RHM

Hospitableness: the new service metaphor? Developing an instrument for measuring hosting

Matthew Blain[1] and Conrad Lashley[2]*

[1]*Compass Group UK & Ireland, Compass House, Chertsey, Surrey, United Kingdom*
[2]*School of International Hospitality Management, Stenden University of Applied Sciences, Leeuwarden, The Netherlands*
*Corresponding author email: conradlashley@aol.com

Over the last couple of decades the word hospitality has emerged from the shadow of being used to describe a cluster of commercial activities providing accommodation, food and drink experiences to guests for a fee. Hospitality describes a ubiquitous aspect of human behaviour. The need to protect and honour visitors has a tradition as long as human society and is practiced around the globe. The study of hospitality reveals that societies do have changing levels of obligation to be hospitable, and that many of the more advanced contemporary societies no longer practice the requirement to be hospitable with the same intensity that perhaps they once did. That said, philosophers and others suggest that in any given social context, there are differences amongst individuals in the commitment to being hospitable for the pleasure it gives them personally. They are not motivated by ulterior motives, personal gain, or the threat of punishment. Guests are unconditionally welcomed by hosts driven by altruistic motives. Whilst it has been possible to describe the behaviour of hospitable individuals, there has not been until now an instrument to measure the strength of genuine hospitality in individuals. This paper describes the development of a suite of questions designed to measure these qualities in individuals. This paper describes the development of the instrument and argues for the application of the instrument in wider array of tourist and other contexts than are described here.

Keywords: host, guest, hosting, researching hospitableness

Introduction

Whilst hospitality has been used as something as a public relations device to describe an industry providing commercial accommodation, dining and drinking services, there has been much recent academic interest in the cultural, historical and social meanings of hospitality and hospitableness, which have major implications for these and other service providers (Lashley et al. 2008, Molz and Gibson 2007, Lashley and Morrison 2000). Hosting has been used as a metaphor to describe a context when individuals enter a space which is not theirs, it is a space controlled by another. Host and guest relationships can be seen to apply in situations beyond bars, hotel and restaurants to include tour guides, air stewards, conductors and drivers on coaches, staff in museums and at attractions, and many more. Using this metaphor, the visitor, as a guest, is entering the host's space. Most significantly, the host is obliged to make the guests safe and to ensure that guests are unconditionally welcome. Whilst there are some obligations on guests, the chief responsibilities which concern us here lie with hosts. The welcome for the guest has to be unconditional. This approach is founded upon deep-rooted traditions of hospitality, and provides a model for building long-term customer loyalty beyond the somewhat simplistic advocacy of the 'service culture'. Furthermore and extending beyond these immediate contexts, 'Hospitality serves as a means of understanding society' (Lynch et al. 2011, 14).

Motives are central to this discussion of hosting and hospitableness. Telfer (1996, 2000) argues that some people may have a higher innate propensity for hospitableness than others, and that these people may naturally be drawn to work in situations where they can welcome others. These individuals are being hospitable, in situations that are not immediately associated with hosting. At the point of service, the profit motive may be secondary to the more altruistic motives of hospitableness, such as the simple enjoyment of the act, or a desire to welcome others. She compares this to a hospital surgeon where it would be unusual for the medical practitioner to be thinking about his wage cheque when saving a life. Telfer argues, therefore, that genuine hospitality is driven by altruistic motives, contrary to Ritzer's (2004) assertion that the cash motive distorts motives. Genuine hospitableness can be found within hospitality, irrespective of the commercial context. People driven by these genuine hospitable feelings are drawn to work in a context which allows them to be welcoming to strangers.

This paper seeks to further explore these ideas. A literature search reveals a growing body of work on 'hospitality', but few authors study the nature of 'hospitableness' as a distinct concept. This research seeks to understand the traits of hospitableness through a motive-based model, and then uses this conceptual framework to inform the development of an instrument that aspires to measure individual hospitableness. It looks for answers to Telfer's challenge about the need to identify differing levels of natural propensity. It charts the development of the hospitableness instrument through

a number of iterations as it follows a process offered by Churchill (1979). This is tested for validity against a framework proposed by Cook and Beckman (2006) and through this the instrument demonstrated high levels of internal reliability. The paper shares the experience of developing an instrument which aims to identify genuine or altruistic hospitality. That said, the instrument has been developed and field tested in a relatively limited setting and needs wider use and exposure.

This paper initially identifies an array of motives to offer hospitality in different contexts, but is concerned principally with exploring hospitableness as manifested in situations where hosts clearly see hospitality as an act of giving and generosity motivated simply by a desire to be hospitable and to 'convert strangers into friends' (Selwyn 2000). Whilst much of the focus assumes these acts of hospitableness take place primarily in domestic settings, Telfer (2000) suggests there is no reason to assume that acts of hospitableness are unlikely to occur in commercial settings. Commercial organisations could benefit from employing individuals who possess and demonstrate the qualities of hospitableness, because it enables the possibility of providing service experiences to customers which build a competitive advantage compared with competitors. The issue being confronted by this paper is that there is no instrument for recognising the qualities of hospitableness in applicants for work in commercial contexts. The paper shares the experience of developing an instrument which aims to identify genuine or altruistic hospitality.

Hospitality and hospitableness

Telfer (2000) makes a distinction between hospitality and hospitableness. Hospitality she defines as involving the provision of food, drink, and accommodation to those who are not members of a household. She recognises that the provision of these might also occur in commercial settings but 'the central ides of the concept remains that of sharing one's own home and provisions with others' (39). At the same time there is an obligation, accepted by hosts, to care for and protect guests. In earlier times, these obligations have had a religious dimension. Religions across the globe, and through time, have made hospitableness an obligation, and a defining feature of religiosity. Frequently a common story involves god, or the gods (in multi-deity religions), arriving in disguise to check that hospitality is offered to all strangers irrespective of perceived status or origins. Where hospitality is denied to these would-be guests, the god(s) takes away the failed host's property. Whilst these religious strictures were important they represent an obligation which may be at odds with Telfer's notion of hospitableness because the host is behaving in a way that has been externally imposed and may be seen to have an ulterior motive. Guests are offering hospitality because they are obliged to do so. Telfer (2000) suggests that genuine hospitality is offered by hosts only with appropriate motives. Principally, 'These include the desire to please others, stemming from general friendliness and benevolence or from affection for particular people; concern or compassion, the desire to meet other's needs; and allegiance to what one sees as duties to be hospitable, a duty help one's friends or a duty to help those in trouble' (42). Hospitableness therefore involves hosts offering hospitality in a giving and generous way, without thought of repayment in kind or any other form of reciprocity. In this paper we term this altruistic hospitality as 'genuine hospitality'. It is the genuine hospitality that provides a model for recruiting hosts who will make visitor occasions successful in all contexts. Hence the hospitable tour guide or air steward will have the ability to make visitors or passengers welcome and safe, because they experience this desire as a genuine emotion.

Heal (1984) in her study of hospitality in early modern England suggested three principles of hospitality. 'A host receives all comers, regardless of social status or acquaintance. Hospitality is perceived as a household activity … concerned with dispensing of … food, drink and accommodation. Hospitality is a Christian practice sanctioned and enjoined by the scriptures on all godly men' (Heal 1984, 67). Heal also reveals that hospitality in early modern England was viewed as a noble activity, that the guest was regarded as sacred, and that in conformity to the religious imperative hospitality should be altruistically given. The origins of these cultural norms are well documented and have been traced back to ancient times by writers such as O'Gorman (2007). They inform the modern perspective of hospitality and hospitableness by contrasting classical views with those of our own society. It is likely that a study of modern day hospitality would find that much of the spiritual and noble motivation to be hospitable have receded, albeit that the basic behaviours of providing nourishment and shelter to invited guests remain.

Writing from the religious perspective, Nouwen (1998) begins his discussion of hospitableness by contrasting English understanding of 'hospitality' with that of Germany and Holland. He argues that the German word for hospitality 'Gastfreundschaft' literally translated means 'friendship for the guest' whilst the Dutch word 'gastvrijheid' translates as 'freedom for the guest'. This insight informs his definition of hospitality as 'primarily the creation of a free space where the stranger can enter and become a friend' (1998, 49), of allowing room spiritually, physically and emotionally for the guest. Nouwen argues that for 'hospitality to be genuinely given the host should voluntarily impoverish both their mind and heart'. He challenges the reader to reach back into their own experience and discover that the best hosts give us the 'precious freedom to come and go on our own terms' (1998, 74). He suggests that someone who is filled with 'ideas, concepts, opinions and convictions' (1998, 75) cannot possibly be a good host, nor can someone filled with 'worries or jealousies' (1998, 77). Hosting, he writes, is about listening, about allowing people to be themselves, and about giving them room to 'sing their own songs, speak their own languages, dance their own dances … not a subtle invitation to adopt the lifestyle of the host, but the gift of a chance to find their own'; it is 'about inviting guests into our world on their terms' (1998, 78). He argues strongly that hosting is not about talking all the time or attempting to continuously occupy or entertain guests – this form of hospitality is oppressive and self-defeating. He concludes with an argument that despite this, hosts should always have a view – not one that is endlessly promoted in an attempt to persuade the guest that it is right, but as a stimulus for debate and interaction.

Derrida's work on hospitality uses a philosophical lens to discuss the question of genuineness. He notes that in French the word 'hôte' applies equally to guests and hosts, suggesting the inextricability of the two dimensions of the hospitable relationship, and their similarity. This perhaps

mirrors Nouwen's work, where he comments that all hosts are at other times guests and vice versa (Nouwen 1998), and is also something O'Gorman comments on when he notes that the Greek word for 'host' is 'xenos, which has the interchangeable meaning of guest, host, or stranger' (2007, 18). Derrida extends considerable thought to the nature of 'invited' versus 'uninvited' guests, concluding that while cultural and historical norms make it possible for most 'hosts' to be hospitable to invited guests, it is only those that are also hospitable to the unexpected guest who are genuinely hospitable in what he terms 'radical hospitality' (2002, 360). He claims that where 'I expect the coming of the "hôte" as invited, there is no hospitality' (2002, 362).

Derrida goes on to argue that truly hospitable people are those who are ready to be 'overtaken', 'who are ready to be not ready'; those who are prepared to be 'violated' 'stolen' or 'raped' (2002, 361). The choice of language here is particularly emotive, but perhaps deliberately so as Derrida tries to engender the idea of genuinely hospitable hosts allowing themselves to be 'overtaken' by their guests in every possible sense. However, this 'overtaking' sets up a paradox, with Derrida stating that the traditional reaction to such a violation of the 'home' is that of xenophobia 'in order to protect, or claim to protect, one's own hospitality' (Derrida and Dufourmantelle 2000, 53), and that such xenophobia in turn restricts a person's future ability to be hospitable. In this context, it is likely that the xenophobia Derrida refers to is to be interpreted in the widest sense to mean a fear of 'guests, foreigners or strangers'.

In his study of ancient and classical origins, O'Gorman explores the religious and cultural ancestry of hospitableness, finding almost without exception that rules and norms have existed through history regarding the obligation to be hospitable to a stranger (whether invited or not). It is the echoes of these norms that Heal (1984) so clearly identified in early modern England. In Roman, Greek and Christian tradition, these obligations typically involved the provision of a 'warm welcome, food, a comfortable place to sit, charming company and entertainment', the reward for which was preferential treatment from the Gods. O'Gorman notes that this is graphically illustrated in Genesis 19:1–9 where only 'Lot' is spared from the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah due to his unswervingly hospitable behaviour. He discovers that reciprocity is a constant theme in early Greek and Roman hospitality, with guests not only expected to return the hospitality but indeed forming bonds and non-aggression agreements with their hosts that could be passed down through generations in the form of tokens (2007, 22). Within the first of his five dimensions of hospitality, 'honourable tradition', O'Gorman concludes that 'reciprocity of hospitality is an established principle' (2007, 28), and within the third, 'stratified', he notes that reciprocity of hospitality is 'legally defined'. His work provides an interesting window through which to explore the conceptual framework, offering

insights into both behaviours (providing food, security etc.), and motives (conforming to cultural, religious and reciprocal expectations).

O'Gorman's work contrasts directly with that of philosopher Elisabeth Telfer who attempts to distinguish between the types of motives involved in providing hospitality. She places altruistic (genuine) giving of hospitality higher on a moral scale than hospitality delivered with the expectation of reciprocity, although acknowledges that they are part of the same continuum. In the search for genuineness she dismisses the *behaviours* of hosting quickly, commenting that 'if we want a general formula for these skills, it must be this: what good hosts are good at is making their guests happy. In other words, they know what will please them and are able to bring this about' (Telfer 2000, 40). Arguably Telfer's biggest assertion is that hospitable people may not be good hosts, but provided their *motivations* for hosting are genuine their hospitableness cannot be undone by a lack of skill in the physical components of hosting – providing food and drink, etc. This understanding is of particular relevance and goes to the heart of this research, suggesting that 'hospitableness' is simply about motives and perhaps not the two-dimensional conceptual framework initially considered that balanced motivation with behaviour.

Combing the work of Heal (1984), Nouwen (1998), Telfer (2000) and O'Gorman (2007) it is possible to detect a number of motives for hosts offering hospitality to guests. Figure 1 provides a graphical representation of this. Telfer identified the offering of food, drink and accommodation for some thought of ensuing gain as *ulterior motives hospitality*. It is assumed that the guest is able to benefit the host and hospitality is offered as a means of gaining subsequent benefit as an outcome of the hospitality offered. Writing in the early fifteen hundreds, Niccolò Machiavelli says, 'Keep your friends close, but your enemies closer.' In this sense, *containing hospitality* is motivated by a fear of the stranger, but advocates close monitoring by including the stranger in the household so as maintain surveillance. Wagner's opera *Die Walkure,* involves Hunding offering Seigmund hospitality even though Hunding knows him to be an enemy. This provides an insight into both the obligation to offer hospitality to all, irrespective of whom they are, but also suggests the motive to monitor and contain the enemy. For some authors, *commercial hospitality* involves a financial transaction whereby hospitality is offered to guests at a price, and would be withdrawn if the financial payment could not be made. Hence some argue that commercial hospitality represents a contradiction and cannot deliver hospitableness (Ward and Martins 2001, Ritzer 2007). Telfer (2000) reminds us that this is a somewhat simplistic view because it may be that hospitable people are drawn to work in bars, hotels and restaurants, and offer hospitableness beyond the commercial transaction and the materialistic instructions from managers.

A number of writers suggest that hospitality involves reciprocity whereby hospitality is offered on the understanding

Ulterior Motives Hospitality	Containing Hospitality	Commercial Hospitality	Reciprocal Hospitality	Altruistic Hospitality

Figure 1: A continuum of hospitality

that it will be reciprocated at some later date. Hospitality practiced by elite families in Augustinian Rome was founded on the principle of reciprocity as an early form of tourism (Lomaine 2005). Affluent Romans developed networks of relationships with other families with whom they stayed as guests and then acted as hosts when their former hosts were intending to travel. Cole's (2007) work with the Ngadha tribe in Indonesia provides some fascinating insights into contemporary hospitality and tourism in a remote mountain community today. The tribe practices reciprocal hospitality through tribe members hosting pig roasting events for fellow tribe members. This *reciprocal hospitality* involves hospitality being offered within a context whereby hosts become guests and guests become hosts at different times as the pig roasting event passes round different families. Finally, *genuine hospitality* involves the offer of hospitableness as an act of generosity and benevolence, and a willingness to give pleasure to others. It is this form of hospitality which is the key principle here because it provides an ideal type, or a pure, form of hospitality, largely devoid of personal gain for the host, apart from the emotional satisfaction arising from the practice of hospitableness.

Research aims and objectives
The development of a research instrument which is being reported upon here represents the third phase of a research process. The first stage involved one of the authors engaging in participant observation, acting as both guest and host at a series of dinners amongst friends and acquaintances. The second phase involved the development and administration of a questionnaire aimed at identifying the personality traits which support the qualities of hospitableness. The conceptual framework proposed that hospitableness is a two-dimensional construct that can be measured on a scale from mechanistic behaviour through to the genuine /altruistic. A series of statements were drafted for each of the twenty sub-dimensions in the model that attempted to measure individual affinity either directly or indirectly to the elements of the framework (e.g. for the sub-dimension of 'put guests before yourself' a statement of 'I feel that it is important to put guests' enjoyment before my own' was applied).

   For each sub-dimension three statements were created – two positively worded and one negatively worded in line with the best practice suggested by Lee-Ross (1999). By measuring each dimension in three different ways it is possible that a reasonable degree of validity and reliability can be established in the instrument. The statements were sent to individuals who participated in the participant observation phase research for comment regarding their 'face validity' (Furnham and Drakeley 2000) and the quality of the wording. Individuals were also asked to be mindful that the statements should be equally applicable to someone working in the hospitality industry as they are to the domestic host. Subsequent amendments were made before the question bank was used to create the hospitableness instrument.

   For the delivery method two styles of instrument were considered – the first, 'dichotomous' questioning (Fisher 2007, 193), involved taking the statements and pairing the 30 from level one of the hospitableness model against the 30 that relate to level two of the model. Participants would then decide which statement from each pairing was 'more like me'. The second was an eight-point Likert scale.

   The specific research questions for this document are:
• What is the appropriate conceptual framework that maps the dimensions of hospitableness?
• What are the sub-traits of hospitableness?
• To what extent can a reliable instrument be developed to measure the sub-traits of hospitableness?
• To what extent can such an instrument be validated as measuring traits of hospitableness against third party measures?

   The conclusion reached in earlier stages suggested that the initial conceptual model of hospitableness as a continuum of behaviours to motivators was flawed. As thinking developed through the earlier phases, it became evident that motivators and behaviours are mutually exclusive – i.e., rather than forming a hierarchy where behaviours underpin motives, it is possible to score on both scales simultaneously. Consequently it was also possible to score highly on motivators even if an individual's behavioural skills were under-developed, or conversely to be able to demonstrate the behaviours of hospitableness even in the absence of suitable motivation. Re-examination of the conceptual framework led to the realisation that *behaviours* were less important in the development of a selection tool aiming to identify those with the highest disposition to hospitableness. This document begins with the assumption that it is *motives* that are the important factor to diagnose because these are hard to influence whereas it is 'almost always … [possible to] … train for technical prowess" (Meyer 2008). To answer research questions one and two, this document will therefore revisit the motives scale previously developed and challenge whether it is still valid or needs to be amended into a new conceptual framework.

   Given the proposed evolution of the conceptual model during the development of this document, it has also been necessary to update or refresh the hospitableness profiling instrument developed earlier in order to answer research question three. This was in any case inevitable as the previous iteration ultimately proved to lack internal reliability when statistically tested. Despite this it is possible that the sections of the tool that did demonstrate reliability can be recycled into the final version provided the sub-traits or dimensions that they purport to measure still feature in the final version of the conceptual framework.

Developing the instrument
The design of the question bank for the second iteration of the Hospitableness Profiling Questionnaire (which this document reports on) initially followed a similar development path to the first questionnaire piloted earlier. In its previous guise the questionnaire initially followed a 'paired statement' or 'dichotomous' format (Fisher 2007), with respondents being asked to choose which of two statements was most like them or least like them.

   This format was designed to support a conceptual framework that described hospitableness as a continuum, with the intention that the either/or question structure would allow the researcher to discern which side of the scale the respondent favoured. However, as it became evident that the two high-level dimensions from the early conceptual framework of hospitableness may not be range based, the conceptual framework was amended to show five mutually exclusive dimensions of hospitableness (ulterior motive,

containment, commercial, reciprocity, and altruism) and having made a decision to create an instrument to measure just one of these (altruism/genuine hospitality), the initial challenge was to define the sub-dimensions of the scale. To achieve this, key themes from the literature search were listed and grouped, with a name or category tag then applied to each grouping. Where similarity existed to pre-defined dimensions from the earlier hospitableness profiling instrument in the first questionnaire, this categorisation was carried across.

In total 12 sub-dimensions of altruistic hospitableness were proposed for the first draft, although with the risk acknowledged that the groupings of themes from the literature review was completed using an affinity diagram (Pyzdek 2003, 263) which is a subjective process based on opinion. The advantage of mapping specific themes to categories from the earlier instrument was that where question statements had shown positive correlations in previous reliability testing it has been possible to bring them forward to the new questionnaire. For some of the existing dimensions all three questions from the original triplet could be re-used, or in some cases just two. As in the first questionnaire the instrument continued to use a negatively worded question in each set of three as good practise borrowed from Lee-Ross (1999). Further questions were then developed for the gaps and new categories.

In total the 12 sub-dimensions produced a question bank of 36 statements (twelve times two positively phrased and one negatively phrased question) scored on a Likert scale. It was expected that question statements would continue to show a high degree of correlation in the new instrument, although regardless of this expectation they were retested during reliability trials together with the new items using Spearman's rho statistical analysis. The researcher arranged for the instrument to be reviewed by both the supervisory team and a small panel of participants drawn from the participant observation research conducted earlier.

The primary concern for reviewers during the question development process was 'face validity' (Furnham and Drakeley 2000). Reviewers were also asked to assess the question structure, highlighting questions that were imprecise or contained double concepts. For example, 'I love playing host because I enjoy entertaining people' was ultimately split into 'I enjoy entertaining people' and 'I love playing host for my family and friends' (two question statements). This redrafting process also allowed the word count to shrink, as did the removal of phrases that should have been located in the stem or the introduction to the questionnaire such as 'When hosting…' or 'In my view…'

The scoring remained on an eight-point Likert scale (from 0 to 7). This proved popular in the earlier instrument with anecdotal feedback suggesting it to be a format that people understood and found easy to use. This is important when assessing the instrument against Webster and Hung's (1994) test of 'practicability', which reviews the ease with which the instrument is deployed and completed by respondents.

The instrument was deployed over the World Wide Web using a commercial software platform. 'surveymonkey.com' allows users to create questionnaires in a variety of formats and that are hosted on the company's servers. The user is then able to email a link (web address) to participants who complete the questionnaire online. The advantage of this approach is that the proprietary software looks and feels professional, and provides easy access for all participants who have access to a broadband connection. The software can also be set to follow rules such as disallowing the skipping of questions or the randomisation of questions (which would reduce the risk of bias). However for those who don't have web access it is possible to print hard copies of the survey to be completed by hand, and these can then be manually entered into the database of responses which the software collates. Although this precludes the use of a question randomiser for deployment into industry, it should be noted that the paper-based format is most likely to be the final deployment method due to restricted access to computer facilities in pubs, although as an alternative the use of hand-held devices could be considered or pre-surveys completed at home.

Churchill (1979) notes the reliability risks of any study where human beings are asked to respond to a survey. He comments that rating differences can easily be caused by the level of fatigue of the respondent, their mood or misinterpretations of the question statement. It is for this reason that the precision of wording in questions is so important, something that should be honed in the design phase of an instrument before deployment (Aladwani and Palvia 2002). However, errors are equally as likely to be caused by mechanical mistakes such as ticking the wrong box. One advantage of an online deployment is that the system will automatically prevent duplicate answers. A solution to this for paper-based surveys has yet to be found.

Thirty-three completed surveys were received and downloaded into spreadsheet software and prepared for import into the academic statistical analysis package SPSS. This involved moving question data back into sequential order (they had been previously been randomised/re-distributed by the deployment software), and converting the negatively worded question results (Lee-Ross 1999) into positive scores in order that correlation analysis would test like data. Subtotals were also added for each triplet. The data was then imported into SPSS and reviewed for correlations using bi-variate analysis. This meant testing each triplet of questions by analysing each statement against the other two in order to establish whether they behaved in a similar way. The findings from the survey deployment were disappointing with only one sub-dimension (desire to entertain) showing a three-way correlation between the question statements during statistical testing:
• I enjoy entertaining people
• I love playing host for my family and friends
• Hosting can be a bit of a chore.

This sub-dimension was also notable because it included a negatively phrased question that demonstrated a relationship with the other positively worded questions, whereas the general trend was for such statements to lack correlation to the others in their triplet. For example, in ten of the 12 sub-dimensions there were positive correlations with a 2-tailed 95% or greater significance between the pairs of positively worded statements. In contrast only six of the 12 triplets contained a negatively worded question that correlated to one other statement.

It had been hoped that a greater number of question sets would show internal consistency, the next stage then being to seek internally reliable triplets that would correlate against the sub-totals of others. However, this was not possible and in most cases the null hypothesis had to be accepted. The findings were particularly unsatisfactory because so

many questions had been carried over from the instrument developed earlier. Only those that mapped to the new conceptual framework *and* had shown a correlation were used and it had been a reasonable assumption given the 95% confidence level that the correlations previously demonstrated would be carried over. Six of the seven two-way correlations between positively worded statements that were carried over were still found to exist, although one did fail the test in the second instrument. However, of the two negatively worded statements that had previously correlated to both of their positively worded counterparts, neither maintained a relationship with more than one other statement.

In response to two failed instrument designs (the first questionnaire and this second instrument) a short study was undertaken to test the hypothesis that the problem was being caused by the tone of the negatively worded statements. The 12 negatively worded questions were re-written to be positively phrased. The questionnaire was distributed to 12 of the original second phase questionnaire sample group who were asked to complete the survey again. Although small, it was intended that the results would give an indication of whether or not the level of correlation was likely to change significantly as a consequence of the re-write before testing in a wider deployment. As with the main instrument design, the results were separated into triplets and analysed using Spearman's rho test.

The tests found that the number of correlations of negatively phrased statements to positively worded questions only increased from 7 to 9 (out of 24 possibilities). The size of the increase was disappointing and indicated that the hypothesis that the third question in each triplet did not work because it was a negatively phrased statement (in a survey about an inherently positive subject – hospitality) was incorrect. The null hypothesis was therefore accepted and the re-phrased survey did not proceed to further testing with a larger sample size.

Another interesting finding was that the number of correlations overall decreased in the instrument when it was completed with all of the questions being positively worded – from 17 to 15 correlations (out of a possible 36). Much of this might be explained by the small sample size of the second survey (suggesting less reliable results), but it is possible that the data may also have been impacted by the statements being answered in a different context. It is conceivable that an all positive statement bank generates a different response to each question compared to a bank where participants are moving backwards and forwards in their scoring between positive and negative. However, within the constraints of the research study, this phenomenon can only be sign-posted as a potential area for later study and it will not be taken further at this time.

Having failed at two attempts with the two questionnaires to design a question bank that could demonstrate internal reliability within each triplet of question statements (and by extension create consistency between sub-dimensions) it was necessary to re-think the approach. The number of statement correlations fell in the second questionnaire compared to the first and so it was reasonable to assume, based on past evidence, that another re-write might not necessarily improve the performance of the instrument. Conscious that the opinion of the panel of reviewers on both occasions had been that the question statements had face validity and that the re-writing

of negatively worded statements had failed to have a positive impact, there was not an obvious starting point from which to redevelop the instrument.

It was in this context that a counter-intuitive hypothesis developed that the instrument may potentially have a strong question bank but that the groupings of statements and subsequent alignment into categories had been incorrect. The existing design had been led by attempting to group together themes from the literature review using an affinity diagram, but as an opinion-based method it was conceivable that these groupings had been inaccurate. If so, the questions may have appeared against the wrong sub-dimensions, which in turn were leading to an unreliable output.

To test this, question statements from the original second phase survey were re-loaded in the statistical analysis package and Spearman's rho was calculated for every possible combination across the whole statement bank, looking for correlations with 2-tailed significance (i.e. the relationship could be positive or negative). The results were immediately of interest, with every statement showing correlations with numerous others outside their initial triplet of questions at both 95% and 99% confidence levels. It appeared that contrary to the original findings it might be possible to reject the null hypothesis and that the design flaw with the instrument may in part have been attributable to the arbitrary grouping of literature review themes.

It was then possible to re-design the question bank using a very different process to that of the first two attempts, with a manual intervention seeking to build 'buckets' of question statements that correlated against each other in a method similar to that used by Dienhart et al. (1992). Using this system it quickly became obvious that groups of more than three questions could be found and in some cases the number of inter-correlating questions was as high as seven. Conscious of the small sample size ($n = 33$) questions were sought with cross-correlations that showed as significant with 99% confidence. This reduced the number of statements and led to a decision about how many question statements should feature within each 'bucket'. The number that appeared to provide the optimum balance and that maximised the number of 'question sets' was four or five statements per group.

Some of the statements could sit in more than one question bucket (sub-dimension) as they correlated with a high number of others and this, combined with an uneven initial distribution, allowed a degree of re-allocation in order to balance each question set. To achieve this, once an initial distribution had been achieved the questions were then mapped back to the original literature review findings and consequent sub-dimensions that had inspired their creation. This led to a re-evaluation, of which themes from the literature should be grouped together with some being changed based on the new question groupings. These were then tested for face validity. Where questions did not appear to fit, a similar process was used for the allocation and re-allocation of questions, with each question location being tested for face validity against the other statements in the group. The result of this work was that final grouping of questions and literature themes became quite different from the initial conception although they appeared logical when reviewed as a whole. Once this had been achieved the five new sub-dimensions (groups of questions) were named.

The final stage of the instrument development was to test the consistency between each of the sub-dimensions (factors) identified. To achieve this, the scores for each of the four/five statements were totalled by sub-dimension across the 33 responses. These sub-dimension totals were then analysed using Spearman's rho test to look for correlations. The results were surprising, with three sub-dimensions showing strong correlations with 2-tailed 99% confidence. However the other two categories didn't correlate at all. This meant that the final instrument design could only produce 13 questions (from a starting point of 60 in the second questionnaire) that genuinely offered internal reliability. To deploy such an instrument into industry would have the undoubted benefit of being quick to complete for respondents, but would carry the risk that it would lack face validity due the small number of questions. Respondents may also challenge how so few questions could be a reliable predictor of a personality trait. However, in context it should be noted that the development of the instrument for this document has focused on a single arm of a five-pronged conceptual model of hospitableness. These 13 questions are targeted at the dimension of 'altruistic' hospitableness and assuming a similar number of internally consistent questions could be developed for the other three dimensions of hospitable motives (reciprocal, containing, commercial and ulterior motive) it is reasonable to assume that the final question bank would comprise a minimum of 48 questions, a level that is likely to have a higher credibility with potential users of the questionnaire. The actual wording of the 13 'reliable' questions can be found in the table below.

Although the question statements correlate within their sub-dimensions and the sub-dimensions correlate against each other, an easily identified risk with the questions is that due to high face validity it would be easy for a respondent to second guess the appropriate score in a selection process. This has not been an issue during development because the instrument has been completed without the added complexity of being used as a recruitment tool. However if people are asked to undertake the instrument as part of a job application, it may lead to disingenuous responses as job-seekers attempt to improve their chances of selection.

To counter this potential bias and mindful of the manner in which question scoring changed across all statements when negatively worded phrasing was removed, it was decided to deploy the instrument into industry for the final part of the

research with many of the non-correlating questions still in the questionnaire. Only those showing fewer than four correlations to other questions at the 99% significance level were removed. The rationale of deploying 'failed questions' was to help 'disguise' the critical few questions that aimed to profile the altruistic dimension of hospitableness in order to reduce the opportunity for cheating on the survey. By including the negatively worded questions it was also hoped that the risk of respondents simply scoring everything 'high' would be reduced. In addition, by providing the original context for the questions (i.e. most of the initial question bank) it was expected that there would be greater consistency in the results produced with the pilot data analysed above. The removal of the most poorly performing question statements leaves respondents with 32 questions to answer. The generation of an 'altruistic' hospitableness rating will, however, still be based on the 13 questions that showed internal consistency, with analysis of the others simply being conducted as a check of instrument functionality (i.e. do the rejected question buckets still show internal reliability?) and to see if further correlations emerge as the sample size increased over time. The larger question bank may also prove to have greater face validity with respondents and potential employers who might have felt that 13 questions alone would be insufficient to generate a true rating of hospitableness. This is an issue that would dissipate when question sets for the other three dimensions of hospitableness come on line in further research, as additional questions will be developed which could not only replace defunct 'altruistic' questions, but also augment the question bank overall.

The risk of manipulation remains a concern and if the instrument were to proceed to further development it would be beneficial to test a scoring structure that groups questions and creates a forced ranking system that would drive greater differentiation between preferences. This was not done at this stage of instrument development because the risk of answer management by participants did not become clear until discussions began about use of the profiling tool for selection purposes. Forced ranking would alleviate concerns expressed by a brewery that hosted the research over excessive face validity – an important consideration if the profiling tool were to be marketable in a commercial context where the response process might be either electronic or paper-based (assuming the brewery to be a proxy for other corporate clients).

Table 1: The final question bank

Desire to put guests before yourself	I put guests' enjoyment before my own
	I do whatever is necessary to ensure that guests have a great time
	I always try to live up to my idea of what makes a good host
	The comfort of guests is most important to me
Desire to make guests happy	I get a natural high when I make my guests feel special
	I enjoy taking responsibility for the wellbeing of guests
	It means the world to me when guests show their approval of my hospitality
	It's important to do the things that people expect of a good host
	I seek out opportunities to help others
Desire to make guests feel special	When hosting I try to feel at one with the guests
	I try to get on the same wavelength as my guests
	Guests should feel that the evening revolves around them
	I find it motivating to take accountability for other people's welfare

Conclusion

Interest in hospitableness emerged in academic writing from two groups of academics writing independently. Within the community of people working as members of hospitality management teams, the authors have become increasingly interested in the study of hospitality as a human, social phenomenon beyond the management of the commercial context in bars, hotels and restaurants (Eksell et al. 2013, Lashley et al. 2008, Lashley and Morrison 2000). Apart from a suite of books, and a host of academic papers, a new journal has been created to provide a forum for research which recognises that 'the study of hospitality requires a more hospitable approach that is accepting of difference and presents an open face to its various intellectual representations' (Lynch et al. 2011, 3). Around the same time, other academics informed by social science perspectives (Molz and Gibson 2007: 6) began to employ hospitality and hospitableness as a metaphor for wider social interactions. They say, 'Hospitality is a profoundly evocative concept that reverberates with cultural, political and ethical undertones'.

The study of hospitality and hospitableness open up a discussion of the motives for offering and participating in hospitality. Philosophers (Telfer 1996, 2000, Selwin 2000) suggest that there may be an array of motives for offering hospitality and that genuine hospitality is only going to be present when the motives are genuine, based upon compassion and a concern for others without any concern for reciprocity or personal gain to the host. It is clear that this quality of hospitality is naturally spread across the population. Some individuals are more naturally prone to be hospitable than their fellows. This paper is informed by the recognition that genuine (altruistic) hospitality is openly described in the literature but until now there has been no instrument available for measuring the propensity to be hospitable in individuals.

This paper reports on the development of a suite of questions which are able to identify hospitableness. Informed by a qualitative research activity, researchers began working on an instrument which went through several iterations before arriving at questions that have internal consistency. The 13 questions identified are designed to measure an individual's concern to offer genuine hospitality which is essentially altruistic. The instrument suggested here embeds the 13 questions amongst a cluster of questions stemming from earlier iterations of the research instrument. This paper reports on the development of this single strand of the intentions to offer hospitality and suggests that similar research might be undertaken to identify reciprocal and calculative hospitality, etc. That said, the instrument developed here requires to be employed in a number of different settings and the authors hereby invite those interested to join in applying this across an array of hospitality, leisure and tourism settings.

About the authors

Dr Matthew Blain is a Head of HR for Compass Group UK & Ireland. Professor Conrad Lashley is Senior Researcher at the School of International Hospitality Management at Stenden University of Applied Sciences, in Leeuwarden, The Netherlands.

References

Aladwani AM, Palvia PC. 2002. Developing and validating an instrument for measuring user-perceived web quality. *Information and Management* 39: 467–476.

Churchill JRG. 1979. A paradigm for developing better measures of marketing constructs. *Journal of Marketing Research* 24(4): 64–73.

Cook D, Beckman T. 2006. Current concepts in validity and reliability for psychometric instruments: theory and application. *The American Journal of Medicine* 119: 166–166.

Cole S. 2007. Hospitality and tourism in Ngadha: an ethnographic exploration. In Lashley C, Lynch P, Morrison A (eds.), *Hospitality: a social lens,* Oxford: Elsevier

Derrida J. 2002. Acts of religion. London, Routledge.

Derrida J, Dufourmantelle A. 2000. *Of hospitality,* Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Dienhart J, Gregoire M, Downey R, Knight P. 1992. Service orientation of restaurant employees. *International Journal of Hospitality Management* 11: 331–331.

Fisher C. 2007. *Researching and writing a dissertation: a guidebook for business students* 2nd edn. Harlow: Pearson.

Furnham A, Drakeley R. 2000. Predicting occupational personality test scores. *Journal of Psychology* 134(1): 103–111.

Heal F. 1984. The idea of hospitality in early modern England. *Past and Present* 101(1): 66–93.

Lashley C. 2000. Towards a theoretical understanding. In Lashley C, Morrison A. (eds.), *In search of hospitality: theoretical perspectives and debates.* Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Lashley C, Morrison A. (eds.) 2000. *In search of hospitality: theoretical perspectives and debates.* Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Lee-Ross D. 1999. Development of the service predisposition instrument. *Psychology* 15: 2.

Lomaine A. 2005. Tourism in Augustinian society (44 BC–69AD). In Walton JK. (ed), *Histories of Tourism.* Clevedon: Channel View Publications.

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

Meyer D. 2008. *Setting the table: the transforming power of hospitality in business.* London: Harper Paperbacks.

Molz JG, Gibson S. (eds.) 2007. *Mobilizing hospitality: the ethics of social relations in a mobile world.* Aldershot: Ashgate.

O'Gorman KD. 2007. Discovering commercial hospitality in ancient Rome. *Hospitality Review* 9(2): 44–52.

Pyzdek T. 2003. *The Six Sigma handbook,* revised edn. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Ritzer G. 2007. Inhospitable hospitality? In Lashley C, Morrison A, Lynch P. (eds.) *Hospitality: a social lens.* Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Selwyn T. 2000. An anthropology of hospitality. In Lashley, C, Morrison, A. (eds.), *In search of hospitality: theoretical perspectives and debates.* Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Telfer E. 2000. The philosophy of hospitableness. In Lashley, C, Morrison, A. (eds.) *In search of hospitality: theoretical perspectives and debates.* Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Warde A, Martens L. 2001. *Dining out.* London: Sage.

Webster C, Hung L-C. 1994. Measuring service quality and promoting decentring. *The TQM Magazine* 6(5): 50–55.