The hospitality consumption experiences of parents and carers with children: A qualitative study of foodservice settings

Dr Peter Lugosi[a*]
Dr Richard N.S. Robinson[b]
Ms Maria Golubovskaya[b]
Ms Laura Foley[c]

[a] Oxford Brookes University, United Kingdom
[b] University of Queensland, Australia
[c] James Cook University, Australia

[*]Corresponding author

Contact: plugosi@brookes.ac.uk

This is the final accepted version. The full citation is:
Lugosi, P., Robinson, R.N.S., Golubovskaya, M. and Foley, L. (2016) The hospitality consumption experiences of parents and carers with children: A qualitative study of foodservice settings. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, Vol. 54, pp. 84-94, DOI: 10.1016/j.ijhm.2016.01.012.

Highlights

- Identifies factors that frustrate, satisfy and delight parents/carers with children.
- Performing childcare frames carers' needs and perceptions of (dis)satisfiers.
- Experiences of (in)hospitality shaped by design, services and staff/patron practices.
- Children's agency and wellbeing are key to influencing the overall experience.
- Recognising and responding to the 'work' of childcare can improve experiences.

Abstract

Drawing on research conducted in Australia and the United Kingdom, this paper addresses two questions: first, how is parenting and childcare provision performed within restaurants, cafes and pubs; and second, how are different aspects of hospitality provision entangled with parent, carer and children's experiences? The findings show how gestures of hospitality, particularly service interactions that are tailored to meet the specialist needs of these consumers, can create positive emotions and encourage customer loyalty. Furthermore, the data show the importance of recognising children as sovereign consumers. We conclude that responding directly to children's needs can augment their experiences and hence, those of their carers and other patrons. The paper identifies a number of implications for management practice and several avenues for future research.

Keywords: Children; Consumer; Experience; Family; Foodservice; Parents

1. Introduction

Families are an important segment of the hospitality and tourism market. It has been suggested that in the United Kingdom alone, family dining out comprises of 3.18 billion visits worth £16.1 billion to the foodservice sector (NDP, 2014). There has been growing interest in family consumption of hospitality and tourism (Chen *et al*., 2015; Khoo-Lattimore *et al*., 2015; Mottiar & Quinn, 2012), with researchers recognising that families take many different, non-nuclear and non-hetero-centric, forms and that parenting and childcare is not performed exclusively by parents (cf. Carr, 2011; Schänzel & Carr, 2015; Schänzel *et al*., 2012; Wang *et al*., 2014). Academic researchers have recognised that restaurants, cafes, pubs and bars are important sites in which family leisure and parenting are performed and brought into public domains; nevertheless, it is acknowledged that little is known about these everyday practices in spaces of commercial hospitality (Karsten *et al*., 2015). Market researchers and professional commentators, assuming a provider-advocate perspective, have identified factors that can entice families to foodservice outlets (Harrington, 2013; McWattie, 2014; Quinn, 2013). However, recent studies have stressed that academics have largely ignored the experiences of parents and other childcare providers who patronise hospitality venues (cf. Lugosi *et al*., 2015). Drawing on interviews conducted in Australia and the United Kingdom, this paper addresses this gap in knowledge by responding to two research questions: first, how is parenting and childcare provision performed within restaurants, cafes and pubs; and second, how are different aspects of hospitality provision entangled with parent, carer and children's experiences?

This study adopted a constructivist position, utilizing an inductive, qualitative approach to considering consumer experiences (Lincoln & Guba, 2013; Robinson *et al.*, 2014). There is a well-established body of work examining experiential consumption and experience management in hospitality, leisure and tourism (cf. Morgan *et al*., 2010; Ryan, 2010; Walls *et al.*, 2011a for an overview of the field). Much of the existing work has been developed within the positivist paradigm, seeking to test hypotheses by exploring relationships amongst predefined constructs (Knutson *et al*., 2009; Oh *et al.*, 2007; Walls, 2013). In contrast, the paradigmatic approach adopted in the current study posits that the themes and constructs developed from research are co-constructed between the respondents' and researchers' interpretation of reality. Inductive, qualitative approaches may be more appropriate for examining consumer experiences because a) they allow the research participants to define and explain their experiences, enabling their narratives to open new lines of enquiry rather than relying on preconceived constructs, and b) they can explore thoughts and feelings not easily reducible to numerical measures (cf. Holloway *et al*., 2010; Osman *et al*., 2014; Walls *et al*., 2011b; Ziakas & Boukas, 2013). An inductive approach was thus more appropriate for giving greater 'voice' to the experiences of parents and carers.

The paper begins by reviewing the literature on the consumption of leisure amongst parents and carers with children, and the very limited body of literature that has considered the experiences of parents and carers with children in hospitality venues. Following the section on the study's methods, the findings and discussion consider five interrelated themes: 1) welcoming families; 2) focusing on children as

sovereign consumers; 3) family-oriented service; 4) family-friendly servicescape and 5) the role of other customers. We conclude by discussing the implication of the findings for experience design, operations management and service development, identifying avenues of further research and reflecting on the study's limitations.

2. Literature review

2.1 Consuming leisure as parent and childcare provider

A rich tradition of social science research has highlighted that the consumption of leisure, tourism and hospitality for a parent or childcarer should be seen as different from those without childcare responsibilities (Carr, 2011; Mottiar & Quinn, 2012; Schänzel *et al.,* 2012). Moreover, leisure is experienced differently by men and women, with women often continuing to be responsible for childcare provision within leisure settings (Davidson, 1996; Larson *et al*., 1997; Mottiar & Quinn, 2012; Shaw, 1992). Research has shown how leisure consumption for those responsible for children is simultaneously recreational and laborious: the divide between leisure and work is thus blurred. Added to the practical challenges of caring for children are the social expectations placed upon parents and care-providers to be 'good' parents, mothers, fathers and carers (Collett, 2005; Goodwin & Huppatz, 2010; Lee *et al*., 2014; Miller, 2005, 2011; Tardy, 2000). Such expectations bring with them social and psychological risks: perceptions of external scrutiny and judgement for failing to conform to parental ideals. These can lead to self-doubt, social exclusion and even depression among childcare providers.

Consumption becomes another social domain through which parents and care-providers articulate their sense of identity (Carrigan & Szmigin, 2006; Lugosi *et al*., 2015; Miller, 2014). The purchase, use and display of goods and services can complement the acts of childcare and parenting (Johnstone & Todd, 2012; Lugosi *et al*., 2015; Thomsen & Sørensen, 2006). Studies by Johnstone and Todd (2012) and Lugosi *et al*. (2015) also suggested that consumption servicescapes such as retail and foodservice venues may facilitate social interaction thus helping to negotiate the challenges associated with parenting.

This body of literature is significant for the current study because it provides a sensitising theoretical framework for approaching parent and carer consumption. The literature stresses the ongoing interaction between leisure consumption and childcare responsibility such that the blurring between leisure and the 'work' of parenting may be a source of tension. Lugosi *et al*. (2015) for example argued that the wellbeing and satisfaction of parents and care-providers within consumption settings was directly linked to that of their children. In short, if their children were unhappy or misbehaving, parents and care-providers had a compromised experience. The consumption of hospitality, and more specifically, food and drink related experiences, must therefore be examined in relation to the requirements, tensions and opportunities of childcare provision.

2.2 Parents' and carers' consumption of hospitality

Recent studies have highlighted that parents' and carers' consumption of hospitality in food and drink service contexts has largely been neglected by academic research (Karsten *et al*., 2015; Lugosi, 2010; Lugosi *et al*., 2015). Insights into their consumer experiences come from two principal sources: first, social scientific studies mainly of culture, parenting and childcare provision in public spaces, and health and nutritional science studies regarding consumer behaviour; and second, practitioner commentary and market research on foodservice consumer trends. Sociological, anthropological and geographical studies of motherhood and parenthood make short references to conscious parents' food choices (Nash, 2012), feelings of scrutiny or inhospitality in particular foodservice venues, and avoiding some venues during the difficult periods of pregnancy (Longhurst, 2007). Restaurants and cafes often emerge in studies of breastfeeding as places where women faced surveillance and exclusion (Boyer, 2011, 2012; Lane, 2014; Mahon-Daly & Andrews, 2002). Laurier and Philo (2006) show how women with strollers negotiate cafe environments and how fellow diners assist a female carer clean up a spillage. However, there are no attempts in these studies to examine in any detail the hospitality dimensions of consumers' experiences in foodservice settings.

Schortman's (2010) observations of Honduran culture suggest that parents take children out for a number of reasons: international branded restaurants offer clean food, of consistent quality, and polite service. Fast food venues also provide opportunities for parents to interact with others whilst their children can play in safe, controlled environments. Schortman (2010) also suggests that marketing to children by large multinational foodservice chains shapes their tastes and their demands, thus influencing parents' choices to patronise such venues. Her reflections help to consider the practices of consumption in their social context, but the study does not focus on the products and services that shape the consumer experience *per se.*

More recently, Karsten *et al*. (2015) examined family leisure time in cafes, bars and restaurants. They considered the way entrepreneurs targeted families alongside the difficulties operators faced when catering for these market segments. Karsten *et al.* (2015) also studied parents' and children's interactional routines, focusing largely on different patterns of sociality. In a related study, Karsten and Felder (2015) suggested that interaction and consumption in such leisure spaces was part of children's socialisation. However, they neglected to consider the broader hospitality dimensions of their consumer experiences, or how the practices and experiences of parenting/care-provision shaped those hospitality elements.

Academics in the public health and nutrition fields provide alternative insights into the consumption practices of parents and carers with children. Studies have considered in some detail the factors that shape decision-making in out-of-home food consumption (Pinard *et al*., 2015), with particular emphasis on the influence of menu design and labelling on the food purchasing behaviour of children and families (Tandon *et al*., 2011). These studies are laudable insofar as they help to understand the factors influencing poor dietary choice in foodservice settings. However, this body of research

offers limited information about the hospitality consumption experience more generally.

Further insights regarding family experiences in foodservice settings have emerged in the practitioner-focused literature. Recent consumer trend data, for example, has identified the top products and services that parents require e.g. crayons and colouring material, high chairs, baby-changing facilities and child-friendly staff (Harrington, 2013). Little, though, is revealed in these studies about the detailed nature of the consumer experience. Journalistic commentaries in trade-focused publications also provide relevant insights, albeit from provider perspectives, identifying examples of good practice and giving prescriptive advice on how to cater for children and families (Buchthal, 2006; McWattie, 2014; Quinn, 2013). Practitioner advocates thus appear to recognise families, parents, care-providers and children as important consumer segments and decision-making units with particular needs. However, there is a dearth of research into the nature of their consumer experiences and the multiple factors that influence their patronage in foodservice venues. It is this substantial gap in knowledge that this study seeks to address.

3. Methods

3.1 Research approach and sampling

We adopted an inductive qualitative approach, utilising semi-structured interviews, which enabled us to identify broader conceptual themes in participants' narratives for understanding aspects of consumer experiences. The study used non-probability, purposive sampling, combining criterion and proactive snowball techniques (Patton, 2002). The key criterion for inclusion was patronage, with children, of food and beverage venues, which included restaurants, cafes, pubs and bars. The distinct gaps in knowledge led us to exclude accommodation settings to maintaining a clearer focus. Beyond patronage we recorded other aspects that could have influenced the findings, including behavioural patterns, education, different family configurations and ages of children. The invitation also extended to parents and carers who did not visit such hospitality venues regularly with children to help understand reasons for their choices not to consume. As delimitation, for this study we did not recruit professional carers (e.g. nannies/au pairs) nor other family carers (e.g. grandparents), although one respondent reflected on her parental and grandparental experiences.

The aim was not to obtain a generalizable sample; nor did we seek to conduct a comparative analysis of different nationalities. Nevertheless the location of research teams in Oxford in the United Kingdom and Brisbane in Australia enabled us to recruit participants in both countries. In order to aid the 'transferability' of these findings to other contexts, we sought heterogeneity in the sample with which to explore a variety of experiences (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). We were therefore keen to recruit people with different patterns of consumption ranging from heavy to light users, different family configurations and different aged children. However, rather than presuming that behavioural patterns, exact number of children or ages of children determined experiences, we focused instead on the richness of emerging themes to help

determine when no further participants were needed to delineate substantial new themes. Furthermore, for ethical reasons, we were sensitive regarding aspects such as relationship status and sexuality: we did not actively seek to elicit such details to avoid perceptions of stigmatisation or purposeful selection of 'curiosity cases'. Several participants, however, self-identified as single and/or separated mothers and fathers, and one was part of a same-sex relationship, thus adding desired diversity to our sample.

The research did not offer external incentives for participation, and therefore it was important to utilise a range of methods to recruit adequate participants to generate substantial data. Participants were contacted through a number of channels including postings to parent-centric websites such as netmums.co.uk and the use of pre-existing university databases of potential participants. Additionally, visits were made to play centres, flyers were distributed at a school in the UK and a radio interview was used to recruit participants in Australia. However, regardless of the communication source or country, the information given to potential participants and criterion for inclusion remained consistent.

See Table 1 for sample details.

The final sample included mothers, fathers and those involved in caring for children (23 females and 7 males). The sample had considerable cultural and ethnic diversity with participants of various mixed heritage including Azerbaijani, German, Italian, Indian, Mexican and Zambian. However, as in all inductive research where participants volunteer to participate, there is an element of self-selection bias. A limitation was that the sample had a greater number of participants with higher education qualifications and we recruited more female than male participants. Furthermore, despite our attempts to recruit people who did not visit venues, we only have one such contributor.

3.2 Interviews

In order to ensure consistency, all the interviews utilised the same interview schedule, which used a range of questioning strategies that have been well established in qualitative research (cf. Josselson, 2013; Spradley, 1979). These included exploratory questions that enabled participants to identify their consumer geographies, for example: 'What are the hospitality venues (cafes, restaurants, bars/pubs etc.) that you visit with your child(ren)/the child(ren) in your care?' (Probed for most frequently visited if there were several). These were followed up by elaboration questions, for example: 'Why do you go there as opposed to other places?'. We utilised contrast questions, for example: 'Are there places you definitely would not go to?' [if yes] 'Which ones and why not?'. We also encouraged participants to provide descriptive narratives by asking open questions, for example: 'Can you tell me about a particularly negative experience in a venue?' (Probes: please describe what happened; tell me who was involved and what made it negative). These questioning strategies enabled participants to take a greater role in driving the direction of the discussion, but we also

utilised a series of sensitizing concepts (Blumer, 1954; Patton, 2002) relating to general areas of food and beverage provision. For example we probed impressions of layout, furnishing and facilities, the staff and the service, and the products (foods/drinks) available. Foodservice consumption experiences inevitably involve these human and non-human dimensions and in most cases respondents discussed these issues without explicit encouragement, but we asked them about their perceptions on these features if they did not emerge naturally. This enabled us to explore some foodservice-specific concepts, which could have more direct managerial implications, without having an overly restrictive or deterministic view of experiential components.

Similar to other studies with parents (e.g. Boyer, 2012) interviews were conducted in locations convenient to the participants. These included restaurants, cafes, participants' homes and gardens, university offices and rooms. One interview was conducted via telephone and another through Skype. Interviews lasted for approximately one hour. All the interviews were digitally recorded and transcribed by a third party.

3.3 Analysis

The study involved concurrent data collection and analysis (Lofland, 2006): researchers could thus revise the interview schedule in light of emerging issues. For example, the theme of noise emerged during an initial interview, and was explored with other participants in subsequent interviews. Formal analysis followed established procedures of familiarisation, data reduction and (re)ordering (Braun & Clarke, 2006; Miles & Huberman, 1994; Sandiford & Seymour, 2007). Familiarisation involved repeated reading and re-reading of transcripts, listening to the recorded interviews and consulting notes made during the interviews.

The development of an interview guide, based on the literature and our initial consideration of relevant issues meant the analysis utilised a number of pre-existing sensitising concepts, akin to template analysis (King, 2004): as noted above, these included aspects such as the service and the service environment (see also Miles & Huberman's 1994 discussion of provisional coding). We added new codes and more detailed codes to these existing general codes as they emerged through analysis. As Saldaña (2009) observed, the initial cycles of coding involved a more open coding, with later cycles involving greater levels of focus as we attempted to examine specific areas.

Coding helped to reduce the data set from the original 194,364 words of transcribed text to 16,057 words, which we subsequently reordered into seven thematic areas each with constituent sub-themes (24 in total) that we evaluated and revised following discussion and reflection. However, rather than assuming that any data reduction and ordering is a definitive 'fixing' of reality, we remained open about the structuring of the data and the themes. As Richardson (1997) suggested, the act of writing up our findings continually forced us to revaluate and analyse the data in light of our arguments and existing literature. Consequently, the themes that are distilled within the final manuscript do not follow the data ordering neatly or simplistically.

Within the formal analysis stage we sought to improve the credibility of the findings through 'researcher triangulation' (Denzin, 2009) by having three researchers

code the data in parallel. However, as MacQueen *et al.* (2008) advised, one researcher took a central role in consolidating the codes and themes. The qualities of emerging codes, sub-themes and themes were examined dialogically and reflexively between the researchers. For example, when one of the researchers identified the emerging theme of 'homeliness', another researcher questioned what type of incidents in the data this referred to, explored its components and through this process evaluated whether this was a new and distinct conceptual sub-theme. Coding and identifying emerging issues separately, and subsequently bringing the three interpretations together, reinforced points of agreement, while highlighting areas of difference in interpretation.

Finally, regarding the data presentation in this paper, we have deliberately focused on five thematic areas that were identified through analysis, rather than adopting a rigid, predetermined framework, for example 'quality management', which focuses on areas such as service or product quality. One of the strengths of inductive qualitative research is the flexibility to identify themes which intersect with but are not reducible to such conceptualisations. Furthermore, we consciously avoided reductive conceptions of our participants' identities that ignore the dynamic nature of 'self' or 'selves'. Being a single parent, female or male, or of Zambian or Italian origin, for example, intersects with other issues, some demographic, others more contextual. Therefore we do not make unsubstantiated claims about 'types' of people, although we were mindful of how demographic, cultural and situational factors may influence their (perceptions of) experiences.

4. Findings and discussion

4.1 Welcoming families

Many of the research participants referred to notions of genuine hospitality or hospitableness when describing their (positive) experiences. Most had experienced some level of covert or overt animosity and thus seemed to be acutely aware of being, or not being, welcomed. Interestingly, several of the participants stressed the importance of focusing the service interaction on the children and recognising them as being part of the service interaction. Margaret was one such example. She and her husband said they take their daughter Hannah to the same Portuguese-style restaurant nearly every Sunday for lunch because of the sense of hospitality they received there. She explained, while gesticulating enthusiastically:

> They know us and they are very familiar and they have sometimes presents for Hannah so Hannah knows them also. So yeah <chuckles> that kind of familiarity thing is the one that is very appealing to us I would say…in my culture service is *really* important, so when I'm talking about service it's that you receive your meal on time, fast, fast and that they receive you with a smile and they know what you are going to order, you know like

> that, 'Oh yes I know you', that kind of I know you, the smile that they are looking at your eyes, that you are not just, you know, money… (Margaret)

Margaret's recollections certainly stress the role of staff and the gestures of hospitality in welcoming and inclusion. However, her narrative also highlights the contribution of consumer co-creation, in this case especially the role of culture and memory in shaping expectations of the experience and perceptions of hospitality. During the interview Margaret suggested that the restaurant reminds them of their native Mexico and the hospitality they receive in their own cultures within such commercial transactions. Their choices to consume there points to a sense of identification with the context, which draws on their cultural values, as well as the organisation's ability to create experiential propositions that engage and in time directly respond to their value-laden expectations.

Similar notions of identification were highlighted by other participants, for whom certain venues and their practices promoted a sense of homeliness, a positive quality reported in the literature (Lashley *et al*., 2007). For example, a woman of Italian descent, with two toddlers enthused: 'we find Italian [restaurants] good… I love watching the kids eat spaghetti, it's like home for me, it's family, it reminds me of growing up and seeing kids slurp spaghetti everywhere is like a real, warm, fuzzy for me' (Gabriella). Personal touches also augmented these encounters, as recalled by a mother when her children were several years younger:

> In a Chinese restaurant in the Valley, we had the little old grandmother come and sit with us, and she was talking to my eldest in Mandarin... And my youngest was saying to her that she thought that fried ice-cream should come with lemon, honey and ginger sauce. And the little old lady got up and went out the back into the kitchen and came back and she had made her a lemon, honey and ginger sauce for her fried ice-cream, and it was great! (Corinne)

Contrarily, the chain restaurants specifically, were reported as 'a bit lacking in, I don't know, it's all a bit slapdash, there's no care taken, it doesn't feel homely, it doesn't feel comfortable and doesn't feel friendly a lot of the time' (Corinne).

Advocates of experience management stress the importance of personalising service experiences and tailoring encounters towards specific consumer needs so as to engage them emotionally (Gilmore & Pine, 2002; Hanefors & Mossberg, 2003; Hemmington, 2007). Frontline service personnel often have central roles in detecting the specific needs of their clientele, and responding in sincere ways, performing hospitality authentically (Gibbs & Ritchie, 2010; Hemmington, 2007). However, it is again important to foreground that the parenting and childcare dimensions can impact on perceptions of staff-consumer encounters and the nature of the hospitality experience. For example, a German mother of a six year old boy observed:

> Yeah, that's really important. … I think if you get made to feel that you're welcome and they understand, especially if it's somebody who is any older

> than 16, 17, if they look at you, 'Oh mine's like that,' it's all right. And you think, 'Oh that's cool,' but some people do give you a dirty look. And then, you're thinking, 'OK, we're not welcome,' because obviously your child goes completely crazy, you would go home anyway, you wouldn't want to be there, but if they just do what kids do, and people give you the evil eye, then you think, 'Well this is impossible, you obviously don't want families here.' The staff are really important, even if they just make little comments to say, 'How old is he?' or, 'Is that your little one?' or just daft things like that, where you think, 'They're happy to see us, they don't mind.' (Brigitte)

These narratives stress the importance of frontline staff being able to recognise the specific needs of care-providers for whom the experience is fundamentally shaped by the presence of children. Importantly, the ability to accept children was reflected in a closely-related emerging theme discussed below. Positive service experiences were not simply defined by frontline staff's ability to acknowledge children, but also by their capacity to respond to children as sovereign customers with agency.

4.2 Focusing on children as sovereign consumers

Marketers and academic researchers have recognised children's agency and acknowledged the importance of viewing them as active decision-makers (Carrigan *et al*., 2006; Grieshaber, 1997; Holloway & Valentine, 2000). Echoing these observations, a recurring theme in the data was the importance of acknowledging and interacting with children. For example, when reflecting on the features of a positive experience, one male respondent in his mid-fifties emphasised the key role of the personal acts of hospitality directed towards the child.

> He [staff member] took her [child] out in the garden, showed her around the garden personally, brought her back in again, and she ate all the food. But it was that whole sense of welcoming her, and taking the trouble, as 'the great man', taking her round and showing her the garden… But the receptionist in the restaurant and the waiters were incredibly kind, and just talking to her about what she liked and so on, and she chose some quite exotic things… they were just taking a lot of time with her… I think the quality of the interaction with the waiting staff in that particular case, it was the fact that they were clearly interested in her as a young girl… it was just a very good, interesting, interaction with her, as an individual. We were there but they weren't talking to us, they were talking just to her. (Adam)

Importantly, these features of the service experience were reflected in several other interviews in the UK and Australia. Though Indian culturally, Ada and her husband frequented western restaurants with their single-child daughter, and visited one pasta eatery regularly. In discussing factors that led to positive experiences Ada noted:

> They’re pretty nice to her which is important for us… We like the people who sit down with her and treat her like a person, they normally talk to her, not over her. A lot of them in these [restaurant] places do that, especially I notice they sit down next to her and ask her, treat her like a little person, ask her what she wants, read out the menu to her – she can read now so she reads now to them sometimes and they have a discussion before they decide… we do like going to places not too crowded and they have the time to pay attention to her, her needs are important, we wouldn’t be eating out if it was not for her. (Ada)

Considering children as consumers has been criticised by some for contributing to the commodification of childhood and the socialisation of children into problematic modes of consumption (McKendrick *et al*., 2000). Certainly, in our study there was an almost unanimous sentiment regarding the avoidance of fast food chains for these reasons. Nevertheless, as recognised elsewhere, consumption can also be linked more positively to children’s self-development and socialisation (Lugosi *et al*., 2015). In this study, parents appeared to acknowledge, albeit implicitly, that this was a natural part of the child’s desire to articulate their sense of identity. As this, and following quotes reveal, Karina was determined to see her three-year old son explore his own identity:

> He'll go up to the till. Well, he used to insist on being part of the ordering process and order his own babyccino, which got complicated when he started ordering a big-boy-ccino and no one knew quite what that was, but he just thought I'm not a baby, so that menu item no longer applies; I'd rather a big-boy-ccino… He's upset if his plates are cleared without someone asking his permission. Because he sees it as a possessive thing, that was my plate that had my dinner on it, why would someone take it away from me? (Karina)

Acknowledging this desire for independence is part of the challenge for frontline staff, but equally important is their ability to respond to these demands. The previous respondent noted that the child’s grandmother would take her son to a particular restaurant, because ‘he [the child] knows all of the staff by name and they know him by name and *they know that they're not to touch his plate*’ (Karina, emphasis added). Such personalisation distinguished the venues and the experiences they offered; it appeared to create a positive affect towards those spaces and the people who could construct this type of hospitality. Furthermore, the provision of such hospitality towards the children also helped to assure positive experiences for the parents and other consumers, as this first time mother of a young baby described, albeit in a group dining situation:

> And [the owner] took this all very seriously, came out and spoke to them about how their meals were being cooked, and treated them all as paying customers of an age to have decisions. And given that they were aged I

> think five, six and possibly eight at the time, this was very good <laughs> it was that air of just taking them seriously, not, 'Oh you're a child, you'll have chips, that's it.' And he's always very nice to the adults as well, but I think it was going the extra mile to make sure that the children enjoyed their meal, because if the children don't, they whine, and no matter how much the adults enjoy eating, if you've got whiney children it's horrible. (Nicola)

4.3 Family oriented service (and meeting specialised requests)

As noted at the outset, existing literature has stressed that family consumption of leisure, tourism and hospitality involves practices that are distinct from those of other consumers without children (Carr, 2011; Schänzel *et al*., 2012). A recurring set of themes in the current study reflected parents' requirements for services tailored to meet their specialist needs. These services have procedural and material dimensions. For example, in discussing key procedural aspects that could delight, Helen, a mother of two 'energetic' children noted: 'Partly it's that the food comes quickly, children get pretty bored if they've got to wait around, and if they're hungry I need the food to come fairly quickly'. Respondents highlighted that bringing food for children even before the parents or carers were served was important in placating them. Foregrounding the children contributed to the overall satisfaction of the carer and other customers.

Hospitality provision could also extend to providing specialised extras that were not part of the formal experiential proposition: 'I did used to go to [branded cafe] quite a lot, and I still go there, but they used to give me hot water so I could heat his bottle' (Karen). The availability of this additional service was particularly important for her as a mother of a young child. Several mothers noted that the rhythms of their feeding determined when and where they could go. For very young children it can be extremely difficult and often impossible to substitute specialist baby foods with that available in foodservice outlets, and it is hard to placate them if they get hungry, so providing specialist services such as warm water was crucial in shaping which venues were deemed hospitable and which were not.

Many of the delight factors highlighted by our contributors involved focusing on children and facilitating their experiences. For example, a mother juggling the needs of three children under four years of age on an outing proffered:

> They give them apple juice in the takeaway coffee cups, so we don't have to worry about them breaking them and spilling isn't as much of a problem. (Sophia)

Similarly, a mother of a six year old reflected on the materiality or material factors that shaped their experiences:

> [Large branded furniture store] has got a little cafe haven't they and they have special kids' cutlery, I find that that sort of thing is very hard to find.

> The little cutlery, they give you a massive, big fork, for two or three year old kids. So you think, 'You have a child's menu, why can't you just give us some plastic cutlery, so they don't poke their eyes out?' (Brigitte)

Importantly, as the following quote highlights, personalised acts of hospitality, demonstrated through the provision of specialised services, created affective bonds between the children, carers, frontline staff and the venue. Such an emotional relationship with the hospitality experience subsequently encouraged loyalty, which was driven by the child's involvement in the consumer decision-making process. Ada again, in some detail, described the regular early dinners they take at the pasta restaurant:

> The last time we went there, they take the order on the little notepad thingy, they actually gave it to her and let her draw on that. He [waiter] was sitting with her and he let her draw on that because she was getting very restless and he noticed that, so to allow us to eat in peace he sat there with her for a bit. So he wasn't babysitting but he was actually entertaining her, and it wasn't long … and she felt good about it because she told me that, 'Let's go back there, he was really nice so can we find him again?' And she remembers his name, his name was Derek, he actually told her he remembered hers, he made sure he said it right and he sat down with her, spent that time with her and she wanted to go back there for him. The next time around it was not so much about the pasta it was about going back and seeing Derek. (Ada)

In some situations where carers were looking after more than one child alone, personalised forms of hospitality engendered enormous amounts of trust.

> Kelly was having a bit of a tantrum, it was a bit too late and she was having a bit of a sulk and George really needed to go to the bathroom. And my partner was away at the time so one of the staff members took George down to the bathroom, which we know them so totally trust them to do so… it's not always easy when I'm alone with the two kids. (Tessa)

Contrary to these extensions of hospitality, parents were clearly socially conditioned to consider that some tasks were their own responsibility, and not the venue's, or their staff, for instance cleaning up child spillages: 'I have felt apologetic when there's been crumbs everywhere and I've been looking around for some way I can bus my own table rather than having the shame of someone cleaning up behind me' (Karina). This further demonstrates the ongoing 'work' of childcare provision and performance of parenting in leisure contexts. However, in contrast, Rosa, a mother of a blended family of four children confessed she would not clean up mess in a fine-dining restaurant. The expectations regarding service and by extension the consumers' 'role-size' in the experience co-production differed between sectors and were shaped by the operator's propositions of hospitality (Chathoth *et al*., 2013; Lugosi, 2007,

2009). While hospitality venues seemingly profit from this guilt, which motivates carers to co-produce their experience, they seem less inclined to tolerate perceived losses in revenue. Our respondents reported they were aware of this: 'I don't want to deny the place business, but I also don't want to spend $7 for a slice of banana bread when I can make a loaf for $2 or $3' (Karina). Yet ugly scenes were reported when child's portions could not be purchased for adults, or brought-in food could not be consumed at their venue. These responses could be considered inhospitable as well as short-sighted given the various social media forums that parenting communities share.

4.4 The family-friendly servicescape

Many of the respondents highlighted the importance of the servicescape in shaping the experience. The service environment had functional dimensions, which relate to the practical layout and usability of the space. The functional dimensions also included the ability of facilities to meet consumers' specific needs as carers for children, for example, dedicated baby-changing spaces. However, the data showed how features of the broader service environment shaped the experience even before consumers entered the venue. Researchers have recognised that the consumption experience begins before the physical encounter with the venue or destination (Quinlan Cutler & Carmichael, 2010). Consumption in general involves subjective judgements and anticipation regarding what to expect from the physical and human aspects of the experience. However, for parents and carers, this also involves planning that considers how the experience will be managed alongside and in relation to parenting and childcare provision. As a case in point, the accessibility of the servicescape was seen as a central feature determining decisions to visit especially for those with younger children. For example, Adrian, who cares for his two three-year olds, explained:

> I mean the coffee shop down the road I hardly go there because it's just parking the car's a nightmare, and you know the whole 'you're not supposed to leave kids in a hot car' thing and…you've gotta get them out of the car as well and it's just not worth doing… (Adrian)

Growing interest in accessibility within tourism and leisure experiences has placed considerable emphasis on disability and aging rather than on those travelling with children (Buhalis *et al.*, 2012). There is however an increasing shift towards a 'whole-of-life access' perspective, which in principle includes those travelling with young children (Buhalis *et al.*, 2012). The respondents helped to appreciate the aspects of the servicescape that can make a place exclusive or inclusive, but they also highlighted how accessibility intersects with the performance of childcare provision. Adrian, for example, is a single parent, which means that when he does see his children he is the sole carer during visits to foodservice venues. This makes issues of access in these situations even more prominent because he does not have a second person assisting him, for example in looking after children while he goes into venues to pick up food, or managing the transition from parking areas to the venue. Accessibility

challenges may also be amplified in intergenerational consumption situations where grandparents accompany young (grand)children and both have restricted mobility.

Ada's description of her experience of joining a 'mum's group' for an outing with all their children raised related issues concerning the ability of the venue design to meet their specific needs as parents and carers:

> We had made a reservation, we went, we ended up waiting for, I think, around 45 minutes and they had no chairs to actually sit down and wait, so we ended up standing outside the restaurant and we had to keep going and checking to see if there was a place available and when it would be fine and we had to tell them that, 'Look, if it's not going to happen we're going to leave' because the [young] girls are getting hungry and they were getting very restless, it was very difficult to contain them. (Ada)

Their experience of waiting outside points to a range of organisational shortcomings regarding demand and capacity management. It also points to gaps in the organisation's service recovery strategies as no attempts appear to have been made to manage the queuing or waiting process. However, it also brings to light how inadequate design, in this case the failure to provide arrival areas or facilities, excludes and has the potential to generate notions of inhospitableness.

Other respondents' narratives also highlighted how subtle aspects of the servicescape could make particular places, and sometimes entire categories of venues, inaccessible. These were excluded from their choice sets when deciding on places to visit. For example:

> I generally don't go to cafes, a lot of it because you can't get a pram inside there, they're very tight and entwined, physically uncomfortable places to be, let alone the fact that they're not really designed for kids, I mean it's a coffee shop and kids don't drink coffee! (Adrian)

Interestingly, the 'soundscape' also had a functional role in shaping choices. Several parents noted avoiding venues because they were too quiet. In contrast, other venues became attractive because of the noisiness, which was caused partly by the physical design. For instance, when asked why they frequented a particular venue, Helen, the mother of the 'energetic' children, emphasised that it was because it was 'generally reasonably noisy, the music is fairly loud, which I suppose helps if your children are being loud themselves. It's bright, lots of hard surfaces, which is not very good for the acoustics actually, the sound reverberates'.

Importantly, beyond their functional qualities, servicescape designs also had hedonic dimensions. As the following quotes demonstrate, the hedonic aspects of the design often played a positive role in attracting customers to specific venues:

> We go to [comic-book themed restaurant] I think because the decoration, there's always something interesting to look at. When he was smaller there was always something to distract him with, which was fantastic, it's very

> frustrating sitting waiting for food, when there's nothing to look at and nothing to do, so for a while we did only frequent places that had crayons, which I'm very glad we've moved out of that stage. But with [this venue], there's always the, 'Oh let's go and see how many aliens you recognise,' or, 'let's go and find Scooby Doo,' or whatever, there's something always to look at. (Nicola)

> There's open window space into the kitchen, so actually it's quite fun to watch the chefs for a while, that's another good thing that you can do to entertain [the children], and sometimes the chefs smile and wave. (Helen)

Examination of the design and layout of facilities must also take into account the spatial strategies for accommodating parents and carers with children. Organisations may choose between integration or separation when hosting family parties (Lugosi, 2010). Within integration strategies families are placed in amongst other guests, while separation involves different degrees of 'containment' as family parties are placed either in designated sections of venues or in completely separate spaces.

Respondents repeatedly stressed that 'controlled separation' was a pervasive element of their experiences, but it was often a conscious choice by parents rather than something imposed upon them by the operators. In practice this often meant sitting at the edges of venues, or in areas where they did not disturb others. Separation therefore involved both physical and aural presence (or absence). Respondents also said that separation was aligned to the notion of control. Their children could explore and remain physically active, whilst remaining under the supervision of the carer. As one parent noted, she felt it was safe for her daughter in one particular seated area because 'the entrance [was] closed', and she had 'control of her just here [on and around] the couch' (Margaret). As observed elsewhere, choosing to practice controlled separation facilitated the positive experience of children, which, in turn, helped to assure the positive experience of the carer (cf. Lugosi *et al*., 2015).

4.5 Other customers

Lynch *et al.* (2011) have argued that notions of host and guest are complex and these roles are often assumed by different actors at different times. However, this study of patronage with children shows the need to further challenge dyadic conceptions of hospitality provision. Rather than assuming that hospitality is produced through interaction between the host and guest, the organisation and customer, or even the frontline staff and patron, it is necessary to examine the *triadic* nature of hospitality – involving hosts, guests and *others*, which may include other guests or consumers not directly involved in the specific consumption experience.

Emerging research highlights how other consumers mediate and co-create consumer experiences (Lugosi, 2007, 2009; Miao, 2014; Miao & Mattila, 2013; Torres, 2015). Within our study, narratives pointed to the ways in which other patrons made places feel welcoming or exclusive, partly because of the children in their presence. Some respondents retold incidents of open conflict, which were prompted by children

disturbing other customers. However, hostility often emerged more subtly. For example, a father of two toddlers responded cheerily to the challenges of their infrequent dinner family outings:

> We went in with Tom when he was a baby in a pram, one where we had to wheel through. One particular gentleman was there with his wife and I said, 'excuse me' about three times - he just had to move his chair a small amount and he just sort of looked down his nose at me, sort of thing, even though he was asleep, he wasn't making any noise <chuckles> just yeah didn't look like he was keen on the fact that we were coming in with a child in a pram… Yeah, and then we're a bit tentative of Elly making any noise or anything like that, so it sort of put you a little on edge but we stayed there <chuckles>. (John)

Many of the respondents noted that they were conscious of other people's reactions to them during visits to venues. As other studies have shown, parenting in leisure settings brings care-provision into the public domain (Karsten *et al*., 2015; Lugosi *et al*., 2015). Consumption thus provokes external judgements, from staff and customers for instance, forcing parents and carers to question whether they (and children in their care) were living up to normative expectations of acceptable behaviour. Hostility towards their children was arguably perceived as a critique of them as parents and carers. Martine, a mother of one, reflected on how animosity became evident when she took her baby son to a cafe:

> Just a nasty look and just tutting at me really … it wasn't a direct confrontation, but she made it very clear that she disapproved of the noise. And I think she even held her ears. And I was just depressed at the time, so I think the combination just made me feel awful. So in my mind it was a particularly bad thing, and I didn't go back there for a long time. (Martine)

Martine was struggling with post-natal depression, so such negative reactions were amplified by her psychological state of mind. Nevertheless, her reflections point to the darker side of customer co-production and perceptions of how other consumers contribute to experiences. Just as positive human encounters and small gestures of hospitality noted previously helped to create positive affective relations, minute, covert acts of resentment by other patrons could also make places inhospitable. For many parents, perceived hostile gestures also had longer-term consequences: discouraging them from visiting venues in the future and prompting negative word-of-mouth.

This potential for tension between patrons with children and those without also raise important ethical and practical management issues for operators. If, as numerous authors have pointed out (cf. Anderson *et al.*, 2013; Rosenbaum *et al.*, 2011), hospitality and services management should seek to increase consumers' wellbeing, operators may need to prioritise the interests of certain patrons over others. Operators may well question whose wellbeing should be prioritised. Family parties and

disruptive children may undermine the experiences of multiple guests, thus jeopardising their satisfaction and the business' income. However, it is also important to stress that Martina's experiences are not unique and there are numerous references to the negative consequences for parents and mothers in particular who feel stigmatised and socially excluded from hospitality spaces because they were performing childcare (cf. Lane, 2014; Lugosi, 2010; Small & Harris, 2014). The disruption caused by children, though undoubtedly unpleasant to some, is arguably a more trivial, short-term inconvenience compared to the deeper psychological consequences of hostile acts that can fundamentally change perceptions of public space for parents. Furthermore, operators should also be mindful that the (perceived) exclusion of parents and childcare providers can provoke negative public reactions, particularly through social media, which pose reputational risks for organisations and brands. Operators should therefore be mindful of how they manage the experiences of parents, care-providers and children alongside patrons without children.

5. Conclusions

As noted at the outset, family consumers are an important segment for hospitality, tourism and leisure providers. However, the experiences of parents and carers with children within hospitality venues have thus far remained under-examined. This paper has addressed this substantial gap in knowledge, examining how multiple human and non-human factors interact to shape their experiences. The data demonstrate the transformative impacts that gestures of hospitality in welcoming parents and carers, acknowledging children as sovereign consumers and tailoring the servicescape, products and services can have on individuals' experiences, satisfaction and future behavioural intentions. The study has also demonstrated how gestures of (in)hospitality from other patrons may also play a key role in shaping perceptions of venues. Importantly, this study has, firstly, placed consumers' voices at the centre of enquiry, enabling us to generate themes, inductively, based on consumers' thoughts and feelings stemming from their direct experiences. Secondly, our data collection and analysis has continued to recognise the multidimensionality of experiences for parents and carers consuming with children. In short, we fully recognised that such consumption blurs the divide between care-'work' and leisure consumption. We were thus mindful to avoid reducing the consumption experience to the choice, purchase and consumption of food and drink. Instead we acknowledged how the coexistence of hospitality consumption and childcare provision invokes other social pressures, for example the desire to assure the wellbeing of children as well as to conform to discourses of the 'good' parent (Collett, 2005; Goodwin & Huppatz, 2010; Tardy, 2000), whilst performing childcare in public settings.

5.1 Implications for practice

The findings of this study have a number for implications for management practice, whilst opening numerous new avenues for future research. The findings from the study can inform experience design and human resource management. Frontline

staff can be sensitised to recognise the work of childcare provision and to adjust their interactional routines accordingly. This may simply involve prioritising and engaging with children when ordering, preparing and serving food to ensure they are placated, which in turn may take some pressure off parents and carers, who would otherwise have to ensure by themselves that children wait patiently. Furthermore, interactional routines by frontline staff could pay increasing attention to the child as an independent decision-maker. Engaging directly with children may help to improve their satisfaction, which can subsequently influence the satisfaction of parents and carers, leading to increased loyalty and positive word-of-mouth. However, sensitising frontline staff to the pressures of childcare can also encourage them to offer specialist services, such as the provision of hot water or cleaning materials. These small gestures of personalised hospitality can also help to generate positive reactions among parents and carers, thus contributing to positive affective relations and behaviours.

Recognising the needs of parents and carers may also inform venue design. As our data show, design features such as open kitchens and colourful wall decorations can act as value-adding characteristics to engage and amuse children, which again contribute to their overall satisfaction, and simultaneously to that of their carers. Keeping children happy and engaged is also likely to benefit other consumers.

Venues that accommodate a mixed client base, which include carers and children, may also consider the benefits of adopting a policy of 'controlled separation'. Such separation strategies can be perceived positively or negatively. On the one hand they may be perceived by customers, particularly those with children, as being discriminatory, favouring one group over another because of the children in their party. On the other hand, however, separation may be received more positively by both customers with and without children because they reduce the risks of potential conflicts caused by noise and interactions. Parents and carers may be able to relax knowing that their children are contained in a 'surveillable' area where they will not disrupt others; and 'strangers', who may be considered by carers as sources of risk to children, are kept separated from them.

Experience designers may also wish to focus on consumer socialisation, either using signage or training frontline staff to help socialise children and carers to adopt certain codes of behaviour. However, socialisation may extend to communicating to customers without children that venues are child or family-centric and hostility towards children or breastfeeding mothers will not be tolerated. Again, this may be communicated through signage, but notions of welcome towards children and families may actually be transmitted most potently by the gestures of hospitality performed by frontline staff.

5.2 Implications for theory

With the growing recognition that services and experiences are co-created through the interaction of human and non-human elements (cf. Chathoth *et al.*, 2013; Lugosi, 2014; Walls *et al.*, 2011a), this study helps researchers to appreciate how disparate elements interact to make and transform experiences. The implication is that through our data we present a dynamic conception of experience creation rather than

reducing it to a static series of quality dimensions that are staged, provided, measured and thus controlled by the organisation. This lends itself to a practice-centric conception of and approach to understanding how experiences are constructed and performed in particular spaces (cf. Lugosi, 2014).

Moreover, recent studies have begun to pay greater attention to the role of children in influencing hospitality related consumption experiences and decision-making processes (Chen *et al.*, 2015; Khoo-Lattimore *et al.*, 2015; Lugosi *et al.*, 2015). Building on this, our data suggest the need to adopt a more dynamic view of the family as a decision making unit. More specifically, our data point to the need to acknowledge the power exercised by children, both directly, but also indirectly as childcare providers' choices are shaped by their performance of parental responsibilities. Our study stresses the need to appreciate the important framing effect that parental identity and the performance of childcare provision has on consumption experiences. Parents' and care-providers' motivations, expectations, decision making, and their conceptions of consumption-related risks and rewards are fundamentally shaped by consuming as childcare providers, in a consumption unit where the wants, needs, perceptions and embodied performances of carers and children intersect.

5.3 Limitations and future research directions

The study's limitations should also be acknowledged. The study drew on a relatively small sample and, as we noted in the methods section, the sample had a greater proportion of women and respondents with higher educational levels. Our sampling thus likely introduced gender and class biases. Also, the study was conducted in western and predominantly Anglospheric cultural settings and, despite the ethnic diversity of the sample, the importance of the cultural context and different normative assumptions regarding parenting and hospitality could not be adequately explored here. Thus future research could consider broader samples or settings, for example Hispanic or Confucian heritage contexts, in which caring can be provisioned by communities, or extended family members, rather than parents *per se* (cf. Wang *et al*., 2014). Finally, we should also acknowledge that we have not examined in particular detail how differences in the ages of children may influence consumer behaviours and experiences. It is important to recognise that the challenges and opportunities of patronage with children change significantly during the life course.

Despite these limitations, future research can draw upon the thematic areas identified here to create quantitative instruments to test the significance of the various dimensions for different consumer groups. Survey or experimental approaches can be used to explore how other issues such as the age of the child, number of children, the cultural context, including nationality and ethnicity, and the type of venue may impact upon how customers evaluate different factors in their experience. Further studies could also explore in greater detail how experiences can influence future behavioural intentions, loyalty and word-of-mouth.

Further research can adopt qualitative approaches to explore the experiences of parenting within hospitality venues in non-western cultural contexts. The issue of non-consumption and the reasons that parents and carers deliberately avoid some venues

and commercial hospitality altogether are also significant areas to explore in subsequent research. Future studies may also consider the perspectives of other patrons and how the behaviour of carers and children impact upon their experiences. Studies could also consider how frontline staff recognise and respond to the presence of families and children, including the interactional routines and coping mechanisms they utilise to assure the positive experiences of carers, children and other patrons.

References

Anderson, L., Ostrom, A. L., Corus, C., Fisk, R. P., Gallan, A. S., Giraldo, M., ... & Williams, J. D. (2013). Transformative service research: An agenda for the future. *Journal of Business Research*, *66*(8), 1203-1210.

Blumer, H. (1954). What is wrong with social theory. *American Sociological Review*, *18*, 3-10.

Boyer, K. (2011). "The way to break the taboo is to do the taboo thing": Breastfeeding in public and citizen-activism in the UK. *Health & Place*, *17*(2), 430-437.

Boyer, K. (2012). Affect, corporeality and the limits of belonging: Breastfeeding in public in the contemporary UK. *Health & Place*, *18*(3), 552-560.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *3*, 77-101.

Buchthal, K. (2006). The ten-minute manager's guide to...being child-friendly. *Restaurants & Institutions*, *116*(4), 20-21.

Buhalis, D., Darcy, S., & Ambrose, I. (Eds.). (2012). *Best Practice in Accessible Tourism: Inclusion, Disability, Ageing Population and Tourism*. Bristol: Channel View Publications.

Carr, N. (2011). *Children's and Families' Holiday Experiences*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Carrigan, M., & Szmigin, I. (2006). "Mothers of invention": Maternal empowerment and convenience consumption. *European Journal of Marketing*, *40*(9/10), 1122–1142.

Carrigan, M., Szmigin, I., & Leek, S. (2006). Managing routine food choices in UK families: The role of convenience consumption. *Appetite*, *47*(3), 372-383.

Chathoth, P., Altinay, L., Harrington, R.J., Okumus, F., & Chan, E.S. (2013). Co-production versus co-creation: A process based continuum in the hotel service context. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, *32*, 11-20.

Chen, Y.S., Lehto, X., Behnke, C., & Tang, C.H. (2015). Investigating children's role in family dining-out choices: Evidences from a casual dining restaurant. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, DOI: 10.1080/19368623.2016.1077368.

Collett, J.L. (2005). What kind of mother am I? Impression management and the social construction of motherhood. *Symbolic Interaction*, *28*(3), 327-347.

Davidson, P. (1996). The holiday and work experiences of women with young children. *Leisure Studies*, *15*, 89-103.

Denzin, N. (2009). *The Research Act* (3rd edn). Piscataway, NJ: Transaction.

Gibbs, D., & Ritchie, C. (2010). Theatre in restaurants: Constructing the experience. In M. Morgan, P. Lugosi, & J.R.B. Ritchie (Eds.), *The Tourism and Leisure Experience: Consumer and Managerial Perspectives* (pp. 181-201). Bristol: Channel View.

Gilmore, J.H., & Pine, J. (2002). Differentiating hospitality operations via experiences: Why selling services is not enough. *Cornell Hotel & Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, *43*(3), 87-96.

Goodwin, S., & Huppatz, K. (Eds.). (2010). *The Good Mother: Contemporary Motherhoods in Australia*. Sydney: Sydney University Press.

Grieshaber, S., (1997). Mealtime rituals: Power and resistance in the construction of mealtime rules. *British Journal of Sociology*, *48*(4), 649-666.

Hanefors, M., & Mossberg, L. (2003). Searching for the extraordinary meal experience. *Journal of Business & Management*, *9*(3), 249-270.

Harrington, J. (2013). Pubs 'must do more' for young families. *The Publican's Morning Advertiser*, 18 September 2013, http://www.morningadvertiser.co.uk/General-News/Pubs-must-do-more-for-young-families.

Hemmington, N. (2007). From service to experience: Understanding and defining the hospitality business. *The Service Industries Journal*, *27*(6), 747-755.

Holloway, S., & Valentine, G. (Eds.) (2000). *Children's Geographies*. London: Routledge.

Holloway, I., Brown, L., & Shipway, R. (2010). Meaning not measurement: Using ethnography to bring a deeper understanding to the participant experience of festivals and events. *International Journal of Event & Festival Management*, *1*(1), 74-85.

Johnstone, M.L., & Todd, S. (2012). Servicescapes: The role that place plays in stay-at-home mothers' lives. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, *11*, 443–453.

Josselson, R. (2013). *Interviewing for Qualitative Inquiry: A Relational Approach*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Karsten, L., & Felder, N. (2015). Parents and children consuming the city: Geographies of family outings across class. *Annals of Leisure Research*, *18*(2), 205-218.

Karsten, L., Kamphuis, A., & Remeijnse, C. (2015). 'Time-out'with the family: The shaping of family leisure in the new urban consumption spaces of cafes, bars and restaurants. *Leisure Studies*, *34*(2), 166-181.

Khoo-Lattimore, C., Prayag, G., & Cheah, B. L. (2015). Kids on board: Exploring the choice process and vacation needs of Asian parents with young children in resort hotels. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, *24*(5), 511-531.

King, N. (2004). Using templates in the thematic analysis of texts. In C. Cassell & G. Symon (Eds.), *Essential Guide to Qualitative Methods in Organizational Research*, (pp. 256-270). London: Sage.

Knutson, B.J., Beck, J.A., Kim, S., & Cha, J. (2009). Identifying the dimensions of the guest's hotel experience. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly, 50*(1), 44–55.

Lane, R. (2014). Healthy discretion? Breastfeeding and the mutual maintenance of motherhood and public space. *Gender, Place & Culture*, *21*(2), 195-210.

Larson, R., Gillman, S., & Richards, M. (1997). Divergent experiences of family leisure: Fathers, mothers, and young adolescents. *Journal of Leisure Research*, *29*(1), 78-97.

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

Laurier, E., & Philo, C. (2006). Cold shoulders and napkins handed: Gestures of responsibility. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, *31*(2), 193-208.

Lee, E., Bristow, J., Faircloth, C., & Macvarish, J. (2014). *Parenting Culture Studies*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic Inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (2013). *The Constructivist Credo*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

Lofland, J. (2006). *Analyzing Social Settings* (4th edn). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Longhurst, R. (2007). *Maternities*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Lugosi, P. (2007). Consumer participation in commercial hospitality. *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research*, *1*(3), 227-236.

Lugosi, P. (2009). The production of hospitable space: Commercial propositions and consumer co-creation in a bar operation. *Space & Culture*, *12*(4), 396-411.

Lugosi, P. (2010). Women, children and hospitable spaces. *The Hospitality Review*, *12*(1), 31-38.

Lugosi, P. (2014). Mobilising identity and culture in experience co-creation and venue operation. *Tourism Management*, *40*, 165-179.

Lugosi, P., Robinson, R.N., Golubovskaya, M., Foley, L., & Harwell, J. (2015). Experiencing parenthood, care and spaces of hospitality. *The Sociological Review*, DOI: 10.1111/1467-954X.12330 (Article in-press).

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

MacQueen, K.M., McLellan-Lemal, E., Bartholow, K., & Milstein, B. (2008). Team-based codebook development: Structure, process, and agreement. In G. Guest & K. M. MacQueen (Eds.), *Handbook for team-based qualitative research* (pp. 119–35). Lanham, MD: AltaMira Press.

Mahon-Daly, P., & Andrews, G. J. (2002). Liminality and breastfeeding: Women negotiating space and two bodies. *Health & Place*, *8*(2), 61-76.

McKendrick, J.H., Bradford, M. G., & Fielder, A.V. (2000). Kid customer? Commercialization of playspace and the commodification of childhood. *Childhood*, *7*(3), 295-314.

McWattie, S. (2014). Seven ways for attracting families to pubs. *The Publican's Morning Advertiser*, 04 March 2014, http://www.morningadvertiser.co.uk/Pub-Food/Seven-ways-for-attracting-families-to-pubs.

Miao, L. (2014). Emotion regulation at service encounters: Coping with the behavior of other customers. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, *23*(1), 49-76.

Miao, L., & Mattila, A.S. (2013). The impact of other customers on customer experiences: A psychological distance perspective. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, *37*(1), 77-99.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative Data Analysis* (2nd ed.).Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Miller, T. (2005). *Making Sense of Motherhood*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Miller, T. (2011). *Making Sense of Fatherhood*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Miller, T. (2014). Engaging with the maternal: Tentative mothering acts, props and discourses. In S. O'Donohoe, M. Hogg, P. Maclaran, L. Martens, & L. Stevens (Eds.), *Motherhoods, Markets and Consumption* (pp. 159-170). London: Routledge.

Morgan, M., Lugosi, P., & Ritchie, J.R.B. (Eds.). (2010). *The Tourism and Leisure Experience: Consumer and Managerial Perspectives.* Bristol: Channel View.

Mottiar, Z., & Quinn, D. (2012). Is a self-catering holiday with the family really a holiday for mothers? Examining the balance of household responsibilities while on holiday from a female perspective. *Hospitality & Society*, *2*(2), 197–214.

Nash, M. (2012). *Making 'Postmodern' Mothers: Pregnant Embodiment, Baby Bumps and Body Image*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.

NDP Group (2014). Consumer Reports on Eating Share Trends (CREST), October, 2014. West Byfleet, NDP Group.

Oh, H., Fiore, A.M., & Jeoung, M. (2007). Measuring experience economy concepts: Tourism applications. *Journal of Travel Research, 46*, 119–132.

Osman, H., Johns, N., & Lugosi, P. (2014). Commercial hospitality in destination experiences: McDonald's and tourists' consumption of space. *Tourism Management*, *42*, 238-247.

Patton, M.Q. (2002). *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods* (3rd edn). London: Sage.

Pinard, C.A., Byker, C., Harden, S.M., Carpenter, L.R., Serrano, E.L., Schober, D.J., & Yaroch, A.L. (2015). Influences on food away from home feeding practices among English and Spanish speaking parent–child dyads. *Journal of Child & Family Studies*, *24*(7), 2099-2106.

Quinlan Cutler, S., & Carmichael, B. A. (2010). The dimensions of the tourist experience. In: M. Morgan, P. Lugosi, & J. R. B. Ritchie (Eds.), *The Tourism and Leisure Experience: Consumer and Managerial Perspectives* (pp. 3–26). Bristol: Channel View.

Quinn, C. (2013). How to appeal to families: Turning the rugrats into cash cows. *The Publican's Morning Advertiser*, 04 November 2013, http://www.morningadvertiser.co.uk/Business-Support/How-to-appeal-to-families-Turning-the-rugrats-into-cash-cows.

Richardson, L. (1997). *Fields of Play: Constructing an Academic Life*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Robinson, R.N.S., Solnet, D., & Breakey, N. (2014). A phenomenological approach to hospitality management research: Chefs' occupational commitment. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, *43*, 65-75.

Rosenbaum, M. S., Corus, C., Ostrom, A. L., Anderson, L., Fisk, R. P., Gallan, A. S., ... & Williams, J. D. (2011). Conceptualisation and aspirations of transformative service research. *Journal of Research for Consumers*, *19*, 1-6.

Ryan, C. (2010). Tourism experience: A review of the literature. *Tourism Recreation Research*, *35*(1), 37–46.

Saldaña, J. (2009). *The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers*. London: Sage.

Sandiford, P. J., & Seymour, D. (2007). A discussion of qualitative data analysis in hospitality research with examples from an ethnography of English public houses. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, *26*(3), 724-742.

Schänzel, H., Yeoman, I., & Backer, E. (Eds.) (2012). *Family Tourism*. Bristol: Channel View.

Schänzel, H., & Carr, N. (2015). Special issue on children, families and leisure–first of two issues. *Annals of Leisure Research*, *18*(2), 171-174.

Schortman, A. (2010). "The children cry for Burger King": Modernity, development, and fast food consumption in Northern Honduras. *Environmental Communication*, *4*(3), 318-337.

Shaw, S.M. (1992). Dereifying family leisure: An examination of women's and men's everyday experiences and perceptions of family time. *Leisure Sciences*, *14*, 271-286.

Small, J., & Harris, C. (2014). Crying babies on planes: Aeromobility and parenting. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *48*, 27-41.

Spradley, J. (1979). *The Ethnographic Interview*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Tandon, P.S., Zhou, C., Chan, N.L., Lozano, P., Couch, S.C., Glanz, K., Krieger, J., & Saelens, B.E. (2011). The impact of menu labeling on fast-food purchases for children and parents. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, *41*(4), 434-438.

Tardy, R. (2000). 'But I am a good mom': The social construction of motherhood through health-care conversations. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, *28*, 433–73.

Thomsen, T.U., & Sørensen, E.B. (2006). The first four-wheeled status symbol: Pram consumption as a vehicle for the construction of motherhood identity. *Journal of Marketing Management*, *22*(9-10), 907-927.

Torres, E.N. (2015). The influence of others on the vacation experience: An ethnographic study of psychographics, decision-making, and group dynamics among young travelers. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, *24*(8), 826-856.

Walls, A. (2013). A cross-sectional examination of hotel consumer experience and relative effects on consumer values. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, *32*, 179-192.

Walls, A., Okumus, F., Wang, Y., & Kwun, D. (2011a). An epistemological view of consumer experiences. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, *30*(1), 10–21.

Walls, A., Okumus, F., Wang, Y., & Kwun, D. (2011b). Understanding the consumer experience: An exploratory study of luxury hotels. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, *20*(2), 166-197.

Wang, M. C., Naidoo, N., Ferzacca, S., Reddy, G., & Van Dam, R. M. (2014). The role of women in food provision and food choice decision-making in Singapore: A case study. *Ecology of Food & Nutrition*, *53*(6), 658-677.

Ziakas, V., & Boukas, N. (2013). Extracting meanings of event tourist experiences: A phenomenological exploration of Limassol carnival. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*, *2*(2), 94-107.

Table 1. Sample details

Name	Gender	Age	Highest Level of Education	Number of Children	Age(s)	Visitor Behaviour	Sample Group
Adam	M	55+	PG	1	12 Years	>1 per week/1 per week	UK
Nicola	F	35-44	PG	1	9 Years	>1 per week/1 per week	UK
Adele	F	45-54	PG	1	14 Years	>1 per week/1 per week	UK
Karen	F	35-44	PG	1	7 Months	>1 per week/1 per week	UK
Martine	F	35-44	PG	1	2 Years	>1 per week/1 per week	UK
Helen	F	35-44	PG	2	3 Years 6 Years	1-2 per month	UK
Chloe	F	35-44	Higher	1	2.5 Years	1-2 per month	UK
Brigitte	F	35-44	Higher	1	6 Years	>1 per week/1 per week	UK
Anna	F	45-54	Higher	2	5 Years 6 Years	1-2 per month	UK
Amanda	F	35-44	PG	2	4 Years 7 Years	1-2 per 3 months	UK
Jo	F	25-34	PG	1	1.5 Years	>1 per week/1 per week	UK

Henri & Paul	M & F	35-44	Higher	2	4 Years 5 Years	>1 per week/1 per week	UK
Rosa & Greg	M & F	35-44	Higher	4	7 Months 5 Years 12 Years 15 Years	>1 per week/1 per week	Australia
John	M	35-44	Secondary	2	1 Year 5 Years	1-2 per month	Australia
Margaret	F	25-34	PG	1	2 Years 11 Months	>1 per week/1 per week	Australia
Hassan	M	25-34	PG	2	2 Years 4 Years	>1 per week/1 per week	Australia
Noah	M	25-34	Primary	1	2.5 Years	Never	Australia
Olivia	F	55+	Higher	4 Children/ 2 Grandchildren	Grandchildren: 4 Years 11 years	1-2 per month	Australia
Karina	F	25-34	Higher	1	3 Years	1-2 per month	Australia
Eva	F	25-34	Higher	1	9 Years	>1 per week/1 per week	Australia
Ada	F	35-44	Higher	1	6.5 Years	>1 per week/1 per week	Australia
Corinne	F	35-44	Further	2	8 Years 15 Years	1-2 per month	Australia
Sophia	F	35-44	Higher	3	8 Months 2.5 Years 3.5 Years	>1 per week/1 per week	Australia

Gabriella	F	35-44	Further	2	2.5 Years 4.5 Years	1-2 per month	Australia
Monika	F	35-44	Higher	2	1.5 Years 2.5 Years	>1 per week/1 per week	Australia
Tessa	F	25-34	Higher	2	4 Years 5 Years	1-2 per month	Australia
Adrian	M	25-34	Higher	2	3 Years 3 Years	>1 per week/1 per week	Australia
Sara	F	35-44	Further	3	5 Years 8 Years 13 Years	1-2 per month	Australia