MUNDANE WELCOME: HOSPITALITY AS LIFE POLITICS

1. INTRODUCTION

The study of hospitality has long been associated with anthropology and what Candea and Da Col (2012:Siii) refer to as 'classic anthropological wisdom', such as its associations with 'reciprocity and mediation of otherness'. Further examples relate to hospitality's association with hosts and guests-strangers, as well as ritual, civility, formality and courtesy which Selwyn (2000) advises take place in the context of 'moral frameworks' (19). Whilst a positive discourse surrounds hospitality in terms of its capacity to bring people together, other associations are more problematical. Thus it is also associated with 'ambiguity and potential danger' and subverting 'facile distinctions between disinterested and self-serving actions' (Herzfeld, 2012:S210). Shyrock (2012) locates hospitality as associated with both morality and politics/ethics. Herzfeld (2012) identifies hospitality as part of a larger moral economy and concerned with the 'framing of risk' (S215). Candea and Da Col (2012) draw attention to the under-theorisation of hospitality in anthropology and call for re-engagement in the topic against a background of significant interdisciplinary interest in the concept and practice in relation to social themes such as migration, postcoloniality, sovereignty and international law.

Kant highlights the importance of the planet's population necessarily interacting with one another in a hospitable fashion owing to being confined to a finite space (Kant, 1996 [1795]). Yet in tourism, there is a curious neglect of welcome given its associations with the idea of universal hospitality to enable global movement. Despite welcome being central to the tourist experience, as a focus of research it has been overlooked. Nevertheless, elements of welcome are pervasive in tourism scholarship. For example, Molz (2007) considers the importance of the body in tourism and draws attention to how bodies are adapted to 'fit' or 'pass' and how some bodies find it easier to travel than others on the basis of nationality, race, gender, sexuality, disability. Shyrock (2012) suggests it is the hospitality industry as well as government bodies through immigration controls and policies which assume the role of caring for the temporary foreign traveller outside of the domestic space. Tourism is variously participant in ensuring legal and social boundaries leading to inclusion and exclusion, foundation stones of welcome, for example, through passport controls (McGuire and Canales, 2010) or tourist enclaves (Davis and Morais, 2004).

The critical turn in tourism with its aspirations to address issues such as social justice is arguably a concern with creating healthy, welcoming societies (Ateljevic, Morgan and Pritchard, 2012). At a macro level consideration has been given to tourism's role in developing healthy societies primarily through economic and social empowerment means (Blake, Arbache, Sinclair and Teles, 2008) but also through attention to tourism's engagement with, for example, obesity (Small and Harris, 2012) or age (Sedgley, Pritchard and Morgan, 2011). Such studies concerned with issues of social inclusion and exclusion, focus upon factors which lead to marginalisation of individuals from mainstream society and explore the role of tourism in addressing them. Literature on the tourist experience deals less directly with experiences of welcome and non-welcome through exploration of "an individual's subjective evaluation and undergoing (i.e. affective, cognitive, and behavioural) of events related to his/her tourist activities' (Tung and Richie, 2011:1369) and through a concern with the emotional, mindful and spiritual impact of the tourist's experience (Cohen and Cohen 2012). Similarly, studies exploring the tourist engagement with place and space variously touch upon the individual experience of welcome and non-welcome (Rakic and Chambers, 2012). Crouch, Aronsson and Wahlstrom (2001) describes the tourist encounter as one that is 'imaginative, reflexive' (2001:253), a 'poetic encounter' (after de Certeau, 1984) (2001: 254) involving 'agency and subjectivity' (254) which leads to the tourist 'encountering her- or himself' (255).

There has been a tendency within the tourism field to only dwell within frameworks that cast tourism in contrast to everyday life (for example, Seliinnemi, 2003) rather than being, in many ways, continuous. Nevertheless, increasing attention in the tourism literature is being paid to the ordinary, the taken-for-granted. Rickly-Boyd and Metro-Roland (2010) highlight the importance of the prosaic, both everyday objects such as language, architecture and people, and background elements such as a stream, forest, wildlife, in influencing tourist experiences of place. Obrador-Pons (2009) signals the overlooking of the banal and reveals the significance of the sensation on the skin of, in his examples, sun or sand. Binnie, Holloway, Millington and Young (2007: 516) suggest it is the banal and the routine which '…hold things together, they give us ontological security'. Edensor (2007:199) argues that much of the tourism experience – contradicting Crouch et al's (2001) imaginative, reflective tourist encounter – is based upon 'unreflexive practice and habit'. Through a focus upon mundane tourism the blurring with everyday life becomes near inseparable (McCabe, 2002). Significantly, McCabe (2002) points to how tourist experiences mirror broader issues in society. Likewise, Back (2015) observes how the mundane provides a portal to broader social issues.

Hannam, Sheller and Urry (2006) distinguish between obligatory and voluntary forms of travel which give rise to different forms of hospitality (being welcome or not). The framing within mobilities gives rise to the home as a place of mooring assuming a particular significance. Molz and Gibson (2007) advise that mobility is usually implicit in hospitality and engage with the ethical implications of such mobilities, pointing to a relative neglect of the topic. Inspired by Kant (1996 [1795]), their concern is with cosmopolitan hospitality and the ethics of social relations: the ability to host, who is permitted to be a guest, how to host the Other, and how the host's self is defined. The major overarching theme arising in the literature of mobilities and ethics is how to co-exist with strangers on a day-to-day and ongoing basis (Bauman, 1995); the importance of this concern is due to the dramatic rise in international mobility. Simmel (1971) identifies the stranger on the basis of their mobility. Whilst Derrida (1999) has focused attention on the ethical issues arising from crossing the threshold into a home space, the ethical issues involved in crossing the threshold to leave the home space and engage with the outside world have received less attention. Bell (2009) suggests that applying a hospitality lens may be very beneficial to better understanding tourism. It is timely to adjust the tourism lens and focus upon a critical hospitality studies perspective of welcome.

The study of hospitality 'wherever hospitality exists, in whatever shape or form' has been propounded (Lashley, Lynch and Morrison, 2007:188). In advocating such a focus, emphasis is paid to the interaction between hospitality and society (Lynch, Molz, McIntosh, Lugosi and Lashley, 2011). There is a significant multi-disciplinary literature studying society through a hospitality perspective, much of it concentrating upon use of the hospitality as welcome metaphor to examine hospitality offered at a national or civic level of society, for example, to refugees (Gibson, 2003). Such studies reflect the analytical power of hospitality and reinforce the centrality of the ethic of hospitality in terms of its governance of human relations (Derrida, 2001). The identification of hospitality as found in domestic, commercial as well as social settings (Lashley, 2000) is indicative of hospitality as a mobile concept. Despite much effort to define and understand the nature of hospitality (Bell, 2012), hospitality is still poorly understood and its theoretical potential for making sense of the world underdeveloped and underutilised (Lynch et al., 2011). The simple but immensely powerful metaphor of hospitality as welcome is underexplored from a hospitality studies perspective. In the context of hospitality management the idea of hospitality as welcome is arguably captured under the idea of the service encounter and welcoming of the customer/stranger (Bitner, Booms and Tetreault, 1990). Here, a definition of the concept of hospitality is being understood that typically emphasizes

hospitality as much concerned with a degree of welcome and hospitableness as the provision of food, beverage and accommodation.

The idea of 'welcome' commonly features in definitions and discussions of hospitality. Keywords associated with welcome (Harper Collins, 2000; Visuwords.com, 2012) include: '*kindness*', an act of consideration to an Other; '*Welcoming strangers*', a reaching out to the Other; '*Acceptance*', tolerance but also a sense of embracing difference; '*Invite*', a communication with the Other, a request to join; '*Hospitable*', qualities of the person who, or thing which, is welcoming and also a feeling of the welcome; '*Received with pleasure*', welcome as something embraced, internalised by the individual evoking an emotional response; '*Inhospitable*', something or someone unfriendly, unfavourable and therefore a reinforcement of the sense of the Other being a stranger, an emphasis upon their exclusion; '*Unkind*', lack of consideration for the Other and thereby possibly suggests a focus on self; '*Inconsiderate*', lack of thought for the Other thereby diminishing their significance. This cursory review elicits the social and accordingly societal significance of welcome/non-welcome.

This study is in keeping with the idea of 'hospiety' (A. Grit, personal communication November 11, 2013) i.e. how can tourism facilitate a welcoming society? Such an aspiration fits with the broad intent of the 'moral turn' in tourism with its ambitions of making the world a better place, a concern with the 'messy collision of the Self and Other in life' (Caton, 2012:1921). The nature of such collisions, more commonly described as 'encounters' (Molz, 2013), need to be better understood owing to their intrinsically (un)ethical nature (Gibson, 2010) and to act as a prelude to making the world more just and foster 'a spatiality of care, connection and positive possibility' (Grimwood, 2015:19). Another way of framing the tourist encounter is to think of it as a space of hospitality (Dikec, 2002). Grit (2014) is interested in the positive potential of such spaces, which he calls 'hospity' and contributes to the possibility of hospiety.

The overarching aim of the project informing this paper is to provide empirically-informed understanding of individuals' experiences of welcome and non-welcome in order to advance existing conceptualisations. Research questions include: What exactly is welcome/ unwelcome? What is the nature, the essence of welcome/unwelcome? What determines an experience of welcome/unwelcome? This paper presents findings from an ethnographic study which explored individuals' experiences of welcome in everyday life. The focus therefore is the individual who experiences encounters 'in affective, embodied fashion' (Gibson, 2010:

524). The study draws upon analysis of a variety of data sources including audio diaries, questionnaires, media sources, photographs and observations.

2. HOSPITALITY AS WELCOME

Despite studies employing the metaphor of hospitality as welcome, the elaboration of a welcome theory is limited; the closest contained in the works of Derrida (1997; 1999; 2000a; 2000b). Derrida investigates hospitality from a philosophical perspective and uses domestic hospitality as his intellectual reference point. He uses hospitality as welcome as a means of exploring the welcome offered to migrants at a national level. Derrida's exploration is partly informed by Levinas (1981; 1995) and founded upon a theoretical approach employing deconstructionism (Caputo, 1997). He offers a theoretical treatise of hospitality as welcome between people (host-guest) with key elements including the (impossible) ideal of unconditional hospitality versus the reality of conditional hospitality, and also ethics as hospitality (Raffoul, 1998).

Derrida's exploration of hospitality as welcome is illuminating and thought-provoking, and helpful in highlighting hospitality as a micro and macro phenomenon. However, Derrida is not concerned with providing an exposé of day-to-day hospitality as welcome. Rather than offering a theory of hospitality as welcome he offers theoretical insights into the phenomenon and provides theoretical tools which others have employed to reflect upon and further Derrida's ideas regarding immigration and ethics in particular. Derrida (1997:63) refers to the 'threshold' of hospitality where hospitality may be offered, *or not* [my emphasis], although his attention then focuses primarily upon the crossing of the threshold into welcome. National hospitality offered to migrants and refugees has been considered by numerous authors, for example, Cornu (2008) on co-existence and hospitality towards strangers; Ben Jelloun (1999) on French hospitality and racism.

Both hospitality and welcome have a bipolar or knife-edged nature to them (Sheringham and Daruwalla, 2007), in that they involve both inclusions and exclusions, and so when we think about hospitality and welcome, we must also always be thinking about their opposites, inhospitality and non-welcome. A significant ongoing debate in human geography and other subjects, for example, sociology, cultural studies, partly inspired by Derrida's work on hospitality, relates to the transformation of human prejudice and the enactment of liberal values (Valentine, 2008). In this perspective, people are not comfortable with what they do not know

and become anxious in relation to the differences of others. However, arising from this position is a desire by some to create the conditions for meaningful encounters addressing prejudice towards others and thereby practise liberal values in respect of an openness to others, a cosmopolitan hospitality. This approach has driven a number of studies concerning 'how we *might* [my emphasis] live with difference' (334). For example, Fincher and Iveson (2008) argue that planning should favour design which facilitates the creation of conviviality. Yet they suggest planning fails to understand at a deeper level how meaningful encounters take place. Such debates are more broadly linked to the idea of creating a hospitable society through cosmopolitan hospitality (Yeoh, 2004). This study investigates the *reality* of how one lives with difference through the enactment of hospitality, in line with Laurier and Philo (2006) and their interest in passing encounters. Laurier and Philo (2006), whilst acknowledging the impossibility of representations of the interior world of the individual, argue that the attempt to do so nevertheless has value. Their study of a café sheds light upon aspects of how human interactions occur and reveals that there is much to be learned from mundane, often taken-for-granted micro-hospitality events, such as, in their example, a fleeting encounter between two customers.

Bell (2007) uses the metaphor of hospitality as welcome to examine hospitality in an array of social situations building upon ideas of Tregoning (2003) in viewing hospitality as concerned with 'ways of being-with-others'. He draws attention to moments of mundane hospitality that populate everyday life and illustrates its occurrence through, for example, commuting to work on trains where the host passenger moves their bag from the adjacent seat to make way for another passenger temporarily transformed into the host's guest. Even this simple host-guest dynamic is more complicated since the hospitality relationship often involves micro-hosts such as the initial sitting passenger above and macro-hosts such as the train company (Robinson and Lynch, 2007). Further, one should recognise the mobility or interchangeability of the host-guest roles and their social significance in daily life (Selwyn, 2000). Thus, one can conceive of a mobile hospitality practise that transcends fixed spatial associations and where the host-guest role is dynamic and interchanged. Bell (2007) highlights the mediatory role of the (broader) built environment in the production of daily hospitableness, here by civic authorities, for example, the provision of public seating. Commercial hospitality and civic hospitality such as the public seating are examples of mundane hospitality the individual encounters on a day-to-day basis. Mundane welcome is fundamentally about *dasein*, being-in-the-world (Heidegger

1996), and is the subject of recent attention by Veijola et al., (2014) who explore host(ess)ing and guesting (Veijola and Jokkinen, 2008) in relation to being with an Other.

Understandings of hospitality, tourism and leisure social interactions have been heavily influenced by performative interpretations (Goffman, 1959; 1963; 2009). However, significant criticisms of this interpretative approach have been made on the grounds of engagement with physical surroundings as well as the interactions being as much sensory and imaginative as embodied and gendered (Veijola and Jokinnen, 1994); further, that behaviour should be taken at face value rather than presupposing alternate agendas (Laurier and Philo, 2006). Moreover, whilst many accounts stress the highly commodified nature of commercial hospitality, it is questionable whether mundane hospitality is simply a highly structured performative experience as implicit in Goffman (1959; 1963) or a highly constructed experience as connoted by, say, Bitner, Booms and Tetreault (1990). Dikec (2002) suggests that the assumption that hospitality implies a desirable quality invites critical reflection. He argues it is not always liberating and emancipatory; it may conceal an oppressive aspect beneath its welcoming surface. Therefore I explore hospitality as welcome as a multi-faceted phenomenon pervading everyday life.

2.1 Methodology

My concern here is with the experience of hospitality as welcome/non-welcome in the world primarily in its mundane day-to-day form, which is practised through our engagement with and response to the world. It moves beyond simply a geographical concern with the elicitation of the *consumption* of place (Rakic and Chambers, 2012) but in its capturing of *engagement* with welcome experiences is broadly sympathetic to the nature of the experience being understood through embodied, cognitive and affective processes. The study has employed grounded theory (Charmaz, 2014) and mixed ethnographic methods, including: audio diaries employing sociological impressionism; a short survey; online video analysis; media stories, for example, newspaper articles; photographs of symbols of welcome; and researcher observations. Sociological impressionism is a term used by Lynch (2005) to describe a 'stream of consciousness' approach to capturing inner and outer journey perceptions and reflections of the subjective, embodied, cognitive and affective hospitality experience.

The primary data source is seven audio diaries completed following the sociological impressionism (Lynch, 2005) approach, one by myself, and used to evaluate the suitability of

the method for the project. Participants were requested to maintain an audio diary using a digital recorder for a period of between one and three weeks. Participants were asked to capture any noteworthy experience, thoughts and feelings of welcome and non-welcome as soon as possible after it occurred. Full, rich descriptions were encouraged emphasising unedited stream of consciousness notes as the concern is with capturing the experience of the immediacy of the event. In practice one participant provided a retrospective reflection of important life events associated with a travel experience leading to migration; the remainder are contemporaneous. Level of detail and reflection varies considerably. All participants were themselves either academics or students in hospitality and tourism; five accounts were undertaken during business and/or leisure trips involving overseas travel, two related to day-to-day experiences of welcome encountered in their home environment.

Supplementary sources of data are now outlined. The survey administered to mainly university students involved three simple questions: 1) *What does welcome mean to you?* 2) *Describe an experience where you felt most welcome. Explain what made it so welcoming.* 3) *Describe an experience where you felt most unwelcome. Explain what made it so unwelcoming.* Analysis of responses involved summarising and reflecting upon answers and counting the frequency of repeated keywords. Six online videos were identified through an internet search regarding 'welcome': the video diaries arose from a 'Welcome Project' undertaken by Media 19, a digital media production company. Four of the videos explored *What is welcome?* (Media 19, 2008), and two explored individuals' relationships with an iconic statue serving as a new local landmark (Media 19, 2009); both projects were located in North-East England. The videos of approximately two to three minutes duration were transcribed and analysed. They offer generic (since not based upon the immediacy of particular experiences) individual reflections upon welcome and non-welcome. The Welcome project participants talk about what welcome means to them and all are based in their home town/city. They respond to the following questions: *Where makes you feel welcome? What place makes you feel welcome? What's your favourite place or small corner of your town, city or country that you like to be in? What is it that makes it special?* Further contextual material gathered included newspaper articles and radio programmes; relevant observations and photographs were also collected occasionally, and all reflexively informed the overall analysis through selectively illustrating emerging themes.

For the audio diaries and survey, a convenience sample was employed drawing upon the researcher's personal and professional social networks; those involved were aged between 18-65 years to meet university approved ethical requirements. The survey sample involved 17

participants, primarily international, mainly European university masters students aged 22-29 years. The audio diary and student self-selecting samples might be characterised as composed of largely higher socio-economic group participants, of above average education levels, predominantly white and Western European whereas the videos sample was white British working class (estimated ages 16–55 years). However, the samples included other nationalities and ethnicities in particular from Eastern Europe, India and Australasia.

Line-by-line analysis was undertaken for both audio diaries and videos (total 40,000 words); the video analysis focuses upon the transcribed narratives only (rather than the moving images). Progressing from coded segments, a thematic framework was iteratively developed to structure the capturing of facets of a theme, for example, 'welcome definitions', and ensuring a record of the segment upon which each code is based and its reference details. The next stage of analysis involved writing up the themes in summary form; this process involved highlighting the conceptual dimensions of a theme and judiciously selecting segments to illustrate. A further stage followed in reflecting upon the essence of themes and crystallising the conceptual dimensions. At this creative juncture in the analysis, systematic engagement with relevant literature occurred.

2.2 MUNDANE HOSPITALITY LIFE POLITICS

Sense of Welcome

Senses are social constructions which it is proposed here includes the 'sense of welcome', a term used in a colloquial sense, by McNaughton (2006:645) but here used in line with the thesis of Vannini, Waskul and Gottschalk (2013) such that welcome is a *socially constructed sense*. Vannini et al. (2013) cogently argue for the presence of many different senses beyond the traditional five. Whilst the individual experiences the hospitable/inhospitable world in an embodied fashion through the physical senses, as well as neuroaesthetically, an additional sense is that of welcome/non-welcome. Common to all participants in the project was *a sense/feeling of welcome* and also *non-welcome*. Indeed, the terms 'welcome' and 'non-welcome' did not require definition for any of the participants, all knew what it meant *to them*. The most common meaning ascribed to 'welcome' based upon survey responses was that of a '*feeling*'. Those feelings in numerical priority order related to: *being accepted; wanted; belonging; being at home, good, warm, expected*; as well as, *appreciated, physically and psychologically welcome, relaxed,* and *a feeling that host or staff shows*. The responses conform to the social and esteem needs of the individual identified by Maslow (1943).

Viewing hospitality as welcome as a sense is highly significant as it communicates the idea of the individual as an *interpreter, recipient and sensory negotiator of welcome*. For example, John (a pseudonym, as are all forenames employed here) who describes his experience of delivering a parcel to a golf club.

> *Well, going to drop off that parcel for a friend there was [a] rather soulless experience [Interpreter]. I mean, there was some sort of discussion/argument going on at the desk when I went into the reception, very little attention paid to me at all as a person, customer or anything else [Recipient]. Just about managed to get my message across, leave the parcel and get out of there but certainly didn't feel welcomed at all [Sensory negotiator].* (John, British male, 50-59 years)

Engagement with structured hospitality experiences of welcome will be evaluated against this sense of welcome. For example, participant Viv on a leisure trip to Hong Kong who describes her experience of organising an excursion through the hotel's business centre:

> *So there was a trip to Macao but before that we went down to the business centre and organised a day excursion out to China. The girl at the business centre was very helpful, organised the trip and booked us for Tuesday; certainly told us the information about Macao and how to get there and things like that with no pressure behind to buy a tour; seemed very knowledgeable and the transaction went forward fairly quickly...* (Viv, Australian female, 40-49 years)

Here, the key sensory evaluation criteria mentioned relate to helpfulness, arranging the trip, being knowledgeable and providing information, perceived lack of pressure to buy, smoothness of transaction. The sense of welcome is *influenced by social discourses and ideologies. Prima facie*, it suggests that social ideologies will be highly significant influences on the individual experience of hospitality as welcome and will inform the construction of the *welcome habitus*.

Welcome Habitus and A World of Hostile Potential

Linked to the idea of the sense of welcome is that of the *welcome habitus*, building upon Bourdieu's (1990) habitus conceptualisation: participants carry forward a sense of previous welcome/non-welcome into other situations. So, the sense of welcome is not in constant need of creation *per se* but is built in sedimentary fashion through one's welcome habitus. The external environment is '*a world of hostile potential*', not just human relationships' natural state' as suggested by Kant (1996[1795]) and is implicit in the idea of the stranger and the

derivation of hospitality (*hospes/hostis*) as an enemy/friend (Benveniste, 1973). This perspective accords with the thesis of Beck (1992) concerning the risk society. There is a certain self-interest in terms of personal well-being underlying individual actions when negotiating hospitality. Giddens (2006) is relevant with his thesis of individuals seeking to manage risk, 'a more or less ever-present exercise' (42), which he associates with colonisation [in the sense of seeking to manage] of the future (31). Giddens (2006:45) employs Goffman (2009)'s descriptor '*Umwelt*', 'a sensitivity to… surrounding… area in terms of threats which may emanate…' as intrinsic to humans, a sensitivity which I suggest is informed by one's welcome habitus.

Ontological Search for Trust and Security

Related to agency is the idea of welcome as a constant ontological search by the individual for trust and security. In a Kantian world, the ontological search is for security and hence safety. For example, Monika who reflects upon experiences of having achieved a sense of being welcome within an organisation after several years:

> *you get that sense of security because welcome, really, requires or should give you a sense of trust and security (Monika, New Zealand female, 40-49 years)*

Welcome provides a gift of '*trust and security',* keywords which makes one think of their opposite, 'a lack of trust and security' i.e. quite fundamental aspects of living with the Other in the world. Monika believes *'everyone wants to get on with others in the end'*; such a perspective reflecting the individual's welcome habitus. It suggests a positive condition (individual welcome habitus) facilitating the act as well as the experience of welcome. The search for welcome involves change in the individual as well as others. So, Monika reflects upon her current position in contrast to her general experience of '*unwelcome by the academic fraternity*':

> *I am now at a point where I feel very welcome, by everyone… I've got to know many people over the years and I feel very welcome. It took some time because I'm sure, initially that some just smiled at me and were thinking "what is she doing here?" but it takes time. The question is, can we expect immediate welcome within an organisation? There definitely should be an immediate welcome but I think to get a truer sense of welcome it requires some active work and maybe some time, and putting in some time because… my feeling is, everyone wants to get on with others in the end.*

Monika draws comparison to a colleague (W) who is described as '*prickly*', with a relationship which progressed from being challenging and strained on occasion to highly valued and positive. Monika attributes this progression to her investing effort in making the relationship work through good communication and asking for advice, where she had '*to work at it*':

> *My example with W [colleague] is he probably doesn't feel very welcome, himself... Healthwise he's not well, so he's struggling with his own sense of where he is in this world and that just requires more work, but you can and I believe you can [improve a relationship] and maybe that even gives you a longer lasting sense of [welcome], because you changed not just yourself, you've changed something in someone else as well.*

Further, welcome acts as a contrast to the absence of welcome i.e. welcome of the Other fills an emptiness in the individual, a 'lack', and therefore partly explains the necessity of the ontological search (Ben Jelloun, 1998).

Welcome Anchorages

Welcome acts also as an *anchorage* in the world, a place or sense of security (a 'mooring' in mobilities terminology). The home, 'permanent' or temporary, such as a hotel room, is highly significant as not simply a geographical anchorage offering a certain security but also as a starting point for feeling welcome. For example, Monika at the start of her reflections refers back to her arrival as a backpacker in New Zealand and arriving at a hostel which '*became a launching path*' to feeling welcome:

> *I want to go back 21 years when I first arrived in New Zealand. I arrived with two bags and I didn't know anyone. I didn't really know where to go, in a sense, who would make me feel welcome? So, I thought, well, who to actually approach, so I approached a shuttle bus driver and asked him "do you know a nice place to stay?" He dropped me off at a place in [X], [Y] Lodge, which led to much unexpected developments later on. I ended up living in that street for the next two and a half years.*

Later, Monika picks up her story of becoming welcome in a new country. When a job offer is finally secured – here the elided time surrounding the story started 20 years before – the *assemblage* of factors which creates a sense of welcome in advance of starting work are: the job offer, knowing people in the organisation to which going including a good friend, all leading to expectations of a friendly environment, a shared habitus*:*

I've managed to get a job offer and I'm sure I will be made to feel welcome at [Z]town. I know people there which make life a lot easier, I used to have my good friend who is now an associate professor and I know some others there. I'm expecting in many ways that I will go to a friendly environment and will be made welcome.

Likewise, Nadia when she crosses the threshold of a homestay she is residing at in a foreign city feels like she is at home and the city itself is reminiscent of her home city, both homestay and the city serving as welcome anchorages. For example, on her return to the homestay at the end of a tiring day:

I go through the doors. I'm tired. I go through the doors and I just feel like I'm at home. Strange. But, I do feel like I'm at home here, and the city as well reminds me of the city at home. … people tell me that there is something completely foreign in the city, but it's outside. I don't feel it's foreign. I feel, like, very homey.

For Nadia both the homestay and the city itself are welcome anchorages even though other people described the city as a '*completely foreign*' place. The anchorage concept links into the idea of 'dwelling' or 'home' which act as conditions enabling the individual to be open to the Other (Diprose 2009). Further, 'being-at-home' is also 'identity' (Raffoul 1998:3). Being at home in the world i.e. feeling welcome, enables the sense of individual identity. The anchorage is a 'land of asylum' in Derridean terms (Raffoul ibid:10), a pre-condition to allow the individual to act as host i.e. offering welcome to Others. The anchorage is also a threshold between the world 'outside' and the world of the individual where their identity is affirmed and ethical relations determined (Bulley, 2015).

Welcome Assemblages

The welcome assemblage is a highly significant theme to emerge from analysis of participant diaries. Welcome assemblage refers to the collective experiences and feelings of macro and micro issues which constitute, and contribute to, the individual's constructed sense of welcome. Wise (2013:91) states 'An assemblage is a becoming that brings elements together.' For example, an introduction to the online Welcome Project distils a number of perspectives. Welcome is associated with: '*sunshine, smiling faces, colour*' and '*a pleasant smell, body language associated with welcome, a spacious bright entrance*'. Welcome is also associated with a familiar visual marker (transporter bridge) which is seen to convey welcome and belonging. Another association of welcome is flowers owing to their perfume and colour which

attracts people. Welcome is again represented as a sense (feeling), but also appreciation of the Other, sharing enjoyment and time with the Other. Here, such hospitality is conceived as an outcome of welcome. A beverage, a conversation are the fulfilment of welcome. For example, one description of welcome is as follows:

> *If it is that there is that sense of greeting, "glad that you are here" and "let's share this time together", whether the outcome of that is either a beer or a cup of tea or a nice long chat, then we've achieved what we set out to do.* (Marjory, British female, 46-55 years)

The idea of hospitality as an assemblage is being increasingly recognised in the literature, for example, Grit (2014).

Welcome as Social Oil

Most welcome is ordinary, hardly noticed. From the individual perspective, it just is. For example, things proceeding smoothly such as an arrival at an airport and swift 'processing', and then exit out the building doors and climb into a taxi. That is, welcome proceeds smoothly. Welcome on arrival at an airport may be perceived through lack of inconvenience in relation to, for example, queuing, cleanliness, efficiency, spaciousness, good organisation, altogether creating a sense of a welcome destination. Welcome serves as a kind of *social oil* which only becomes remarkable if it somehow fails: delays happen, signs misdirect i.e. the mechanics of welcome malfunction in some way. Welcome, unremarked, is nevertheless felt and so contributes to the experience of welcome. Such welcome subliminally often creates a positive sense of welcome, well-being by virtue of being no hassle, avoiding frustration but not really creating a hugely positive sense of well-being. For example, my arrival at Hong Kong airport:

> [The flight] *got me into Hong Kong, it all went smoothly. I went through passport [control] quite easily rather than queuing which is good. My bags came off the carousel quickly which is always good. So all of that and the transfer to the hotel was all quite well facilitated. What I did notice, what I thought, was that I just enjoyed the cleanliness, the efficiency of the airport on arrival. It was all quite spacious, quite well organised, it did communicate itself in the way things were set up, a sense of welcome to the arriving traveller…* (Author, British male, 46-55 years)

In many respects, this is what hospitality as welcome is about, social oil, individual facilitation which somehow makes one feel welcome in the world. This facet of welcome links to management as it is invariably organisational efficiency, a kind of organisational welcome.

Non-welcome

A perception by Viv of a lack of welcome by an attendant when visiting a museum is non-welcome because it denies the essential sense of self, one's personal identity, and welcome/acceptance in the world which is an important component in Viv's habitus.

> *Arriving over there we decided to have a visit to the museum. A little difficult to find out some of the information from the information guy at the front area, a little confusing on what we could see, what we couldn't see, what was available. We went into the museum shop and that was exceptionally interesting. The attendant at the museum showed no form of hospitality, when paying, just took the money and sat down and wasn't really interested in anything else.*

Similarly, John at a petrol service station, an experience of waiting at the checkout is one of '*long silences*', '*without anything happening*' except for '*the wheels of commerce turning*'; the nature of the experience is presented as a counterpoint to welcome. Again there is a lack of human engagement, a lack of recognition of the participant's individuality, '*very little in terms of greeting, welcome or interest, engagement, no eye contact*'. The interaction elicits a broader reflection:

> *makes me think about people in jobs like that, what do they possibly get out of it apart from the money at the end of the week or month if they don't make something of it and smile a bit and converse or engage with the people that they're serving? But that's just my point of view.*

For John, '*mak[ing] something of it*' in relation to human interaction would make the job more meaningful, more than simply a financial reward, weekly or monthly. Part of what the participant is expressing is that the person serving is not just denying John's individuality but also to an extent their own. The description of the lack of human interaction in the context of this mundane interaction is in some respects oppressive, dehumanising not just the worker in accordance with Braverman's (1974) thesis but also the customer. The act of welcome facilitates negotiation of the world and fits with Selwyn (2000: 34) who observes that hospitality 'is neither voluntary [n]or altruistic, but, in a particular sense, both necessary and compulsory'.

He elaborates '…it is the means, above all others, of forming or consolidating relationships with strangers…. one of the means… by which societies change, grow, renew and reproduce themselves' (Selwyn, 2000: 34). Hospitality then is invoked by the individual as a means of negotiating the experience of the world, *hospitality life politics (HLP),* a 'necessary and compulsory action' (Selwyn, 2000:34). When the practises of HLP are not reciprocated, the sense of self and identity is adversely affected. Denial of hospitality to the Other in however small a way creates a sense of anomie, of alienation from the world, as well as a certain denial of society's lifeblood.

Hospitality Life Politics

Hospitality life politics (HLP) as emerged from this study refers to hospitality practises invoked by the individual in order to negotiate the(ir) world on a day-to-day basis: 'life' refers to 'mode of existence' and 'politics' to both 'any activity concerned with the acquisition of power, gaining one's own ends' as well as 'the complex or aggregate of relationships of people in society' (Harper Collins, 2000: 895; 1198). Here, HLP captures the idea of individual *hospitality agency* i.e. the deployment of practises such as openness and acts of welcome allowing the individual to negotiate the world on a day-to-day basis, a form of self-empowerment. Hospitality agency is informed by the individual's interpretation, receipt and sensory negotiation of welcome. It therefore enables the individual to try to secure and maintain a place of welcome in the world. The concept hospitality life *politics* implicitly communicates self-interest. HLP reveals the way the individual – all individuals in the audio diary sample – actively experiences and seeks to secure hospitality i.e. welcome in the world, captured in the idea of being *in search of ontological security*.

HLP is broadly in line with Diprose's summary (2009: 69) of Derrida (2000a) where hospitality is '… the condition of subjectivity, sociality and the political'. Put simply, the experience is subjective, it is a social experience and involves tactical decision-making. Life itself is *open to the Other* which is the essence of hospitality 'this responsiveness, this welcome, this openness *is* subjectivity; it *is* dwelling; it *is* the political' (ibid), and it is this life, this sense of hospitality as welcome, which the study sought to capture. In so doing, it follows a Levinasian perspective of dwelling where the individual (and reflected in the composition of the specific sample) is open to the Other (cf Harrison 2007) rather than in the Heideggerian perspective of closure to the Other (*Ibid*). The former according to Adorno (1973) leads to healthy societies, the latter is more likely to lead to unhealthy societies. A contrast is made between a Levinasian and a

Heideggarian approach to travel. The cosmopolitan tourist is associated with greater mobility and a greater openness to the Other in line with Levinas whereas a Heideggarian approach might be associated with mobilities to places where a greater home facsimile is reproduced and more limited interactions occur with the Other through forms of enclave tourism. Indeed, Heidegger largely did not travel (Shepherd, 2015).

Hospitality Life Politics as Agency

So, management organisation is really concerned with facilitating hospitality efficiency. Hospitality then becomes a mundane act (Edensor 2007). The irony here is that the individual tourist's engagement with the mundane acts of hospitality is an engagement with biopolitical performances of hospitality (Minca 2009). Minca uses an island enclave tourism resort experience to illustrate Foucauldian biopolitical hospitality (Foucault, 2008). The common usage of the term 'biopolitical hospitality' concerns an 'extensive complex of discourses, practices and institutions tasked with the care, regulation and improvement of individual bodies and of the collective body of the national population' (Vasudevan, 2006: 800). For Minca (2009), it refers to 'the political production and management of human bodies… the strategy that allows sovereign power to separate in its subjects biological and political/cultural life' (91) although he notes different interpretations of the phenomenon by, for example, Hardt and Negri (2000). The general emphasis though is upon an externally imposed or even manipulated control – whether intentionally benevolent or otherwise - of the individual.

HLP is about *agency.* On the one hand, the social oil is in a certain commercial sense about 'the biopolitical reproduction of a specific smiling and standardized de-personalized body of the worker' who is also 'depoliticized', 'since (s)he is there to perform just a simulacrum of real life' (Minca, 2009: 100). The worker performs and enables the social oil of hospitality to occur by practising mundane hospitality. The mundane or 'banal everyday' has multifaceted positive and negative associations: '… can produce spatialities that are both alienating and subjectifying, *and* liberatory and sources of assurance' (Binnie, Holloway, Millington and Young, 2007:517). The juxtaposition and intersection of HLP and biopolitical hospitality contribute to the various spatialities described. The guest is not simply complicit in the hospitality performance but also practises it tactically in order to try to assure his/her own ends. For Minca (2009), the hospitality assemblage is a highly managed and performative process. On the other hand, however, this perspective seems to understate the agency of the individual as well as the individual's sense/feelings of welcome. So, in terms of the enclave tourist resort experience Minca (2009) presents as an exemplar of Foucauldian biopolitical hospitality, it may also be seen as the

individual tourist exercising agency to entrust themselves to the organisational social oil rather than being subject simply to organisational control. However, how does one reconcile HLP with Foucauldian biopolitical hospitality? Whilst acknowledging agency of the individual, is such agency simply played out within the boundaries of Foucauldian discourse i.e. what may be deemed an illusory agency?

3. POSSIBILITIES OF HOSPITALITY

I suggest that the foregoing conceptualisation is helpful in advancing our understanding of hospitality and will be of value to researchers drawing upon hospitality theory. I have advanced the proposition of HLP, based upon empirical findings and so filled a gap with regard to understanding the experience of welcome which builds upon Bell's (2007) 'moments of welcome'. HLP is significant as it highlights how the individual practises hospitality in everyday life as a way of negotiating the world in their ontological search for trust and security. Therefore, it identifies the agency of the individual in securing hospitality. Indeed, the finding concerning a *sense* of hospitality points to the individual who is able to distinguish what from their perspective is truly welcome and what is not and therefore arguably less open to organisational or other manipulation.

The sense of welcome is explained as socially constructed and is carried by the individual into the world through their welcome habitus. While the person-to-person interactive performances of the individual may be said to habitually operate within broader socio-cultural and linguistic narratives (Still, 2005), another dimension of welcome surfaced is the importance of embodied engagement with the world contributing to a sense of welcome informed by the various sensory interpretations of the individual. My preferred reading is that of individual interpretation which is unique, a kind of existential welcome to adapt Wang's (1999) application of existentialism to the authenticity-performance debate. The importance of welcome anchorages has been identified and here there is a significant role for the tourism industry to play. Welcome is identified as an assemblage consisting of a wide range of dimensions both within and outside the control of organisations. Welcome itself is a form of social oil and is at the heart of making societies function in a healthy and effective fashion. The act of tourism management which enacts organisational social oil such as the airport exemplar suggests the role of management is being concerned with welcome enablement, a more positive emphasis than one concerned with control. Receipt of welcome provides affirmation of the self. Conversely, receipt of non-welcome challenges the individual's sense of identity.

This study has presented findings from an exploration of hospitality as welcome where concerns with the idealistic potentiality of welcome as a means for creating healthier societies has been identified as a driving force for the investigation. Yet, here, the world itself is viewed as one of hostile potential fitting with the thesis of Beck (1992) in which we live in a risk society. Negotiating welcome is a means to mitigate that risk involving a certain openness to the Other balanced with self-interest. In line with the risk thesis one may posit a conditional trust proffered by the individual. That conditional trust enables tourism to be enacted i.e. the guest entrusts themselves to, for example, the airport or the hotel, to provide a hassle-free service in line with their habitus expectations. At those points where the social oil of organisational hospitality does not function effectively the individual starts to re-evaluate the trust bestowed.

The critical tourism project is associated with the potential of tourism to make the world a better place. While attention has been paid to the macro level arguably a greater focus should be paid to the micro-elements of people interactions. For example, the ethical relationships involved in how tourism may contribute to make the world less hostile through a greater concern with how one lives with difference, such as, encounters between tourists and migrants (Lenz, 2010). Nevertheless, as I explored the data I became somehow pessimistic about the possibility of hospiety owing to the degree of self-interest informing individual actions. To ascribe agency to the individual is a positive reading but it also raises a question regarding what is the ideology informing that agency?

The study has given consideration to the potentiality of hospitality to facilitate 'hospiety', a more welcoming society. Hospiety is a somewhat abstract concept interpreted here as being more inclusive. Critical hospitality studies (Bell, 2009) lacks an 'Academy of Hope' in the manner outlined by Ateljevic, Morgan and Pritchard (2011) for tourism. Such an omission is strange given the centrality of hospitality to healthy societies as well as given the ethical issues which beset the hospitality industry, for example, gender and age discrimination, worker exploitation, poor managerial practices etc. Certainly, a critical hospitality studies agenda development would be very beneficial in contributing to challenging and tackling seemingly embedded problems.

Conclusions

This paper has endeavoured to make a number of theoretical contributions. The study of welcome turns the lens away from a focus upon individual performance and exteriority to a greater engagement with the individual's inner monologue, experience and agency as the world

is negotiated. Whilst the focus here has been upon the individual experience of welcome, future work from this study will explore ideology underpinning welcome as well as the bi-polar nature of welcome. Future research would benefit from exploring welcome with more diverse groups than those involved in the current research and also the boundaries of hospitality and their determination. There is a need to better understand cultural interpretations of welcome and non-welcome, as well as exploration of experiences of individuals with strong experiences of non-welcome. Methodological challenges involved in exploring welcome with more diverse groups should not be underestimated. Moreover, greater attention to understanding non-welcome in order to better understand and facilitate welcome is needed. Further exploration of tourism as an ethical relationship is required. Areas for exploration include the role of tourism in creating welcome/non-welcome and a greater focus upon associated discourses and supporting ideology. For example, how do tourists make others feel welcome? How do tourists host welcome? As part of the project to further strengthen the theoretical base of hospitality, it would be helpful to explore the tourist experience through other metaphors such as hospitality as a relationship. Likewise, other constitutive elements of hospitality would benefit from exploration, for example, exchange, reciprocity, trust.

REFERENCES

Adorno, T. (1973) Negative Dialectics (Vol. 1), London: A&C Black.

Ateljevic, I., Morgan, N. and Pritchard, A. (Eds.) (2012) The Critical Turn in Tourism Studies: Creating an Academy of Hope, Abingdon: Routledge.

Back, L. (2015) Why everyday life matters: class, community and making life liveable. Sociology, 49(5):820-836.

Bauman, Z. (1995) Making and unmaking of strangers, Thesis Eleven, 43(1):1-16.

Beck, U. (1992) Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity, London: Sage.

Bell, D. (2007) Moments of Hospitality. In J. Molz and S. Gibson (Eds.) Mobilizing

Hospitality: The Ethics of Social Relations in a Mobile World, Aldershot: Ashgate, pp.29-46.

Bell, D. (2009) Tourism and Hospitality. In M. Robinson, and T. Jamal (Eds.) The Handbook of Tourism Studies, London: Sage, pp.19-34.

Bell, D. (2012) Hospitality is society, Hospitality & Society, 1(2):137-152.

Ben Jelloun, T. (1999) French Hospitality: Racism and North African Immigrants, New York: Columbia University Press.

Benveniste, E. (1973) Indo-European Language and Society, London: Faber and Faber.

Binnie, J., Holloway, J., Millington, S. and Young, C. (2007) Mundane Geographies: Alienation, Potentialities, and Practice; Alienation, Objectification and the Banal, Environment and Planning A, 39(3):515-520.

Bitner, M., Booms, B. and Tetreault, M. (1990) The Service Encounter: Diagnosing Favourable and Unfavourable Incidents, Journal of Marketing, 54(1):71-84.

Blake, A., Arbache, J., Sinclair, M. and Teles, V. (2008) Tourism and Poverty Relief, Annals of Tourism Research, 35(1):107-126.

Bourdieu, P. (1990) In Other Words: Essays Towards a Reflexive Sociology, Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Braverman, H. (1974) Labor and Monopoly Capital, New York: Monthly Review Press.

Bulley, D. (2015) Ethics, Power and Space: International Hospitality Beyond Derrida, Hospitality & Society, 5(2+3):185-201.

Candea, M., & Da Col, G. (2012) The return to hospitality, Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute, 18(s1):S1-S19.

Caputo, J. (Ed.) (1997) Deconstruction in a Nutshell: A Conversation with Jacques Derrida, New York: Fordham University Press.

Caton, K. (2012) Taking the moral turn in tourism studies, Annals of Tourism Research, 39(4): 1906-1928.

Charmaz, K. (2014) Constructing Grounded Theory, London: Sage.

Cohen, E., & Cohen, S. A. (2012). Current Sociological Theories and Issues in Tourism,

Annals of Tourism Research, 39(4):2177-2202.

Cornu, L. (2008) Trust, Strangeness and Hospitality, Diogenes, 55(4):15-26.

Crouch, D., Aronsson, L., & Wahlström, L. (2001) Tourist encounters, Tourist Studies, 1(3):253-270.

Davis, J. and Morais, D. (2004). Factions and enclaves: Small towns and socially unsustainable tourism development. Journal of Travel Research, 43(1):3-10.

De Certeau, M. (1984) The Practice of Everyday Life, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Derrida, J. (1997) De L'Hospitalité, Paris: Calmann-Levy.

Derrida, J. (1999) Adieu to Emmanuel Levinas, Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Derrida, J. (2000a) Of Hospitality: Anne Dufourmantelle Invites Jacques Derrida to Respond, Stanford: Stanford University Press Books.

Derrida, J. (2000b) Hospitality, Angelaki, 5(3):3-18.

Derrida, J. (2001) On Cosmopolitanism and Forgiveness, London: Routledge.

Dikec, M. (2002), Tera Peras Poros: Longings for Spaces of Hospitality, Theory, Culture and Society, 19(1-2):227-47.

Diprose, R. (2009) Women's Bodies Between National Hospitality and Domestic Biopolitics, Paragraph, 32(1):69-86.

Edensor, T. (2007) Mundane Mobilities, Performances and Spaces of Tourism, Social and Cultural Geography, 8(2):199-215.

Fincher, R. and Iveson, K. (2008) The Social Logics of Urban Planning: Towards a Just Diversity in Cities, London: Palgrave.

Foucault, M. (2008). The Birth of Biopolitics: lectures at the Collège de France, 1978-1979. New York: Springer.

Gibson, C. (2010) Geographies of tourism: (Un)ethical encounters, Progress in Human Geography, 34(4):521–527

Gibson, S. (2003) Accommodating Strangers: British Hospitality and the Asylum Hotel Debate, Journal for Cultural Research, 7(4):367-386.

Giddens, A. (2006) Fate, risk and security. In J. Cosgrave (Ed.) The Sociology of Risk and Gambling Reader, New York: Routledge, pp. 29–59.

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

Goffman, E. (1963) Behavior in Public Places: Notes on the Organisation of Gatherings, London: Free Press.

Goffman, E. (2009) Relations in Public, New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.

Grimwood, B. S. (2015) Advancing tourism's moral morphology: Relational metaphors for just and sustainable arctic tourism, Tourist Studies, 15(1):3-26.

Grit, A. (2014) Messing Around with Serendipities. In S. Veijola, J. Molz, , O. Pyyhtinen, E. Hockert, and A. Grit (Eds.), Disruptive Tourism and its Untidy Guests: Alternative Ontologies for Future Hospitalities, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp.123-142.

Hannam, K., Sheller, M., & Urry, J. (2006) Editorial: Mobilities, immobilities and moorings. Mobilities, 1(1):1-22.

Hardt, M. and Negri, A. (2000) Empire, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Harper Collins (2000) Collins English Dictionary, Glasgow: Harper Collins.

Harrison, P. (2007) The Space Between Us: Opening Remarks on the Concept of Dwelling, Environment and Planning D: Society and Space, 25(4):625-647.

Heidegger, M. (1996) Being and Time: A translation of Sein und Zeit, New York: SUNY Press.

Herzfeld, M. (2012) Afterword: reciprocating the hospitality of these pages, Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute, 18(s1):S210-S217.

Kant, I. 1996 [1795] Toward Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Project, Practical Philosophy: the Cambridge Edition of the Works of Immanuel Kant, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lashley, C. (2000) Towards a Theoretical Understanding. In C. Lashley and A. Morrison, (Eds.) In Search of Hospitality, Oxford: Butterworth Heinemann, pp.1-17.

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

Laurier, E. and Philo, C. (2006) Possible Geographies: A Passing Encounter in a Cafe, AREA, 38(4):353-363.

Lenz, R. (2010) 'Hotel Royal' and other Spaces of Hospitality: Tourists and Migrants in the Mediterranean. In J. Scott. and T. Selwyn., Thinking Through Tourism, Oxford: Berg, pp. 209-230.

Levinas, E. (1981) Otherwise than Being or Beyond Essence, The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.

Levinas, E. (1995) The Theory of Intuition in Husserl's Phenomenology, Evanston: Northwestern University Press.

Lynch, P.A. (2005) Sociological Impressionism In A Hospitality Context, Annals of Tourism Research, 32(3):527-548.

Lynch, P., Molz, J., McIntosh, A., Lugosi, P. and Lashley, C. (2011) Theorizing Hospitality, Hospitality & Society, 1(1):3-24.

Maslow, A. (1943) A Theory of Human Motivation, Psychological Review, 50(4):370-396.

McCabe, S. (2002) The tourist experience and everyday life. In G. Dann (Ed.), The Tourist as a Metaphor of the Social World, Wallingford: CABI, pp. 61–77.

McGuire, S. and Canales, M. (2010) Of Migrants and Metaphors: Disrupting Discourses to Welcome the Stranger, Advanced Nursing Science, 33(2):126-142.

McNaughton, D. (2006) The "host" as uninvited "guest": Hospitality, Violence and Tourism, Annals of Tourism Research, 33(3):645-665.

Media 19 (2008) The Welcome Project
https://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLE5138BA7C2F6C566, accessed 9 October 2012.

Media 19 (2009) Angel of the North 2, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vD2ypwncXFU, Directed by Nick Oldham, Channel Four Television Production, accessed 14 September 2015.

Minca, C. (2009) The Island: Work, Tourism and the Biopolitical, Tourist Studies, 9(2):88-108.

Molz, J. G. (2007) Cosmopolitan Bodies: Fit to Travel and Travelling to Fit, Body and Society, 12(3):1-21.

Molz, J. G. (2013) Social networking technologies and the moral economy of alternative tourism: The case of couchsurfing. org. Annals of Tourism Research, 43, 210-230.

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

Obrador-Pons, P. (2009) Building castles in the sand: Repositioning touch on the beach. The Senses and Society, 4(2):195-210.

Raffoul, F. (1998) The Subject of the Welcome: On Jacque Derrida's Adieu à Emmanuel Levinas, Symposium, 2(2):211-222.

Rakić, T., and Chambers, D. (2012) Rethinking the Consumption of Places, Annals of Tourism Research, 39(3):1612-1633.

Rickly-Boyd, J. and Metro-Roland, M. (2010) Background to the fore: The prosaic in tourist places, Annals of Tourism Research, 37(4):1164-1180.

Robinson, M. and Lynch, P.A. (2007) The Power of Hospitality: A Sociolinguistic Analysis. In C. Lashley, P.A. Lynch, .and A. Morrison (Eds.) Hospitality: A Social Lens, Oxford: Elsevier, pp.141-154.

Sedgley, D. Pritchard, A. Morgan, N. (2011) Tourism and Ageing: A Transformative Research Agenda, Annals of Tourism Research, 38(2):422-436.

Seliinniemi, T. (2003) On holiday in the liminoid playground: Place, time, and self in tourism. In T. Bauer and G. McKercher (Eds.) Sex and Tourism: Journeys of romance, love, and lust, Oxford: The Haworth Hospitality Press, pp. 19-34.

Selwyn, T. (2000) An Anthropology of Hospitality. In Lashley, C. and Morrison, A. (Eds.) In Search of Hospitality, Oxford: Butterworth – Heinemann, pp.18-37.

Shepherd, R. (2015) Why Heidegger did not travel: Existential angst, authenticity and tourist experiences, Annals of Tourism Research, 52:60-71.

Sheringham, C. and Daruwalla, P. (2007) Transgressing Hospitality: Polarities and Disordered Relationships? In C. Lashley, P.A. Lynch, and A. Morrison (Eds.) Hospitality: A Social Lens, Oxford: Elsevier, pp.33-46.

Shyrock, A. (2012) Breaking Hospitality Apart: Bad Hosts, Bad Guests, and the Problem of Sovereignty, Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute, 18(s1):S20–S33.

Simmel, G. (1971), The Stranger: On individuality and social forms, Donald Levine (Ed.), Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Small, J. and Harris, C. (2012) Obesity and Tourism: Rights and Responsibilities, Annals of Tourism Research, 39(2):686-707.

Still, J. (2005) Language as Hospitality: Revisiting Intertextuality via Monolingualism of the Other, Paragraph, 27(1):113-127.

Tregoning, W. (2003) It Feels Like Home: Hospitality in a Postcolonial Space, Text Theory Critique, 7, no pagination.

Tung, V. and Ritchie, J. (2011) Exploring the Essence of Memorable Tourism Experiences, Annals of Tourism Research, 38(4):1367–1386.

Valentine, G. (2008) Living with Difference: Reflections on Geographies of Encounter, Progress in Human Geography, 32(3):323-337.

Vannini, P., Waskul, D. and Gottschalk, S. (2013) The Senses in Self, Society, and Culture: A Sociology of the Senses, London: Routledge.

Vasudevan, A. (2006) Experimental Urbanisms: Psychotechnik in Weimar Berlin, Environment and Planning D: Society and Space, 26(6):799-826.

Veijola, S. and Jokinen, E. (1994) The Body in Tourist Studies, Theory, Culture and Society, 11(3):125-151.

Veijola, S., & Jokinen, E. (2008) Towards a hostessing society? Mobile arrangements of gender and labour, NORA—Nordic Journal of Feminist and Gender Research, 16(3):166-181.

Veijola, S., Germann Molz, J., Pyyhtinen, O., Höckert, E. and Grit, A. (2014) Disruptive Tourism and its Untidy Guests: Alternative Ontologies for Future Hospitalities, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Books.Visuwords.com (2013) Online Graphical Dictionary and Thesaurus, www.Visuwords.com, accessed 15 January 2013.

Wang, N. (1999) Rethinking Authenticity in Tourism Experience, Annals of Tourism Research, 26(2):349-370.

Wise, J. (2013) Assemblage. In C. Stivale (Ed.) Gilles Deleuze: Key Concepts, Chesham: Acumen Publishing Limited, pp. 91-102.

Yeoh, B. (2004) Cosmopolitanism and its Exclusions in Singapore, Urban Studies, 41:2431-2445.