

Qualitative Research and the Field of Hospitality: a reflection on the relationship between theory and method

Maria do Rosário Rolfsen Salles^a

Abstract

The article discusses the relationship between qualitative research and the theoretical field of hospitality, aiming to discuss the contribution of studies on hospitality in its various dimensions for social research, in view of the use of qualitative methodologies. Therefore, the bibliography on the subject was used, establishing a cutout in the background and historical development of qualitative research, looking for relationships with the studies in the field of hospitality. The results indicate that research in the field of hospitality, in its dual role as a social phenomenon and as a value, has taken advantage of the evolution and diversification of qualitative methodologies that show the intense relationship between both qualitative research and hospitality.

Keywords: hospitality, social research, qualitative methodologies

Resumo

A pesquisa qualitativa e o campo da hospitalidade: uma reflexão sobre a relação teoria e método

O artigo procura discutir a relação entre a pesquisa qualitativa e o campo teórico da hospitalidade, com o objetivo de discutir a contribuição dos estudos sobre a hospitalidade em suas diferentes dimensões para a pesquisa social, tendo em vista o recurso das metodologias qualitativas. Para tanto, recorreu-se à bibliografia sobre o assunto, estabelecendo um recorte na trajetória e evolução histórica da pesquisa qualitativa, procurando estabelecer relações com os estudos no campo da hospitalidade. Os resultados indicam que a pesquisa no campo da hospitalidade, na sua dupla dimensão como fato social e como valor, tem se valido da evolução e diversificação de metodologias qualitativas que evidenciam a enorme relação entre ambas, pesquisa qualitativa e hospitalidade.

Palavras-chave: hospitalidade, pesquisa social, metodologias qualitativas

Resumen

La investigación cualitativa y el campo de la hospitalidad: una reflexión sobre la relación entre la teoría y el método

El artículo analiza la relación entre la investigación cualitativa y el campo teórico de la hospitalidad, con el fin de discutir la contribución de los estudios en la hospitalidad en sus distintas dimensiones, para la investigación social, en vista de la utilización de metodologías cualitativas. Por lo tanto, hemos utilizado la bibliografía sobre el tema, se establece un recorte en el fondo y el desarrollo histórico de la investigación cualitativa, buscando establecer relaciones con los estudios en el campo de la hospitalidad. Los resultados indican que la investigación en el campo de la hospitalidad, en su doble papel como hecho social e como valor, se ha aprovechado de la evolución y diversificación de las metodologías cualitativas que muestran el gran partido entre tanto la investigación cualitativa y hospitalidad.

Palabras clave: hospitalidad, investigación social, metodologías cualitativas

a. Professor and researcher with the Master Program in Hospitality at the Universidade Anhembi Morumbi, São Paulo, São Paulo, Brazil. E-mail: mrrsalles@uol.com.br

INTRODUCTION

The scientific research of social phenomena, and particularly of hospitality, is a relatively recent activity, considering that it is configured in the present. Thus, it is required to delimit the field of reality that corresponds to the hospitality within those already consolidated in the social sciences, especially of the applied social sciences.

The hospitality, particularly, understood as a way to live together, governed by rules, rites and laws, can be “[...] conceived not only as an essential form of social interaction, [...] it may also arise as a proper form of hominization, or at the very least, one of the most essential forms of socialization” (Montandon, 2003, p. 132) and, in this sense, it is understood that the more or less recent “adoption of the field of hospitality, not just as a designation, but mainly as a theoretical perspective, [brings] gains of varied orders for all correlated fields of application of science [...]” (Camargo, 2003, p. 7), or, more broadly, to the enrichment of the discussion of the main problems of the contemporary society in the context of other related disciplines, seeking, as said by the author, the adoption of a new perspective of analysis for phenomena already studied, not only hospitality and catering.

RESEARCH PROPOSAL AND METHOD

In an article from 2010 that aimed to discuss the challenges of hospitality research, taking into account the advances of research on the theme in Brazilian universities, which have been studying this subject¹, Salles, Bueno and Bastos, started a discussion on theoretical and research aspects involving studies on hospitality, based on the concept of gift developed by Marcel Mauss, in study originally published in 1923/24, with editions of *The Gift* for the Portuguese language, specially the ones from 1974 and 2001. The goal was to show the contribution of the concept for the construction of the theoretical field of hospitality and the resulting contribution of interdisciplinarity for its constitution, starting by the evolution of the concept in history and the open possibilities to the understanding of social phenomena.

In this study, the goal is, based on the debate on scientificity in the social sciences, and the ramification of discussions on the concept of hospitality and understanding of the different dimensions that they assume, to understand the contributions of studies on hospitality for social research when using different methodologies of study, considering that hospitality, as well as the qualitative research and methods, are connected to the study of human phenomena and facts that *de facto*, are not susceptible to measurement, which does not make them less “scientific” or opposed to studies that use quantification. On the contrary, the specificity of the field of hospitality within the evolution of qualitative research in Human and Social Sciences has contributed to the advancement of the discussion of contemporary social problems.

1. Universidade Anhembi Morumbi, Universidade de Caxias do Sul, Universidade do Vale do Itajaí and even the Universidade Federal de Pernambuco, based on a perspective more dedicated to the gift as basis of social relations.

Without aiming to exhaust the production, the goal of the discussion is to reflect on the contribution of the field of hospitality for qualitative studies. In this sense, this is a bibliographic survey, however not exhaustive, on the evolution of the debate on the scientificity of social sciences and contribution of the field of hospitality to the social research.

THE FIELD AND THE RESEARCH ON HOSPITALITY

Using the reflection of Calhoun (2014), on the role of Social Sciences in a world of accelerated changes, Camargo (2015) points out that, among the changes faced by the Social Sciences in terms of the new social reality, the globalization and the individualism are two logics that, together, demarcate the space in the interior of which the research is increasingly invited to move. However, according to Camargo (2015, p. 44), "hospitality is moving in a different direction. It is interested in proximity and the encounter and this is perhaps its main meaning when faced with the logic of globalization and individualism." In this sense, Gotman (1997), equally understands hospitality as a form of individuals, groups and families to mutually and reciprocally lodge, socialize and enjoy services, constituting at the same time, admittedly, a current and very ancient reality. The several historical forms in which social relations are held suppose a collective dimension, which appears with the character of obligation, associated, in a given moment, to the religion and charity, but that nowadays are manifested basically in public and social protection services, and in the commercial domain, in hotels. Thus, the hospitality in the current world, occurs, as the authors state (Camargo, 2015; Gotman, 1997), in the *interstices* of a daily life marked by inhospitality, when not by hostility.

The research in the field of hospitality therefore, on its dual dimension, as social fact and as value (Camargo, 2015, p. 45), opens space for discussion, in the current world, in which what prevails is the tearing of the social fabric, contradictions and conflicts inherent to the capitalist society. The understanding of spaces and domains (domestic, social and commercial) that form the studies on hospitality leads to the better understanding of the possibilities and limits of constitution of the social ties and relations. Therefore, the hospitality "is more than one previously outlined field of study, as occurs in pure and applied sciences" (Camargo, 2015, p. 48). It shows itself as a new paradigm for the study of human relationships, a new perspective, a new look (Caillé, 1998; Camargo, 2015, p. 48).

The recovery of Marcel Mauss' contributions, and of the considerations on the role of the gift in social relations according to the French group M.A.U.S.S. (*Mouvement anti-utilitariste dans les Sciences Sociales*) is dated from 1981, supported by important schools of thought in addition to the Mauss himself, Karl Polanyi, Georg Simmel, among others; with the aim of valuing a theoretical criticism based on some social categories, such as the gift, the democracy, the voluntary association, the participation, the solidarity economy, the solidarity, etc. (Martins, 2007). According to the same author, one of Mauss' central contributions was to demonstrate that the value of things cannot be greater than the value of the relations, and that symbolism is fundamental to social life (Martins, 2005, p. 46). In other words, that the modern mercantile logic does not replace the ancient forms of constitution of bonds and alliances in

modern societies, constituting even a total social fact “in the sense that the society includes all human phenomena of economic, cultural, political and religious nature, [...] without having any prior hierarchy that justifies a natural economy, which would precede the other social phenomena” (Martins, 2005, p. 46) supposing, especially, that the nature of the goods produced is not only material, but assumes a symbolic character, consolidating the social relations, which is in the origin of the emergence of collective moral obligation that the relations assume. Thus, this movement, which explains the social and even the constitution of the society, is characterized by the anti-utilitarianism, which names the movement that proposes a new paradigm to understand social phenomena and social relations.

In this way, the gift (or talent), more understood as paradigmatic resource than as a theory, and the hospitality, as dimension of the gift, are fundamental to the understanding of the formation of social bonds. In fact, “we can think the social practices in terms of mediation of alterity, using the construction of bonds built based on the circularity of the give-receive-return, establishing bridges that create, expand or break social alliances and bonds.” (Bueno, 2008, p. 10). As dimension of ethics, the hospitality evidences “the need to create and nurture places of hospitality where the awareness of a common destiny and the sense of responsibility that motivates the action of solidarity emerges” (Baptista, 2002, p. 158, cited by Bueno, 2008).

On the other hand, about the commercial domain itself, Gotman (2008, p. 115) says “the hospitality entered in such a way in the usual language of the tourism industry, that it ended up becoming a synonymous of such.” In addition, the author says that the free exchange of donation (gift) is supported in an equivalence between donation and counter-donation that are infinitely reproduced, different from the mercantile exchange, which supposes that it runs out in the simple payment of hospitality. This is a discussion that is extended by the Anglo-Saxon approaches on the one hand, and the French, on the other hand. It nurtures the idea that commercial relationships suppose a payed hospitality and that therefore it runs out in the moment that the payment occurs. Authors such as Lashley and Morrison (2004), Lugosi (2008), among others, work on this discussion in a manner to evidence the interrelations between the various dimensions, social or cultural, private and commercial, the relationships of hospitality, which can happen in the overlapping and encounter of the three dimensions.

However, with the concern of expanding the reach of the term beyond the commercial domain and of perfecting the relations in commercial scope, Lashley (2015), remembers that until the end of the 20th century, hotels, restaurants and bars used to be a synonym of offer of accommodation, food and beverages. Thus, it was common to understand places, such as cafés, canteens, snack bars, etc., as places of provision of hospitality and how the hospitality was reduced to the function of receiving and being received in commercial scope. However, says the author, perhaps as involuntary consequence, this notion of hospitality had opened space for the study of the relationship between guests and hosts in all domains: private, cultural, commercial, allowing the hospitality to come to be understood as a fundamental and omnipresent characteristic in human life, proposing, then, the notion of hospitality as the understanding of the disposition of people to genuinely be hospitable, without any expectation of reward or reciprocity. Thus,

this position is understood as an advancement in the understanding of social dimensions of hospitality.

In fact, without getting into the merits of differences between the currents of thought on hospitality that have characterized the so-called French and Anglo-Saxon lines or schools, this perspective, reinforced by the positions of Lugosi (2008), about the importance of the study of the social dimension to the understanding of that strictly commercial dimension, enriched the debate on the possibilities of the field of study of hospitality. "The space created and hospitable attitudes, and not just the service itself, are the mark, the virtue of the commercial hospitable host" (Camargo, 2015, p. 54).

THE HOSPITALITY IN THE SOCIAL RESEARCH PANORAMA AND THE QUALITATIVE RESEARCH

From the point of view of the complexity of the new theoretical approaches that took hold of the theoretical and practical scene of social sciences, and which emerged in the final decades of the 20th century, many have derived from the addition with the fields of semiotics and hermeneutics². Post-positivist interpretations and interpretations derived from the social actors themselves are valued, which leads researchers to an attempt of internal and external validation to the interactionist and constructivist research models. (Anadón, 2006, p. 10).

As a result, research strategies are multiplied, the grounded theory, case studies, historical and biographical methods, ethnography in the study of social and human phenomena. The data collection and analysis is conducted in a methodological manner: qualitative interview, structured or semi-structured, the observation, the personal experience, the methods of document analysis, denoting a plurality of techniques that reflect the diversity of objects from the human and social sciences and the need to adapt the methods to its specificity. Methodological rigor becomes one of the pillars of social research, accompanied by strategies to be used during data collection and analysis. Among them, the prolonged presence in the field, rich descriptions of context and actors, research logbook, triangulation (quality/quantity), etc., in the sense of allowing a rich and detailed interpretation of the phenomenon studied.

In the field of hospitality, equally, in which the ethical criteria in relations with "the other" must be aggregated to scientific criteria, in the case of researchers/researched, multiple strategies of approach of the phenomena, using several exploratory studies, in-depth studies of single or multiple cases, from hotel and service companies of all sorts, to hospitals, communities, situations in which the resource to "qualitative" data, such as statements, letters, documents, correspondences, etc., are one side of the issue. In several cases, the quantitative data are equally resorted to the construction of indexes and indicators. The survey studies of the state of art in various domains have also been used, due to the need to raise studies in other disciplinary fields. In addition, they constitute important aspects in the studies on hospitality, phenomena of transposition

2. These approaches are summarized in the post-structuralism with R. Barthes, the Neo-Marxism with Althusser, the descriptivism, with Geertz, the cultural theories, with Turner, the deconstructionism, with Derrida, the ethnomethodology, with Garfinkel (Anadón, 2006, p. 10).

of borders, such as migratory and immigratory movements, the movements of tourists between different regions and their impacts on community, as well as studies on the urban space, the relations that are established in the scope on contemporary cities, in the Brazilian case, São Paulo and other metropolises.

Currently, there is also an enlargement of the borders of the qualitative research, due to the construction of life stories and biographies, literary support, representations, etc., as data sources, as well as the valuation of the daily life story, of the urban hospitality. Qualitative data collection supposes a wide diversity of methods of data collection and field procedures, as Bauer and Gaskell (2002) emphasize, for example, that are arranged according to different theoretical orientations in the construction of what the authors call *corpus* of research, which in turn, lead to the discussion on the selection of research subjects or even the “representative sampling” in social research.

QUALITATIVE METHODOLOGIES IN THE EVOLUTION OF THE DEBATE IN THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

As previously emphasized, in the study of 2010, “the diverse aspect of society was increasingly becoming important, as its plural nature was being established. [...] With this, it became necessary that this notion of plural was highlighted and the society was studied in its various angles (Queiroz, 2001, p. 21), which conducted the disciplinary fields to specialize more and more, what allows, at every moment, that one outstands over the other, constituting “different forms of knowledge in its object, and certainly, also in its methods, [...] putting in evidence the surprising inequality in its development” (Guillaume, 1986, cited by Queiroz, 2001).

New paradigms, generated in the context of the science itself as in other areas of knowledge, have been questioning presuppositions and procedures that hitherto orientated the scientific activity and conferred credibility to its findings. The view of a science that is objective, neutral, ahistorical, able to formulate general laws on the performance of nature, laws whose truth value would be guaranteed by the careful application of the method, is no longer supported. Today, most scientists admit that knowledge is never entirely objective, that the values of the scientists can interfere with their work, that the knowledge generated by science is not infallible and that even the criteria to distinguish what is and what is not science vary throughout history. (Mazzotti & Gewandsnajer, 1998, p. 109)

If these issues were placed to the physical and natural sciences with greater emphasis, they would become important and crucial for the social sciences and to the field under construction, of hospitality. The research and methods related to the study of human phenomena and facts are not susceptible to a precise measurement. Therefore, they have fit and differentiated from the so-called “experimental” research, of positivist basis, which predominated in the human sciences after the beginning of the 20th century, and which postulated the need of an absolute knowledge and of a “scientific truth”, based on the quantification

and measurement, to the extent of physical and natural sciences (Robo, 1995, p. 1). However,

the complexity of social reality takes the researcher in human sciences to revise the established principles. This incessant revaluation is found present since the origins of the systematization of social research. [...] and the research itself is in charge of demonstrating that the knowledge of human or cultural themes involves a peculiar intimacy between researcher and his/her object, therefore it cannot claim the same relationship that exists in the research on natural sciences. (Bueno, 2008, p. 7)

In the course of evolution of social sciences, two main lines are installed since the beginning: one regarding objectivity, aiming to remove all prenotions to reach a methodological rigor, which has in A. Comte and É. Durkheim its main representatives; and the other, represented by a “comprehensive” sociology, with M. Weber and the theory of social action, emphasizing the need of understanding of its meaning, which recommends therefore, the comprehension of the phenomena based on its interior and their meanings. The Marxist contribution (K. Marx and F. Engels), would evidence the contradictory character of social reality, requiring an in-depth analysis of its structures and thus, the need for a social and historical understanding of social phenomena, as opposed to the notion “invariability” of the social. Contemporaneously, the debate regarding objectivity/subjectivity evidences a flexibilization of the criteria of scientificity, maintaining the discussion on the clarity and reasoning of scientific speech. Consider that “science has as goal to explain the phenomena, not only describe them, and that this feature, considered essential in the natural sciences, is found also in the social sciences.” Indeed, “the research on social sciences nowadays is characterized by a multiplicity of approaches, with presuppositions, methodologies and various narrative styles.” (Mazzotti & Gewandsznajder, 1998, p. 127).

Moreover, consider that, according to the authors, who, from the 1960s, and the so-called “crisis of paradigms”, intensify the debates based on the statements of T. Kuhn (1970) on the objectivity and rationality of science and the recovery of the critical theories of the School of Frankfurt (Horkeimer, 1983), showing the ideological aspects of the dominant science, which led to the search for models alternative to the positivism in the creation of the so-called “qualitative paradigm” or “new paradigm”. This process, especially from the 1980s on, led however to a false qualitative-quantitative opposition, but consolidated, on the other hand, the ways of the so-called “qualitative research”, which deepens the requirement of understanding of social phenomena according to alternative models.³

It can be said that the anthropological roots of qualitative research⁴ are found in the evolution of evolutionary anthropology of the late 19th century, and the concerns with the comparative and evolutionary understanding of cultures and

3. In this context, the lines of analysis, based on social constructivism, on the postpositivism and on the critical theory are consolidated, each of which are based on a philosophical orientation, such as the phenomenology, the valuation of the verification of theory and objectivity, the empiricism, the rigorous analysis of the argumentation and the procedures of selection, collection and evaluation, seeking the logical consistency among them, from there resulting varied methodologies and techniques of data collection and analysis.

4. To follow the evolution and challenges of qualitative research, fundamental references were consisted based on the reflections of Chizzotti (2003), Robo (1995) and Anadon (2006).

biological and cultural dimensions, in addition to the need of conceptualization of culture itself, in authors such as Tylor, Kröeber, F. Boas and Malinowski, L. Strauss, M. Mauss, and so many other recent authors, that at first were concerned with the need to differentiate the biological dimension from the cultural one in human societies, in the understanding of social life (Laraia, 2001). The research based on the accumulation of ethnographic data collected from travel notes of missionaries, settlers, religious people, etc., to document the differences with the “other”, the “strange”, for a research that recommends the integration/impregnation of the researcher in the milieu studied, marks a moment in the evolution of qualitative research that is extended to the beginning of the Chicago School, and represents an evolution, characterized by the intersection of the disciplines from social sciences, the so-called interdisciplinarity.

Also based on a sociological and anthropological point of view, the qualitative research has its origins in the United States of America, based on a context of social critic from the life conditions of great part of the populations and thus, issues such as poverty, immigration, social exclusion and criminality have become the preferred themes of researchers and, in this sense, it can be said that it is the Chicago School and its studies from the 1920s and 1930s that must be called the traditional period of instauration of qualitative research. Researchers produce large amount of studies based on participant observation, in-depth interview in the history of life and on the analysis of personal documents, used as methodologies in the study of problems that characterize urban life, based on symbolic interactionism which postulates that human behavior is not understood, but in connection with the meanings that people attach to things and to their actions (Anadon, 2006, p. 9-10). “With the studies from the Chicago School, the qualitative methodology occupies an important place in the American Sociology, until the 1940s and 1950s, in which the studies based on the “hard data”, evidence a new growth of the human and social sciences” (Anadon, 2006, p. 10).

In the subsequent period, from the end of World War II until the 1980s, the use of theoretical perspectives of the social sciences is consolidated, mixed into the Semiotics and Hermeneutics, which cause great confusion in the research practices, causing the appearance of new theoretical approaches, such as the post-structuralism (Barthes), the Neo-Marxism (Althusser), the descriptivism (Geertz), the deconstruction (Derrida), the ethnomethodology (Garfinkel), etc., period in which what is sought is a systematization of different techniques of qualitative data collection and analysis (interviews, observation, document analysis, etc.). The interpretations that social actors have of the reality are valued, what however is also understood as a difficulty in the data validation of interactionist and constructivist models of research, of phenomenology, of critical sociology, etc., and the forms of research, such as the field studies, *in loco* and natural research, the ethnography, grounded theory, etc. (Anadón, 2006, p. 10).

The manner of conceiving the qualitative research referring it only to its particular techniques is very restrictive because the qualitative research must be associated to the theoretical and epistemological postures that privilege, on way or another, the experience and the points of view of social actors. Thus, the research must be more characterized by the posture theoretically adopted, than by the type of data produced (Anadon, 2006).

Indeed, the particularity of the qualitative research can be summarized by the relationship that establishes and produces, between a defined epistemological posture between the researcher and the data nature.

“Many efforts were spent in the attempt of juxtaposing quantitative and qualitative research, as competitive paradigms of social research [...]” (Bauer & Gaskell, 2002, p. 23). However, the measurement itself of social facts, depends on the construction of categories of interpretation (Bauer & Gaskell, 2002, p. 24) and, it is understood with the authors that the quantitative or qualitative methods are more than differences between research strategies or procedures of data collection, but they fundamentally represent different epistemological points of reference to theorize the nature of knowledge, the social reality and the procedures to understand it. (p. 29).

In this way, recovering the reflection of Camargo (2015) and Caillé (1998) on the importance of the new paradigm of the gift and hospitality for the social research, the hospitality is more than one previously outlined field of study, as occurs in the pure and applied sciences, but it presents itself as a new paradigm for the study of human relationships, a new perspective, a new look (Camargo, 2015, p. 48). It must not be forgotten that in addition to the emphasis on the contribution of Marcel Mauss on *The Gift*, the French intellectuals participating in the Anti-utilitarian Movement in the Social Sciences have been insisting in the contributing of Karl Polanyi, in his production of 1944, *The Great Transformation*, the origins of our time, in Brazilian edition of 2000, in which the author profoundly criticizes the classical liberal economist view, which attributes to the economic transformations, the motor of social change. This critique basically summarizes the foundations of the Anti-utilitarian Movement in the Social Sciences. Indeed, says Polanyi (2000, p. 56):

In the heart of the Industrial Revolution of the 18th century, a miraculous progress in the production instruments occurred, which was accompanied by a catastrophic disarticulation of people's ordinary life. [...] What was the mechanism whose intermediation destroyed the ancient social fabric and tried, without success, a new man-nature integration? The liberal philosophy has never failed as much as in the understanding of the problem of change [...] on the mystical acceptance of the social consequences of the economic progress.

Thus, “the convergence between Karl Polanyi and Marcel Mauss is touching, since their economic analyses find their origin in a same reductionist criticism, which explains the economical action only by the individual material interest.” (Laville, 2004, p. 43).

In fact, contrary to what is expected by the understanding of the functioning of the market as integrator, there appears at least two extremely serious problems: “the disaggregation of the organizer principles of social solidarity and the failure of the traditional conception of social rights that offers a satisfactory framework to explain social exclusion” (Innerarity, 2001, p. 315).

In addition, according to the same author, while in the post-World War II scenario the center of the social fabric was in the redistribution, “the main event of our economies is the exclusion of entire groups from the labor market” (p. 314), which leads to a new justification of public intervention on reduction of

inequalities, which however, does not ensure social cohesion. Without discussing the quality of this intervention, indeed, what is at stake in the center of social issue are the organizer principles of solidarity (p. 316) that the exclusively-economic focuses tend to ignore.

Thus, as emphasized by Innerarity (2001), the category of hospitality can serve to articulate a moral theory, due to its cultural universality and richness of its significations. With the category of hospitality, the author says that “I intend to give conceptual foundation to events that escape the prediction and before which our true moral structure is measured” (p. 18), it is not taking into consideration here an abdication of reason, but the ethics of hospitality, as learning of the productive tract with alterity. “The fundamental ethical competency consists of the opening to the other and to others, in being accessible to the appeals of the world, aware of the different from itself” (p. 19). Thus, the hospitality in a world traversed by particular interests and by the individualism, moves in a different direction. “It is interested in proximity and the encounter and this is perhaps its main meaning when faced with the logic of globalization and individualism.”

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

It was aimed to evidence the importance of the social in the face of the economic strictly considered as motor of the social changes, and to work with the relationships between qualitative research and the field of hospitality, in the sense, also, to evidence its relationships, in the context of the deep fractures and contradictions that characterize the contemporaneity.

The dimension, the category or the field of hospitality, allow the criticism to the strictly economist view of social changes and its consequences for life in society. In the face of the social fabric and the progression of social problems in the contemporaneity, the research on hospitality provides continuity to the tradition of qualitative social research, which aims to recover the sense and maintenance of life in society, emphasizing the importance of social bonds. In this sense, the so-called qualitative research finds support in the current discussions on hospitality, as it was aimed to evidence.

REFERENCES

- ALVES-MAZZOTTI, A. J., & Gewandsznajder, F. (1998). *O método nas ciências naturais e sociais: pesquisa quantitativa e qualitativa*. São Paulo: Pioneira.
- ANADÓN, M. (2006). La recherche dite “qualitative”: de la dynamique de son évolution aux acquis indéniables et aux questionnements présents. *Recherches Qualitatives*, 26(1), 5-31.
- BAPTISTA, I. (2002). Lugares de hospitalidade. In Dias, C. M. M. (Org.) *Hospitalidade: reflexões e perspectivas* (pp. 157-164). São Paulo: Manole.
- BAUER, M. W., & Gaskell, G. (2002). *Pesquisa qualitativa com texto, imagem e som: um manual prático* (Pedrinho Guareschi, Trad.). Petrópolis: Editora Vozes.
- BUENO, M. S. (Org.). (2008). *Hospitalidade no jogo das relações sociais*. São Paulo: Editora Vieira.

- CAILLÉ, A. (1998). Nem holismo nem individualismo metodológicos: Marcel Mauss e o paradigma da dádiva. *Revista Brasileira de Ciências Sociais*, 13(38), 1-35.
- CAMARGO, L. O. L. (2003). Os domínios da hospitalidade. In Dencker, A. F. M., & Bueno, M. S. (Orgs.). *Hospitalidade: cenários e oportunidades*. São Paulo: Thomson.
- CAMARGO, L. O. L. (2015). Os interstícios da hospitalidade [Número especial]. *Revista Hospitalidade*, XII, 42-69.
- CALHOUN, C. (2014). O papel das Ciências Sociais em um mundo em mudança acelerada. *Agência Fapesp*, agosto. São Paulo: Fundação de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado de São Paulo.
- CHIZZOTTI, A. (2003). A pesquisa qualitativa em ciências humanas e sociais: evolução e desafios. *Revista Portuguesa de Educação*, 16(002), 221-236.
- GOTMAN, A. (1997). La question de l'hospitalité aujourd'hui [Número especial]. *Communications*, 65, 5-19.
- HORKHEIMER, M. (Org.). (1983). Teoria tradicional e teoria crítica. In CIVITA, V. (Ed.). *Benjamin, Habermas, Horkheimer, Adorno: textos escolhidos* (Vol. 6, pp. 125-162). São Paulo: Abril Cultural.
- INNERARITY, D. (2001). Ética de *la hospitalidad*. Barcelona: Ediciones Peninsula.
- KHUN, T. (1970). *The structure of scientific revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- LARAIA, R. B. (2001). *Cultura, um conceito antropológico* (14^a ed.). Rio de Janeiro: Zahar.
- LASHLEY, C., & Morrison, A. (2004). *Em busca da hospitalidade: perspectivas de um mundo globalizado* (Carlos David Szlak, Trad.). Barueri: Manole.
- LASHLEY, C. (2015) Hospitalidade e hospitabilidade [Número especial]. *Revista Hospitalidade*, XII, 70-92.
- LAVILLE, J. L. (2004). Com Mauss e Polanyi: rumo a uma teoria da economia plural. In Nunes, B. F., & Martins, P. H. (Eds.) *A nova ordem social: perspectivas da solidariedade contemporânea* (pp. 42-57). Brasília, DF: Paralelo 15.
- LUGOSI, P. (2008). Hospitality spaces, hospitable moments: consumer encounters and affective experiences in commercial settings. *Journal of foodservice*, 19(2), 139-149.
- MARTINS, P. H., & Nunes, B. F. (Orgs.). (2004). *A nova ordem social: perspectivas da solidariedade contemporânea*. Brasília, DF: Paralelo 15.
- MARTINS, P. H. (2007). *Apresentação ao jornal do M.A.U.S.S.* Recife: Universidade Federal de Pernambuco.
- MARTINS, P. H. (2005). A sociologia de Marcel Mauss: dádiva, simbolismo e associação. *Revista Crítica de Ciências Sociais*, 73, 45-66.
- MAUSS, M. (1925). Essai sur le don: forme et raison d'échange dans les sociétés archaïques. *Année Sociologique*, 2d. série T.1.
- MAUSS, M. (1974). *Sociologia e antropologia*. São Paulo: EPU/Edusp.
- MAUSS, M. (2001). *Ensaio sobre a dádiva*. Lisboa: Edições 70.
- MONTANDON, A. (2003). Hospitalidade ontem e hoje. In Dencker, A. F. M., & BUENO, M. S. (Orgs.). *Hospitalidade: cenários e oportunidades*. São Paulo: Thomson.
- POLANYI, K. (2000). *A grande transformação: as origens de nossa época* (2^a ed.). (Fanny Wrabel, Trad.). Rio de Janeiro: Editora Campus.
- QUEIROZ, M. I. P. (2001). Problemas na proposição de pesquisas em Ciências Sociais. In Lang, A. B. S. G. (Org.). *Desafios da pesquisa em Ciências Sociais* (Número 8, Série 2). São Paulo: Humanitas; CERU.

ROBO, P. (1995). A propôs de recherche et de methodes qualitatives. *Ecrits Perso*. Site PR/Méthodes qualitatives.doc. (Documento elaborado a partir de: POURTOIS J-P.(1988). et DESMET H. Epistémologie et instrumentation en Sciences Humaines. Paris: Mardaga, MUCCHIELI A., Paris: PUF, Coleção Qui sais jê, no. 2591, 1991).

SALLES, M. R. R., Bueno, M. S., & Bastos, S. (2010). Desafios da pesquisa em hospitalidade. *Revista Hospitalidade*, VII(1).

Received: 08/10/2016

Approved: 09/25/2017

CONTRIBUTION

Maria do Rosário Rolfsen Salles: Single Author.