounter.

Whilst the tourist has been recognised as a consumer, this poses both risks and opportunities. Interpreting consumer behaviour as only (economic) consumption is somewhat simplistic and in reality the tourist might also be considered a consumer of food and beverages as peak experiences (Quan and Wang, 2004, Wang, 2002). Therefore the tourist as an individual needs to be observed from a range of different perspectives. Hospitality, if viewed as the process of socialisation, offers ample opportunities to situate the tourist in these multiple guises.

Harrison (2001) argues that the aestheticisation of the everyday allows ordinary experiences to become the extra-ordinary. Her research showed that tourists as individuals are not ‘in a simple state of banal escape or vulgar consumption’ (Harrison, 2001 pg. 171), but rather they are engaged in a complex embodied and reflexive encounter.

The provision of material hospitality is increasingly produced as a replication of the home environment of the tourist. However, food has the inherent characteristic of being able be recognised as the exotic (Bal, 2005) and subsequently experienced as an ingestible “otherness” of the tourism destination. Thus the characteristics of material hospitality are placed as attractions in their own right (Quan and Wang, 2004).
This however is problematic from two positions. Firstly, the continued impetus to rationalise the food and beverage experience is intertwined with the economic imperative (See 5.4) and this has seen attempts to (re)enchant the consumption experience through the development of themed restaurants as tourist destinations in their own rights (Josiam et al., 2004). Restaurants become themed representations of culturally ascribed space (Bryman, 2004) and as such become “must see” places for many tourists. This has resulted in what Beardsworth and Bryman (1999) term “quasification” of the tourist experience. The experience of eating is elevated to one of dramatic performance. The mechanisms of the everyday relegated, and placed out of sight. The ubiquitous Hard Rock Café merchandise is a manifestation of this process, where it is the merchandise itself that becomes the target of the consumer (Ritzer, 1999). The performance of hospitality is appropriated by the performance of contemporary consumption, authenticated by the wearing of a t-shirt. Ultimately the “spectacle” readily becomes mundane itself, consigned to the yesterday of has-been trends and fashion.

Secondly, the performance of hospitality is problematised through the production of spectacle. The tourist is removed from the intersubjective encounter at the heart of ancient/archaic hospitality and is placed as observer of the highly scripted, spectacularised theatre that is reproduced ad nauseum. The spectacle has been suggested as challenging notions of authenticity (Beardsworth and Bryman, 1999) and this spectacularisation of many of the spaces of performance of hospitality has therefore resulted in a challenge to the authenticity of both material and performative hospitality.
Furthermore the rationalisation of the performance ensures the opportunities for truly magical, spontaneous events are minimised.

Alder (Alder, 1989) has situated tourism firmly within the context of performance, and it is this performance that defines the tourist, rather than ‘their presence or their gaze’ (Graburn and Barthel-Bouchier, 2001 pg. 151). By its very nature, then, the hospitality industry helps to define the tourist, as it provides the temporal and spatial character for the intersubjective performance between tourists and hospitality staff. However, this is contested by the routinisation of the hospitality encounter, with the rationalised and scripted performance ensuring that ‘the tourists discount what service providers do for them by feeling it to be compulsory, not meant to be for them, and hence stripping it of cultural meanings of concern, care and attention’ (Crang, 1997 pg. 140/141).

Performative hospitality, on the other hand, has as part of its core values the care and concern for the other – the tourist. Moreover it is suggested that it is the socio-cultural construction of spaces of touristic hospitality as essentially domestic (Wood, 1994) (the hotel as “home away from home”) that perpetuates an image of hospitality as routinised. This might well lead to the conclusion that the experience is essentially staged (MacCannell, 1999) and that the spatial constructs of commercial hospitality mediate a performance of domesticity. However, it can be argued, that the act itself is performed on behalf of the tourist by the service personnel and therefore it is not just the spaces that are important in undermining the performance of hospitality. The performance becomes non-thinking individual consumption, acted out by “non-people” (Ritzer, 2003), on behalf of
the tourist. The tourist, rather than being engaged in an interrelational mindful performance, becomes a touristic *flâneur* (Urry, 2001).

As a consequence, it is suggested by Bauman (Bauman, 1994 pg. 151/152) that ‘[t]he designed reality has an advantage over the messy one outside in being custom-made to suit the *flâneur’s* whims’. It might be suggested that this lends legitimacy to the (re)enchantment of rationalised “eateertainment” (Ritzer, 1999). It is the enchantment produced within the space of consumption that is the tourist’s reality. The experience that is constructed ‘can be conceived in more ambivalent and contradictory terms, can be understood as intentional and unintentional, concerned with both being and becoming, strategically and reflexively embodied’ (Edensor, 2001 pg. 78). As Wood (2005 pg. 318) suggests, the tourist as *flâneur* ‘is both at home and rootless, alone and surrounded, ambivalent and intoxicated’.

It might be suggested that the role of tourist as guest is therefore contested. If, as suggested, the space of performance and consumption is inherently a replication of a collective space of domesticity (even if it is somewhat idealised), the objective performance and role of the tourist becomes somewhat of a paradox. If we are to believe the host must be master of the space of hospitality (see Chapter Four), this becomes contested in contemporary consumer society which privileges the consumer (tourist) with sovereignty (Korczynski and Ott, 2004). The economic system ensures the tourist is Queen/King. This is further problematised due to the high mobility inherent in those with the access to tourism. The “tourist as guest” becomes (re)constructed as “tourist as host” (Sherlock, 2001). Consequently the meaning of hospitality is challenged. Whilst the
individuals’ ontological security is undoubtedly ensured, the notion of the fusion of self
and external world is subverted (Pearce, 2005). Therefore the objectification of
hospitality would appear to be at odds with the idea of ‘tourism as an experiential form of
consumption which is culturally orientated, and to which cultural meanings are attached’
(Wang, 2000 pg. 218).

There has been substantial (and ongoing) debate as to the legitimacy of
authenticity. There has been the suggestion that due to the multiple and contested
meanings of authenticity, that the study of tourism would be better served without its use
(Reisinger and Steiner, 2006). However, if it is as Ferrara (1998) argues, that it is the
notion of the intersubjectivity that authenticates the individual, then it is the
intersubjective performance of hospitality, that ensures the normative construction of the
actor-as-tourist identity, thus enabling her/his subsequent socialisation, through the
realisation of performative hospitality. Both tourism as a phenomenon, and the tourist as
individual, can therefore be considered as providing the opportunity for the manifestation
of hospitality as a socio-cultural construct within contemporary consumer society

5.6 Summary

The narratives of hospitality are commonly used to portray both positive and
attractive images of tourism destinations (Jenkins, 1999). Furthermore the globalisation
of the tourism and hospitality industries has led to the production of images that enable
pre-scripted performances of hospitality to be enacted. Thus there is a tension between
our understandings of hospitality as an apparent dichotomy. The economic imperative, where the tourist is considered a consumer and provided with what the organisation thinks is required, produces a standardised inherently product and service (delivery) focused performance. This contests the notion of hospitality as a process of socialisation, an unpredictable, irrational encounter.

The encounter between individuals suggests that hospitality can exist as a relational reality and, as such, is able to be considered bordered and thus realised subject to notions of interiority. Consequently, interiority is a construct that is placed at the heart of the performance of hospitality: it creates spaces of exclusion and inclusion. Hospitality is unable to exist in absence of borders, whether economic, as is the case with the supply of goods and services congruent with material hospitality, or the recognition of codified ‘rules’ that authorise performative hospitality. Logically the concept of interiority is at odds with the deconstructuration of socially or culturally constructed borders: to exist without borders is to know no point of reference between in or out. Hospitality is thus considered contingent upon rules particular to the system involved. The tourist cannot exist within the space of hospitality without crossing these borders.

A marketing dominant paradigm has placed the study of commercial hospitality within an economic system. A focus, it is suggested, predicated on the commercial gains generated by the hospitality sector for tourism destinations. Hospitality becomes synonymous with service, leading to its subsequent reification and it becomes about the quality of service and products, not the act of hospitality itself. Additionally, it can be argued that this subverts the social scientific ontology of hospitality. The tourist as
consumer overrides the development of a nuanced understanding of the tourist as guest. Where the “guest” is recognised, this on the whole becomes a catch all phrase appropriated for consumer approbation, rather than the interiorisation of the guest as central to the process of socialisation (see 3.3). The performance of hospitality is therefore suggested as objectified.

Tourism can be contextualised as performance. Whilst the performance of everyday activities such as eating and drinking have been regarded as unthinking, mindless activities, it is suggested that performative hospitality acts to socialise the tourist as stranger, to become a tourist as “true” guest. As a consequence there is a reflective authentication of the tourist identity brought about by the intersubjective nature of the hospitality performance.
Chapter Six: Conclusion

6.1 Introduction

The consumption of the products and services associated with commercial hospitality is, for many in the developed world, a regular activity. This may be as simple as lunch on a daily basis in the work canteen, through to what may seem by many as complex, and meaning laden, consumption of street food in Shanghai as part of the tourism experience of an international visitor. Commercial hospitality is now accepted as an everyday activity that, in contemporary consumer society, has been examined primarily for its contribution to the economic welfare of the organisation and state, as well as its operation and management (Botterill, 2000). Additionally, the functional aspects of hospitality have been privileged in conjunction with its normative characteristics. However, it is suggested that the understanding of hospitality within the context of social life is both a more complex and more contested socio-cultural construction than what is often conveyed in both the hospitality and service literature as well as in lay understandings of hospitality. Therefore, this thesis has undertaken an analysis of hospitality as commodity exchange, from within a discursive, behavioural, structural and material perspective. This was undertaken using theory and concepts drawn from a range of disciplines.
The overall objective of this thesis was to further our understanding of hospitality within the commercial context. This chapter therefore presents an overview of the key findings and observations made in the thesis with respect to:

- food and beverage as constructing hospitality, as physically consumable and, importantly, as its role in identity formation;
- hospitality as both a cultural and social construction;
- the consumption of material hospitality within contemporary consumer society, and, finally,
- hospitality as located within the tourism system.

The following discussion is structured to allow key conceptual positions to be developed.

6.2 The meal as metaphor

‘Food’ and ‘the meal’ have a multiplicity of meanings. They are recognised as consumable goods as well as an essential feature of human survival, symbolic of both luxury and privation. The consumption of food is an everyday affair in all cultures. However, the meanings ascribed to the practices inherent in the consumption and
performances of the meal are different. Moreover, this difference can be considered both within and between cultures.

By acknowledging the meal as structural (Douglas, 1999, Lévi-Strauss, 1963), it can be considered a system of communicative performances. Food is able to give voice to those involved in the processes and performances of consumption. These performances establish individual identity, how well one eats, how one eats and where one eats provides sign value (Barthes, 1997). Moreover, these performances are considered to act as markers of habitus (Bourdieu, 1984). In other words meals provide a form of social capital by which we are judged by what we eat, how we eat, where we eat and with whom we eat.

If food is considered to be representative of individual identity, then it is also suggestive of the notion of borders. These boundaries can be considered both as internalised motivation: food as biological, or food as social motivation. Food is also symbolic of “otherness”. Furthermore, food is linked to the formation of cultural identity as the consumption of food represents ‘both its oneness and the otherness of whoever eats differently’ (Fischler, 1988 pg. 275). The meal experience is also performed within bordered spaces. Whilst historically eating outside the home was through necessity rather than choice, the performance of the meal in contemporary mobile consumer society has morphed from that of necessity to one of choice. The meal experience has become commodified in line with the commercialisation of dining out as a leisure activity. The consumption of food and beverage outside the home has enabled the establishment of quasi-public private spaces of consumption: the restaurant, brasserie, café, bistro and bar.
Increasingly, these spaces become stages upon which the individual becomes observed as a consumer (Veblen, 1994). As consumption systems increasingly recognise the visual (Lee, 1993), the individual is recognised by aesthetic culinary capital (de Solier, 2005) gained through mediated sources representative, it might be suggested, of bourgeois tastes.

As with other consumption practices, both the products and services associated with the performance of the meals outside the home are becoming increasingly globalised. What was historically seen as the exotic now becomes the everyday. Globalisation and migration have led to ‘foreign’ restaurants and foods being available for local and domestic consumption (Bell and Valentine, 1997). Not only has the meal performance in reality absorbed the exotic as everyday, but mediated images from across the globe ensure tutored authenticity for those with access to television and the burgeoning selection of ‘lifestyle’ channels, magazines and shows. If, as (Douglas, 1984) suggests, past experiences inform the present and influence the future, then in our imaginations (if not at the local ethnic restaurant) at least, we have experienced the exotic.

Whilst eating outside the home was often linked to personal hospitality, as consumption increases in line with internationalisation and increased competition, operational efficiencies have come to increasingly dominate hospitality performance on a global basis. The myth of consumer (on an individual basis) sovereignty ensures the service dominant paradigm becomes synonymous with hospitality. Indeed, the entire concept of hospitality as way of being is contested. Hospitality is increasingly relegated
to the mundane. The commercialisation of hospitality viewed through the performance of
the meal and consumption of foodstuffs, therefore offers an appropriate tool through
which to analyse social realities.

6.3 Dialectics of conflict: hospitality and its enemies

This section summarises the issues surrounding the commercialisation of
hospitality. The discussion is framed by the development of alternative worldviews of
hospitality. This thesis has offered a conceptualisation of hospitality as both able to be
commercialised while remaining true to its antecedents. This has been achieved through
acknowledging that whilst hospitality in the commercial sphere remains within a larger
economic system, it remains centred to some degree situated within its “own” symbolic
system. This system remains central to the realisation of performative hospitality. The
system, rather than being found at the macro cultural/structural level, is located at the
intersection between the macro-level of culture and economy and the level of the
individual and is manifest through the individual as agent. Hospitality as tourism praxis
therefore offers multiple opportunities for the realisation of performative hospitality. This
being said it is the relationships between actors that are central to the performance of
hospitality. It is suggested however that within commercial hospitality there is a
dominant focus on the interaction being one of delivery of material hospitality to the
consumer.
6.3.1 Service as synonymous with hospitality (Hospitality as objective material reality)

In contemporary consumer society the commercial provision of food and beverage is manifest in the service encounter. That is the physical delivery of food and beverage products as realised in the interaction between the consumer and the service personnel acting as representative of the organisation. The use of the term *hospitality Industry* is a relatively new phenomenon (Brotherton, 2005). Prior to this the industry was generally known as the hotel and catering industry, terms that were representative of the actual products and services offered for consumption. It can be suggested that the use of hospitality as a replacement for commodified products and in a commercial sense is open to contestation.

In contemporary consumer society, hospitality has become synonymous with its material reality - food, beverage and the services associated with the provision of these products. Thus when a consumer discusses hospitality, it becomes a discussion of tangible entities. This, it can be suggested has occurred on the back of technological change.

The (recent) ability to industrialise many components of commercial hospitality has led to increasing rationalisation. As a result, Korczynski’s (2004) myth of consumer sovereignty is all pervasive in modern hospitality organisations and organisational efficiencies aimed at creating consumer satisfaction are privileged over culturally constructed concepts of hospitality. Perhaps the most disturbing symptom of this lauding of the consumer as king/queen is the ubiquitous satisfaction questionnaire that confuses
service delivery for hospitality. Hospitality is thus commercialised as a consumer good within the economic system.

As discussed in 6.2, the increase in eating outside the home is becoming increasingly routinised. That means that eating out becomes non-thinking everyday behaviour, while magazines, films and television bombard us with images that inform our expectations. This is true not only for the product itself, but also for the human interaction, the performance between staff and consumer. As with food, this interaction becomes increasingly routinised. Ultimately this results in a “non-relationship” between the consumer and the service personnel as “non-person” (Ritzer, 2003). Hospitality in effect becomes an agent for the development of the restaurant (as one of many food and beverage outlets) as a ‘prime locus of consumption related activities’ (Clarke et al., 2003 pg. 19). This allows, not only the rationalisation and globalisation of the product, but also the performance itself and the human encounter becomes increasingly standardised and internationalised. That being said, this state of affairs provides opportunities for renewed localisation (Robertson, 1992) or the use of the binary localised-globalised dichotomy to create competitive opportunities. Such a process can be seen in the rise of ‘new’ English Cuisine, in a land where one of the most popular dishes is Indian Curry (DEFRA, 2005).

The commercialisation of hospitality along with the rise of consumer society has led to the deconstruction of hospitality as shown in figure 6.1 below. The performative aspects of hospitality involve its realisation as act, hospitality as philosophy being done. In other words it is the welcome, the threshold crossing, the interiorisation of the individual: the intersubjective performance of hospitality resulting in the socialisation of
the stranger. Commercial hospitality however is considered enacted within an economic system and may consist of material and/or performative hospitality. Furthermore, hospitality becomes informational sociality, the transfer of information between host and guest, for example menus, places to visit, rather than experiential sociality. In other words the interaction only becomes relational when the service personnel have knowledge that is required by the consumer.

**Figure 6.1 Oppositional contemporary hospitality**

It is suggested that this relegation of the relational characteristic of hospitality is a consequence of the dominance of material due to high mobility, individualism, affluence and consumerism (Beck, 2002). Socially constructed hospitality is therefore privileged over culturally constructed hospitality.
6.4 Socialising the stranger

Central to the concept of hospitality (as established in Chapter Three) is the process of the socialisation of the stranger. Hospitality is predicated on the concept of cultural and social stability and is a structural mechanism for ensuring the continuance of this stasis when faced with the stranger. The advance of modernity has increased opportunities for mobility, resulting in the destructuration of hospitality’s traditional structural role in highly stable pre-modern societies. However, it is argued that socialisation of the stranger results in the ability to transcend cultural boundaries and in turn experience performative hospitality. Furthermore, this transmutes the stranger as consumer to that of the position of guest.

Food and drink are located at the centre of the socialisation process in contemporary consumer society. Food and beverage can be considered, not just as a product associated with the materiality of hospitality, but also acting as an agent of socialisation in its own right. This is used by many tourism operators who, for example, utilise both the concept of themeing, and in addition, the notion of socialising the consumer through the provision of food and beverage. This is seen in the restaurant concepts such as plate throwing in ‘traditional’ Greek restaurants, through to Haggis ceremonies held for tour group participants in Scotland.

Hospitality as a cultural construction was predicated on not knowing anything of the stranger. Hospitality does not lend itself to objective knowledge (Dikeç, 2002), but it is the attempt to analyse hospitality from within the economic system that has resulted in
substantial theoretical conflict. Amongst these is the constant search for objective knowledge of the consumer. Wants, likes and dislikes, amongst others, are predicated upon the myth of the consumer as sovereign (Korczynski and Ott, 2004). By knowing the guests needs and wants in advance, it is argued, the organisation gains a competitive advantage over its rivals (Worthington, 2005). It has been suggested, however, that knowing the stranger precludes the realisation of hospitality (Dikeç, 2002). The power ascribed to the host is appropriated by the economic imperative and precedence given to the consumer. Hospitality is predicated on the role ascribed to the host and the power inherent to that position as the host. As Derrida (2000) argues there is no unconditional hospitality and, for hospitality to be offered, the individual (host) who ‘receives, welcomes, offers hospitality in his house or hotel …[is] with reason, the master of the household, the *patron*’ (Derrida, 2000 pg. 4).

The process of socialisation is one predicated on the notion of borders, the penetration and crossing of the boundary between known and unknown. These borders are representative of interiority, the realisation of spaces of inclusion and exclusion. Figure 6.2 below, illustrates the processes involved in the socialisation of the stranger in the context of the consumer of tourism, the tourist.
Figure 6.2 represents three stages in the socialisation of the stranger. The initial stage in the socialisation process (S1) in consumer society is that commonly encountered within the space of commercial hospitality. Tourists interact with service personnel and these individuals can be considered to be hosts in the sense that they have been authorised by the organisation and are increasingly accepting devolved power through empowerment strategies. These service personnel also act as intermediaries between the tourist and the local communities. At times the tourist may also interact directly with
individual members of the destinations culture(s), however this is, in the main, represented through heavily staged unidirectional performances.

It can also be suggested that in many instances the performance of hospitality is limited to that of materiality - the provision of food, beverages and accommodation for the tourist primarily as a support activity. In this context the host acts has no choice but to act primarily as service personnel, with a focus on guest satisfaction through a product and quality focus. As such borders between hosts and tourists remain on the whole impermeable, and this is represented by the solid lines surrounding the individual actors in this initial phase (see S1 of Figure 6.2).

Access to this level of hospitality (S1) is primarily governed by the economic system and the ability to pay informs the products and services experienced within the encounter. This thus links to the economic codification of hospitality in the economic system. Under English common law for example, a consumer has a right to food, drink and accommodation as a bone fide traveller, if they have the ability to pay (Boella et al., 1999). Whilst this is conditional upon the availability of rooms and food, and the the implicit ability for the guest to pay without causing any undue problems for the innkeeper, the innkeeper in effect has an obligation to provide material hospitality to the stranger.

Despite the constraints (borders) highlighted in the initial stage of hospitality (S1), the consumption of commercial hospitality can also be considered as having the potential
to dissolve these interpersonal borders by moving to a performative form of hospitality. It is this stage of commercial hospitality that is at risk in contemporary consumer society.

The second stage inherent within the socialisation of the stranger (S2 in Figure 6.2) enables the realisation of the interiorisation of the stranger and the stranger begins the journey from the exterior (as audience or receiver of performances of the materiality of hospitality) to the interior (as intersubjective participant within the performance of hospitality). However, this is process is contingent upon the fulfilment of a number of key criteria. Initial access is dependant upon the processes of socialisation; as such it is reliant on the recognition of the sovereignty of the host. Whilst this may seem at odds with consumer society it is actioned in numerous commercial hospitality situations. Prime amongst these in a tourism context is the Homestay operation, where it is recognised that the tourist as stranger/other is entering another’s home (Lynch, 2005, Tucker and Lynch, 2005) and, as such, ascribes social control to the host. This is further emphasised through the immediate interaction with the host, rather than through service personnel as agents of the organisation. A similar performance is observed at Inns located in the Catskills in New York State, where requests for food are based on what the proprietor wishes to cook (Saltzman, 2004). In both these cases consumers accept the sovereignty of the host and are thus guided in the performance. The outcome of socialisation is also directly related to its role as enabling hospitality as a relational reality. That is, hospitality is contingent upon the performances between individuals. In the process of socialisation, as shown in S2, these performances are recognised as intersubjective and therefore dyadic in nature.
As such, it can be suggested that the power relationship might in fact be dynamic, and whilst initially ascribed to the host may fall upon the guest at particular moments.

The success of the encounter is represented by the dotted lines representing the borders of the host and community. Thus the tourist is recognised as guest and crosses a metaphorical threshold. Similarly the embodied socio-culturally constructed border, within which the guest as an individual is located, is dissolved. The interiority of the individuals is breached and the guest is admitted as a social member of the group. However, the success of the process of socialisation is temporally and spatially situated.

Hospitality is limited by time. One can only stay a guest in one place for a limited juncture without becoming assimilated as a member of that society (Beck, 2002, Derrida, 2005, Kant and Reiss, 1991). Stage Three (S3) represents the crossing of the boundary between being as guest, and being as member within the applicable society(ies). This introduces the temporal nature of hospitality. Hospitality as discussed in Chapter Three, is predicated on temporary, or short term need. Thus when individual mobility rather than being of a temporary duration is considered longer term, it is manifest in a non commercial sense as the asylum seeker (Gibson, 2003), ‘refugee’ (Bauman 2000), migrant or ‘sojourner’ (Hall 2005). The alternative to this is as shown, a return to the exterior that is the material component of hospitality.

Within contemporary consumer society hospitality is typically viewed in an uncritical, unthinking manner. Taken for granted by the consumer on the understanding they have paid for it, hospitality (whatever that may be) thus becomes the expected.
Thinking of hospitality is however ‘to think of openings and recognition’ (Dikeç, 2002 pg 229). Hospitality thus implies a mutuality of recognition. Hospitality is based on alterity, the differences between us and the other.

It has been suggested that the reification and subsequent rationalisation of hospitality has led to the globalisation (or even glocalisation) of the hospitality encounter through its use as the operationalisation of service. It might be suggested that tutored authenticity, as received through mediated images and past experiences challenges the perspective of the “strangeness of the other” replaced with the “sameness of the other”. Rather than a dyadic, intersubjective performance, the consumer of hospitality becomes inward looking, the individuals performance thus becomes monadic and unfulfilling.

The growing importance of service industries to post-industrial economies (Lash and Urry, 1994) and recognition of the rise of commodified experiential consumption (Pine and Gilmore, 1999), contests the performance of hospitality. As a result, for hospitality to succeed commercially, there is an insistence on measurable results and completed tasks, but hospitality is unpredictable and often inefficient, and the results of hospitality are impossible to quantify. It might be suggested that this is the rationale behind a service focus, the standardisation of material and imposition of tightly scripted encounters. It has been suggested by Ritzer and Stillman (Ritzer and Stillman, 2001) that consumer society is moving away from consumer - worker interactions such as encountered within hospitality, replaced with interactions between customer’s and technology. This is seen increasingly with the introduction of check-in/out kiosks in hotels and the use of vending machines to dispense food and beverages in budget hotels.
However, there is optimism for the institution of hospitality within an industry framework. Consumers are increasingly aware of ethical issues, including social impacts occurring from increased tourism to many destinations (Butcher, 2003), and the ‘air miles’ required for the consumption of certain exotic foods. The following section contextualises the tourist as a consumer of hospitality products and services.

6.5 (Re)Constructing hospitality as a relational reality

Hospitality, if considered as the permeation of borders and subsequent access into “others’” culture (see Figure 6.2), is ideally situated to offer cultural experiences to tourists. Tourism offers opportunities for hospitality to enhance the concept of otherness and, in some instance, differences in the materiality of hospitality can act as markers of authenticity (e.g. the Thai meal in Thailand, or the paella eaten in Spain as products representing place) however, it is through understanding hospitality as intersubjective and performative, that hospitality enables the “consumption” of culture alongside the consumption of material of hospitality. Tourism still offers the potential for the everyday to be transmogrified into the irrational exotic through hospitality as a relational reality between host and guest. Whilst food and the meal have been recognised as the everyday, it is suggested ‘the tourist gaze can be turned inwards to look at the familiar and everyday, potentially offering a different kind of experience’ (Long, 2004 pg. 12). As a result, food, the meal experience and hospitality can become assigned cultural meanings and in turn interpret meanings. Furthermore, Greenwood (1989 pg 185) argues that,
whilst a performance may be rendered meaningless through the processes that occur within the tourism system, that same tourism ‘can engender processes of reflection that leads to cultural elaboration’. Thus hospitality may be (re)constructed anew. The tourist both enacts intersubjective hospitality whilst simultaneously consuming the individuality of the negotiated cultural encounter. The search for the real and authentic experience (McCannell, 2001) becomes realised through her/his socialisation as stranger.

Whilst the tourist as consumer is limited in the ability to cross borders, it is possible to identify the potential performance differences when socialised to become the guest (see Table 6.1). Table 6.1 locates the tourist within three consumption paradigms. Essentially these relate to the rationalised consumption system that dominates consumer society. Within this the tourist is located as a categorical consumer, that is, the individual accepts the rationalised products and services unthinkingly. Meanwhile, placing the consumer as observer locates the consumer squarely within Pine and Gilmore’s (1999) experience economy and thus the individual is primarily a consumer of experiences. However, whilst the hospitality encounter is of importance, the products and services that appeal to this consumer involve (re)enchantment (Ritzer, 1999). The tourist as observer consumes hospitality products and services as an interested bystander. The performance is one to be viewed rather than enacted.

The tourist as guest places the tourist who has undergone socialisation as at the centre of the intersubjective performance of hospitality. By considering the tourist as a dialogic consumer, it is the co-existence of rival ways of life, ‘which makes it a matter of fate to compare, reflect, criticize, understand and combine contradictory certainties’
(Beck, 2002 pg. 19) of the individual actors. In effect it is the embodied performance and reflexivity of the tourist as an individual that allow their subsequent socialisation to guest.

### Table 6.1 The Consumer as Tourist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tourist as Consumer</th>
<th>Tourist as Observer</th>
<th>Tourist as Guest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focus</strong></td>
<td>Hospitality as material</td>
<td>Provision of experiences (peak experience?)</td>
<td>Socialisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Power</strong></td>
<td>Consumer as sovereign</td>
<td>Directed</td>
<td>Host as sovereign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Example</strong></td>
<td>Hotel, Restaurants, Cafes</td>
<td>Themed ‘dinners’ with cultural performance, Home hosted dinners, Ethnic Restaurants, Open plan kitchens</td>
<td>B &amp; B, Ethnic Restaurants, Home Hosted dinners, Privately operated lodges, Service encounters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Characteristics</strong></td>
<td>Rationalised, Everyday, Status/social capital, Functional Quality</td>
<td>Staged, Minimal Participation, Replicable performance, Unique experience</td>
<td>Intercative, Intersubjective, Playful, Mystical, Temporal, Doing, Spiritual, Inter-relational Reality, Authentic, Cultural capital</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is suggested that the successful socialisation of the stranger and their transmutation to guest offers the potential for a (re)enchantment of the hospitality experience. However, unlike the (re)enchantment offered by the contemporary consumption systems, performative hospitality is predicated it its inability to be replicated. Therefore each
interaction becomes enchanting in its own right. In contrast many of the performances and experiences offered in contemporary consumer society are designed to be replicable as a result of dominant processes of rationalisation. Thus, the performance over time leads to disillusionment, and the need to once again (re)enchant. It is the understanding of hospitality as a relational reality that ensures an enchanted hospitality experience.

6.6 Future research

This thesis has approached the notion of hospitality from a position that has had little attention from within the tourism and hospitality academy. The analysis has given rise to numerous areas that offer opportunities for interesting and potentially insightful research to be undertaken. A common theme throughout the thesis has been that of the interaction between the staff and consumer, or if one is to think positively the host and guest.

It might be suggested that the industry dominant paradigm as discussed within Chapter Four has influenced the curriculum development within the education sector; notably the emphasis on hard management skills, marketing led consumer theory and economic theories. Whilst this is necessary and indeed essential to the economic success of the industry, issues raised within this thesis suggest that there are opportunities to approach hospitality education from an alternative perspective. This is a view shared by an increasing cadre of academics. Amongst approaches proffered are those linking aesthetics of food and its consumption as a gastronomic experience to hospitality education (Santich, 2003, Scarpato, 2002) and the need for hospitality education to
include at the very least liberal subjects that offer an insight into the behaviours of consumers as individuals from the perspective of for example, anthropology and sociology (Airey and Tribe, 2000, Morrison and O'Mahony, 2002). In order to offer weight to these proposals, it is suggested that we first need to understand the underlying dynamics of hospitality and the hospitality consumer as a co-creator of experiences (in conjunction with the host).

There are a number of issues that have arisen from this project that offer immediate research potential. If, as discussed it is the notion of power that is at the centre of the success of performative hospitality, how do customers view the service provider? An example has been given of the family run Italian restaurant where the host is both visible and one could suggest, in the position of master. Questions arise as to the part the consumer sees herself as playing. Is she the consumer as sovereign? Or is she willing to let the host direct the performance. Does this dynamic play a part in ‘guest’ satisfaction. How has the development of the manager as specialist affected the hospitality performance vis a vis her/ his role as host and the traditional role as “meeter and greeter” of guests: the host seen and acknowledged as host by the consumer.

Additionally how do the dynamics of empowerment play out within the proposed dialogic dominant paradigm? In other words is there a difference in the way consumers as individuals interpret direct power in the performance, for example differences between the performance with the Manager recognised/ acknowledged as Manager, and the service personnel with devolved power (as a result of current management theory).
6.7 Concluding statement

This project has offered a deconstruction of hospitality, both archaic and commercial. It offers an alternative view of hospitality that recognises and situates hospitality as an institution that is at once commercial, but also if understood and applied, capable of offering an enchanted experience. However this is dependant upon the rules of performance being understood. It is developing an understanding of these rules from the perspective of the actors, including consumer, direct interacting staff and organisations that will develop these notions further.
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