Toward a Theoretical Understanding of Occupational Culture: Meanings from the Hospitality Industry

Josephine Pryce, James Cook University, Qld, Australia

Abstract:

This paper examines the concept of occupational culture and how meanings from the hospitality industry contribute to expanding our theoretical understanding of this concept. The notion of occupational communities has received considerable attention in the literature. More recently research findings report the existence of occupational cultures. This paper argues that the two concepts are related but identifies a possible difference which can extinguish anomalies or uncertainties in associated debates. Support for the argument is gained from results of a qualitative study which indicated that there is a common occupational culture, which influences hotel workers to behave in a similar way regardless of the organisation they work for. A number of factors were identified that confirmed the existence of a hospitality occupational culture. These factors included: universal nature of hotel work; hospitality occupational attitudes; group longevity; and collegiality. From this it is proposed that there exists a hospitality occupational culture which transcends the culture of organisations within which these individuals work, which does not fully exhibit defining characteristics of occupational communities and which governs the behaviour and performance of hospitality workers. Such an insight adds to the paucity of literature and research on our understanding of the phenomenon of occupational cultures.

Keywords: Occupational Communities, Occupational Culture, Hospitality, Ethnographic

Introduction

The concept of industry-specific cultures is not new and has sometimes been subsumed under the concept of 'occupational communities'. Salaman (1974, p. 19) identifies occupational communities as, "People who are members of the same occupation, or who work together, have some sort of common life together and are to some extent separate from the rest of society". Schein (1992, p. 278) adds that occupational communities "have a common base of knowledge, a common jargon, similar background and training, and a sense of identifying with each other … have developed a shared set of basic assumptions". Van Maanen and Barley (1984, p. 287) take a similar perspective and define an occupational community as:

> A group of people who consider themselves to be engaged in the same sort of work, whose identity is drawn from their work; who share with one another a set of values, norms, and perspectives … these occupational communities create and sustain relatively unique work cultures consisting of, among other things, task rituals, standards for proper and improper behaviour, work codes surrounding relatively routine practices, and compelling accounts attesting to the logic and value of these rituals, standards, and codes.

These definitions present an image of occupational communities where individuals view themselves as members of an occupation rather than the organisation. Trice (1993, p. 24) supports this view and contends that "occupations (including professional ones) tend to form their own cultures, separate and distinct from an organization's culture". Likewise, Walsh and Gordon (1999, p. 12) recognize that an individual's occupation is an important source of identity and note that "occupations act as strong social groups". Additionally, Bechky (2003, p. 313) suggests that "occupational communities are an important social milieu within which knowledge at work is [constructed and] situated".

In a similar vein, the occupational view of work considers what work means to individuals. This is summarised by McColl et al (2003, p. 2) where occupation is defined "as a function of the person on one hand and the environment on the other". Of particular interest to this study is the socio-cultural component of their model because it "includes learned beliefs, attitudes, roles, and behaviours . . . [and] . . . concepts like time, roles, meaning, and spirituality may be considered parts of the socio-cultural component" (McColl et al, 2003, p. 3). Gomez-Mejia (1984, p. 707) supports the notion that social processing of information is a characteristic of occupations and explains that "individuals, as adaptive organisms, conform their attitudes and beliefs to their social context". He contends that members of a specific occupation share common values because of similarity in work and social environment. Further to this point, Van Maanen and Barley (1992) argue that members of an occupational community construct their self-image and identity from social roles they assume in the occupation.

Additionally, researchers report that an occupational community consists of individuals who view themselves as members of the same occupation, rather than members of the same organization (Salaman, 1974; Marschall, 2004). Salaman (1974) proposes that such a perspective fosters a work-based self-image where such an image is valued and shared by workers. Tolbert (1996, p. 342) adds that occupational networks are viewed as playing a more critical role as "determinants of career outcomes" than connections with an organisation.

Hence, there is much support in the literature for the importance of occupations and occupational communities. Recently, Marschall (2004) argued that the concept of occupational communities is a sensitizing concept rather than a definitive concept. He suggests that a definitive framework is prescriptive with "fixed benchmarks". By comparison, a sensitizing approach considers the influence of social factors on individual's behaviour at work. The present author agrees with Marschall (2004) in his contention that an occupational community is not a definitive concept and entertains the notion of it being a sensitizing concept. More pertinently, however, the author suggests that occupational culture is a valid term to use where defining characteristics of occupational communities are not evident.

In his discussion of occupational communities, Marschall (2004) makes the point that occupational communities exhibit characteristics of a life cycle with evidence of change or transformation over time. He reasons that:

> …computer technologists under study represent an *emergent* occupational community, a collectivity of workers in a discrete domain of work who bear many attributes associated with occupational community, but whose social relationships, organizational culture and occupational norms have not been sufficiently institutionalized to provide substantial, persistent control over their work processes and the capacity to transfer their skills from one generation of practitioners to another in a systematic, consistent and societally legitimated manner. (Marschall, 2004, p.17)

Similar findings emerged from this study and while Marschall's (2004) view of occupational communities transforming through a life cycle has merit, perhaps observations made by Marschall (2004) are a reflection of the limiting potential for occupational communities to sometimes evolve beyond a certain point and what is observed is more of an occupational culture.

Van Maanen and Barley (1984) presented the idea that an occupational community is influenced by a work culture and recognized that the strong ideology of such an occupational culture has a number of sources based in part upon the occupation's unique set of codes, including norms, values, work practices and language, from which members develop their own identity and specialties or expertise. An interesting observation from this discourse is the reference to 'culture' when talking of 'communities'.

In this study, the idea of work culture is extended to hotel workers who are considered to embrace a hospitality occupational culture. This research adds to findings reported by hospitality researchers such as Salaman (1974), Shamir (1975), Riley (1991) and Lee-Ross (2004). It presents a novel perspective on the hospitality industry drawn from ethnographic fieldwork and suggests that results indicate the presence of an occupational culture rather than an occupational community. In formulating what constitutes an occupational culture, this study considers the occupational culture of hospitality workers by presenting a contemporary profile of the frontline occupation of hotel workers.

Considering a Hospitality Occupational Culture

This study proposes that the ideology of hospitality work which is based on knowledge, skills, beliefs and practices of hotel workers acts as an integrating factor in formation of a 'hospitality occupational culture'. With a history steeped in a tradition of providing 'hospitality' to its customers (Lashley, 2000), it seems that in hospitality there is an unspoken 'way of doing things' (Schein, 1992) that reflects cultural norms and values of the industry. In a hospitality occupational culture, the espoused values would support a commitment to the provision of service through genuine hospitality. As Mars and Nicod (1984) note:

> [While the hospitality industry] includes widely differing organisations serving very diverse markets. We [may] … treat hotels as a single industry … because variations between hotels are less obvious than the characteristics they hold in common: *whatever* else a hotel … aims to do, it must always provide *service*. (p. 28)

Like other occupations, hospitality has set formal and/or informal rules and norms regarding appropriate behavior and has rituals, practices and procedures developed form these rules and norms, to advocate expected behaviour of hospitality workers. Rituals or practices associated with providing service in hospitality or hotel settings are endorsed by occupational tasks, duties, roles and responsibilities detailed in nationally accredited TAFE and vocational courses.

Further to this, hotels can be regarded as a particular type of hospitality setting, which can provide a familiar workplace environment for people working in the hotel industry and so can contribute to the occupational culture. This is partly illustrated by the internal structure of many hotels. Traditionally hotels are viewed as a conglomerate of functional areas, which govern their operation and management (Gull, 1995; Jones & Pizam, 1993). Such divisions of a hotel are reflected in such industry jargon as 'back-of-house areas' or 'front-line staff' (Boon, 2007; Lashley, 2000). Nevertheless, it is refreshing to see that some authors view hotels as "an interdisciplinary environment . . . where different departments show convergence, which is achieved despite diversity" (Lockyer, 2007, p. 6).

Additionally, hotel work like many other occupations within the service industry involves working with people within organisations. Pidd (2005, p. 19) contends that employees who spend many hours together at work can form significant social relationships, which can extend to sharing of leisure time after work and can 'shape' work-related cultures. Equally some researchers (e.g. Van Maanen & Barley, 1984) have argued that the same can be said for occupational communities. Blauner (1960) emphasizes that the defining characteristic of an occupational community is that workers socialize more with persons of their own occupations in non-work hours. Equally, Salaman (1974, p. 21) emphasized a fundamental determinant of occupational community is the way in which members "associate with, and make friends of, other members of their occupation in preference to having friends who are outsiders". This is key to understanding a possible theoretical difference between the concepts of 'occupational culture' and 'occupational community'.

Preliminary thoughts on 'Occupational Community' vs. 'Occupational Culture'

Watson (2008, p. 218) defines an occupational community as "a form of local social organisation in which people's work and non-working lives are both closely identified with members of the occupation in which they work". When one considers that hospitality work involves working unconventional hours, the opportunity is compelling for hospitality workers to socialize with each other out of work. Hence, it can be argued that if a hospitality occupational community exists, there would be evidence of social activities, interactions, and relationships that extend beyond work and into leisure time. As mentioned earlier, Marschall's (2004) work reported the absence of such socializing. Equally, Lee-Ross (2004) found that for hospitality workers there was limited 'fusion' between work and leisure. Similarly, Perkins (1984 cited in Marschall, 2004) noted that nurses exhibited only some characteristics of an occupational community. From this it can be reasoned that where an occupational community cannot fully be described as per the definitions of that phenomenon, perhaps it is an occupational culture that is being observed.

Manning (1995, p. 472) contends that occupational culture is:

> a sociological concept [that is] widely and inconsistently used [and] … Embedded in traditions and a history, occupational cultures contain accepted practices, rules, and principles of conduct that are situation ally applied, and generalized rationales and beliefs. Such cultures highlight selectively the contours of an environment, granting meaning of some facts and not others, and linking modes of seeing, doing, and believing.

Glomseth, Gottschalk and Solli-Sæth (2007) add that occupational culture is the attitudes and beliefs formed through adoption of specific tasks and routines. These thoughts are echoed by Watson (2008, p. 215) who defines occupational culture as providing "ideas, values, norms, procedures and artifacts to shape occupational activities and enable members to value the work that they do". Concordantly, Viitanen (2000, p.83) advances that "occupational culture is an occupational group with the rights and obligations that accompany an occupation . . . shares values and norms characteristic of the job and has special knowledge . . . to manage certain tasks". An important implication of these definitions is that there is no mention of merging of work and leisure for members of the occupational group. Preliminary observations of the hotel work groups in this study indicated existences of weak social ties beyond the work environment. So, in this paper, the idea of occupational culture rather than occupational communities is advanced. Viewed in this light, the present study aims to profile hospitality occupational culture within the hotel industry.

Research Approach

This paper presents findings from qualitative ethnographic research which engaged hotel workers from ten different hotels in Cairns. The hotels represented a convenience sample of four- to five-star ratings in the Cairns region with ratings based on definitions for hotel ratings as provided by the Royal Automobile Queensland (RACQ, 1997). Data for the study consisted of field notes and semi-structured interview transcripts which were collected over a period of three years while the researcher worked in the hotel industry. A total of seventy-four in-depth interviews were conducted with frontline hotel employees from various hotel departments.

Results

Findings from this research showed consistencies of perception amongst hotel workers across hotels. Four prominent themes emerged from the study: universal nature of hotel work; hospitality attitudes; group longevity; and collegiality. In summary, the four themes are described as follows:

- **universal nature of hotel work** involving similar procedures and practices in their job tasks, roles and responsibilities that are mitigated by the universal organizational structure of hotels and the very nature of hotel jobs and resulting in collective socialization into the occupation and leading to an identity derived from work;
- **hospitality occupational attitudes** relates to workers being hospitable or understanding what provision of hospitality is all about and that this understanding is at the very core of hospitality occupational culture, including hotel workers as being forthcoming in caring for and helping others; as masters of emotional labour in their ability to disguise true feelings despite adverse and challenging circumstances; and as gregarious individuals who enjoy talking and being around people;
- **group longevity** sustained as result of people working together or of moving from one hotel to another as a group or individually and so sharing a history of having worked together in one or more places, and so, further fostering a common work identity and promoting occupational relationships;
- **collegiality** where there is a sense of camaraderie due to individuals working in the same hotel or industry and sharing the same approach or attitudes to work, set of skills, interests (including educational and career) and hobbies leading to an evolution and nurturing of occupational and personal relationships, and perhaps, extending this to socializing beyond work hours.

This paper focuses on the latter as it strongly supports the contention made here that the two concepts of occupational communities and occupational culture are related but fundamentally different.

Collegiality

Shin et al. (2006) associate collegiality with unity, collaboration, and cooperation. Lorenzen (2006) also maintains that collegiality encompasses equal and fair treatment of co-workers. Equally, Dean (1995, pp. 28-29) says that, "Collegiality involves the building of a group identity, a collegial consciousness [where the] unity or ethos is marked by cooperation, support, equality and the sharing of knowledge with other practitioners in the field." Further, from Hiebert and Hollingsworth (2008, p. 78) it is derived that "Collegiality is critical to employee happiness" and that social support extended from collegiality helps to "reinforce the positive aspects of the self" (Halbesleben, 2006, cited in Hiebert and Hollingsworth, 2008, p. 78). When one considers the nature of hospitality work, it is not surprising to find that these definitions can be extended to relate to work in the hotel industry.

Working in hospitality is unique: labour intensive with long, irregular working hours, and working when most others are out socializing (Nankervis, 2000). These factors advance the

argument that the unique nature of hospitality work gives rise to special bonds or relationships in the form of collegiality developing between workers. More specifically, it seems likely that in such a work environment, a sense of camaraderie can evolve due to individuals working in the same hotel or industry and sharing the same approach or attitudes to work; sharing of same set of skills, knowledge and understanding of the industry; sharing of similar interests (including, educational and career); and, possibly sharing similar hobbies. All these factors could lead to the evolution and nurturing of occupational and personal relationships, and perhaps, extension of these relationships to socializing beyond work hours. Responses from this ethnographic study presented evidence for the presence of a sense of collegiality in varying degrees among hotel workers. It seems that the culture experienced by hotel workers encouraged them to engage in some social activity. As one receptionist stated:

> A few people have developed good friendships through working together and so socialize in and out of work. Generally, however, people only socialize at work functions or functions that are not-so-work related but happen because of people they know through work. The majority of people are just happy to attend work functions like the Christmas party and nothing else.

This suggests a limited amount of social interaction and indicates that the social activities which do occur are principally related to work. Nonetheless, there was evidence of support, cooperation and collaboration. These aspects of collegiality were highlighted by two food and beverage attendants:

> My experience with working in a number of hotels has been that may have minor differences or points of conflict but generally, everyone gets along with each other, regardless of nationality, age or gender or even regardless of the department they work in.

> This is one of the greatest hotels I've worked in where most workers in the hotel get along really well, regardless of the department they work for . . . people don't necessarily socialize together out of work but at work, they're like best friends – comrades!! They're always willing to help each other out with their work.

Most interviewees echoed sentiments of collegiality with mention of the importance of work relationships to their interest in work, eagerness to go to work, enthusiasm about the job, happiness while at work, and how all these factors impacted on their job satisfaction. A food and beverage attendant added:

> Occasionally, there are some disagreements between individuals but on the whole, people here get along. Most people have time and patience for each other and will pitch in if they need to, especially if there's tables to be set or cleared, food or drinks to be delivered, or people waiting to be seated.

Hence, it seems that collegiality is a critical factor in determining behaviour of hotel workers and could even be considered as a motivating factor. An aspect of collegiality which is of particular interest in this study is the extent to which socializing extended beyond work.

With the hotel industry's typical "long, erratic, and unsociable working hours" (Hughes, 2002, p. 19) and 'split-shift' approach, estrangement of hotel workers is a common characteristic of hotel work. From this it would not seem unusual to find 'collective socializing' as a predicator of collegiality. This was evident to some extent in this study and a receptionist echoed points made by other interviewees:

> It's very hard to unwind after a long day in the hotel. Usually when we finish work we'll go to a nightclub for a few drinks, unless you need to work in the morning.

Indeed, some workers formed groups that socialized on a regular basis. Another receptionist further described this as follows:

> There's a little group of us that go out on a regular basis for drinks after work or when we're not working. Some of us have known each other for a long time. For example, Mick and I worked at the Ranches together. We always went out after work then and still do. In fact, I found out about this job through Mick.

Even where individuals did not socialize together, characteristics of hospitality work provided workers with common ground and enforced their solidarity. A food and beverage attendant summed this up as follows:

> I'm much older than the others and though they always invite me out, I have a young family and do not to socialize with them. But even though I don't go out with them, they still ask me out and make me feel like I'm part of their family.

The reference to family is of interest here because Pithouse (1994, p. 20) notes that "Colleagueship means leaning that the team acts as the 'happy family', a necessary artifice to defend against the uncertainties and dilemmas that arise from working with real families". Pithouse (1994) is referring to the collegiality of social workers but parallels can be drawn between that work and the emotionally trying work of hotel workers. It too is fraught with unpredictable interactions that can be complex and challenging.

The comments above have afforded some insights into the nature of collegiality in hospitality and added meanings to our understanding of the nature and pervasiveness of this aspect of hospitality occupational culture. In light of Van Maanen and Barley (1984, p. 287) definition of occupational communities, it seems that the very nature of occupational communities creates does sustain unique work cultures. With such a view, the perspective in which hospitality workers consider their work is raised. Perhaps, for hospitality workers,

work is not just about careers, money, power, status, and other rewards. Instead, as the above comments suggest, it is possible that for hospitality workers, work is about interacting with others, cooperation, collaboration, supporting each other, and collegiality.

While in some cases, it seems that this collegiality is such that life is an extension of work, generally, collegiality was limited to the workplace. For example, a food and beverage attendant commented:

> I'm a uni student, as are probably half of us in this department. I work here to support myself while at university. And I like the people who work in this department and in fact, in this hotel, but my studies are my life and I don't socialise with anyone form here. On the whole, I would say that people keep to themselves and there is very, very little socialising out of work. Most have families, friends and a life outside of work.

Similarly, a receptionist said:

> I get along with the people here but work is work. Other than work, I don't have anything in common with people here. So after work, my time is my own, and I choose to be with people other than the people from work.

This is an interesting finding as it lends support to the idea that what is being observed in this study is in fact an occupational culture rather than an occupational community. Revisiting Blauner's (1960) reasoning and Salaman's (1974) contention that the defining characteristic of an occupational community is that workers socialize more with persons of their own occupations in non-work hours, it would seem this essential element of an occupational community is generally absent. Interestingly, Lee-Ross (2004) also found that social cohesion does not always extend to out of work situations. More pertinently, in their study on pub workers Sandiford and Seymour (2007, p. 222) found that while socializing out of work for these live-in employees was the norm, there was "no direct evidence of a sense of belonging". These observations add substance to the proposition being advanced here that it is occupational culture and not occupational community which is being 'observed' in the hospitality industry. Further, it raises the question of what are the defining characteristics of these two related but different concepts.

Summary and Conclusions

This research has explored, described and analysed hospitality work as it applies to hotels in the Cairns region. It has presented a portrayal of the realities and everyday occurrences experienced by hotel workers and the meanings these hold for them. The knowledge gained provides a deepened and richer understanding of the working lives of hotel workers and hospitality occupational culture.

Findings from this study showed compelling commonalities across the hotel industry which revealed the existence of an overarching hospitality occupational culture rather than an occupational community. It found that such a culture transcends organizations and pervades the hotel industry in Cairns. Close examination of the notion of 'collegiality' presented persuasive support for the rationalization that occupational culture and occupational

communities are distinct concepts, worthy of individual consideration and merit. Further, it is argued that there exists a relationship between the two such that occupational culture is the fundamental phenomenon, which drives the formation and perpetuation of occupational communities.

In an attempt to rationalize these results, the researcher proposes that due to the nature of hospitality work, it is possible that there exists a culture that tends to coalesce around the occupation as a whole. Perhaps it is the occupation of 'hospitality worker', which imbues an occupational identity cuing individuals to perform in a particular way. Ashforth and Humphrey (1995) comment that individuals personify the occupation and that their behaviour is wedged at both the interpersonal level (between individuals) and at the intergroup level (between role occupants). Ashforth and Kreiner (1999, p.418) add, "People sharing a common social category and social pressures come to regard themselves as "in the same boat" – as sharing a common fate". Similarly, Trice and Beyer (1993) describe distinctive and localized occupational or workgroup cultures that are embedded within the larger organizational culture. As Van Maanen and Barley (1984, p.288) argue perhaps individual's behaviour in organisations is best viewed "through an occupational rather than organizational lens". In the case of hospitality, it appears that such is the case for hotel workers in that there exists a hospitality occupational culture which transcends departments and/or organisations. So, the behaviour of hospitality workers has its roots in a realm deeper than that which could be provided by the organisation through any of its systems, practices or processes. Rather, the behaviour of hotel workers is embedded in their work identity and more particularly, the hospitality occupational culture that subsumes hotel work.

-

A key outcome of this study is the sociological aspects of hotel work. Previous researchers have emphasized that defining characteristic of occupational communities is the interplay and blurring of boundaries between work and leisure. From this study, it was apparent that while in some cases hotel workers socialized with each other out of work, the majority identified a sense of collegiality that was limited to the workplace. Consideration has been given to other authors who have conducted studies on occupational communities in the hospitality industry (e.g. Lee-Ross, 2004, 2008; Sandiford & Seymour, 2007; Shamir, 1981). It was noted that Lee-Ross (2004) found that social cohesion does not always permeate out of work situations. He explains that this could be a result of no live-in arrangements for hotel workers. Further, in his study on workers aboard cruise ships, Lee-Ross (2008) found that the artificial environment created by being on board a vessel 'fused' work and leisure activities. Importantly, Lee-Ross (2008) raises the question whether this fusion is temporary and only present while the crew was on board. Equally, Sandiford and Seymour (2007, p. 222) questioned the depth of the relationships formed amongst pub workers and lack of "a sense of belonging", indicating that the work-leisure relationships were merely superficial. These findings indicate that the occupations under study represent hospitality occupational culture rather than hospitality occupational communities.

This research has led the author to conclude that there is merit in the idea proposed by Marschall (2004) in that occupational community is not a definitive concept but rather a sensitizing concept where "occupational groups…undergo a life cycle of development or

"career"". Perhaps the occupational groups observed here and by other hospitality researchers mentioned above are evidence of an emergent occupational community similar to Marschall's software development workers. The question then is when do workgroups become occupational communities? Pursuing the line of the thinking suggested by Marschall's (2004) occupational life cycle theory, it is proposed that occupational groups do evolve over time and that occupational culture is the underlying mechanism observed in occupational groups who may or may not progress through a series of stages or successions which, in turn, may or may not culminate in the penultimate of occupational groups such as would be expected of a professional occupational community. Hence, like a biological community (e.g. Horn, 1974), such an occupational community would be subject to stages of succession (or patterns of change) and be evidenced in its late stage of succession by a more mature community or what the biologists term a 'climax' community.

It is further rationalized that the life cycle of occupational communities may experience a decline as implied by Marshall (2004) or even be ephemeral (Cotter, personal communication). For example, Trice (1993) identifies 'esoteric knowledge' as a dimension which promotes group identity. What happens when that esoteric knowledge becomes general knowledge? It could be argued that this can have a domino affect and impact on other dimensions associated with occupational community. For instance, if further consideration is given to Trice's (1993) framework, this could impact on the 'consciousness of kind'; 'primary reference group'; 'pervasiveness', 'extreme or unusual demands' and/or 'social image' of the occupation. In other words, this change in the standing of knowledge could contribute to an erosion or demise of the workgroups' occupational community.
Hence, this study concludes with the realization that occupational cultures are pervasive and powerful forces in the workforce and that they are the mechanisms which drive occupational communities through their life cycles.

Implications for managers

This naturalistic enquiry presents an insight into the working lives of hospitality workers and their working environment, and provides knowledge and understanding for managers to consider in their roles as hospitality mangers. It presents an understanding to managers of what is occupational culture and its pervasive power. Armed with such awareness, perhaps managers can create healthier workplaces by realizing potentially conflicting demands on hospitality workers between the expectations of their organizations, customers and their occupational culture. Acknowledgement and responsiveness of the occupational culture which embraces many of the facets of frontline hospitality work can assist managers in preventing or alleviating workplace problems. So, attention to occupational culture related challenges faced by workers at the frontline can inform managers on such issues as recruitment, selection, training, employee engagement, and retention.

Future research

This study has presented some preliminary findings on the nature of hospitality occupational culture and its relationship to occupational communities. It is recommended that future research considers some of the extant literature on occupational cultures,

occupational communities, and the models embedded therein, e.g. Trice's grid model, which was successfully used by Guzman et al. (2006) to identify the characteristics of occupational subcultures of IT workers. In particular, it is recommended that further consideration be given to Marschall's (2004) occupational culture life cycle and that future research explores occupational cultures or communities, seeking evidence to substantiate this theory. It would be of value to explore this further, especially in terms of traditional, contemporary and emerging occupations and professions.

References

Ashforth, B. E. & Humphrey, R. H. (1995). Emotion in the workplace: A reappraisal. *Human Relations*, *48*(2), 97-125.

Ashforth, B. E. & Kreiner, G. E. (1999). "How can you do it?": Dirty work and the challenge of constructing a positive identity. *Academy of Management Review*, *24*(3), 413-435.

Bechky, B. A. (2003). Sharing meaning across occupational communities: The transformation of understanding on a production floor. *Organization Science*, *14*(3), 312-330.

Blauner, R. (1960). Work satisfaction and industrial trends. In W. Galenson, & S. H Lipset (Eds.), *Labor and Trade Unions*, New York: Wiley.

Boon, B. (2007). Working within the front-of-house/back-of-house boundary: Room attendants in the hotel guest room space. *Journal of Management and Organization*, *13*(2), 160-174.

Dean, J. (1995). What makes a profession? *Fund Raising Management*, *November*, 28-30.

Glomseth, R., Gottschalk, P. & Solli-Sæth, H. (2007). Occupational culture as determinant of knowledge sharing and performance in police investigations. *International Journal of the Sociology of Law*, *35*, 96-107.

Gomez-Mejia, L. R. (1984). Effect of occupation on task related, contextual and job involvement orientation: A cross-cultural perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, *27*(4), 706-720.

Gull, G. A. (1995). In search of TQM success. *Executive Excellence*, *12*(7), 17-18.

Guzman, I. R., Sharif, R., Kwiathowska, A., & Qing, L. (2006). *Occupational culture and commitment in the IT profession: A multi-country perspective*. Paper presented at the 2006 Americas Conference on Information Systems, Acapulco, Mexico.

Hiebert, J. & Hollingsworth, Y. (2008). "Friends in Deed" for librarians in need. *The Bottom Line Managing Library Finances*, *21*(3), 77-81.

Horn, H.S. 1974. The ecology of secondary succession. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics*, *5*, 25–37.

Hughes, J.M. Christensen (2002). Recruitment and selection issues and strategies within international resort communities. In S. Watson, N. D'Annunzio-Green and G. Maxwell, *Human Resource Management: International Perspectives in Hospitality and Tourism* (pp. 15-34). London: Continuum.

Jones, P. and Pizam, A. (1993). The international hospitality industry: *Organisational and operational issues*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Lashley, C. (2000). Towards a theoretical understanding. In C. Lashley, & A. Morrison. (Eds.), *In Search of Hospitality: Theoretical Perspectives and Debates* (pp. 1-17). Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Lee-Ross, D. (2000). Development of the service predisposition instrument. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *15*(2), 148-60.

Lee-Ross, D. (2004). A preliminary cross-cultural study of occupational community dimensions and hotel work. *Cross Cultural Management*, *11*(4), 77-90.

Lee-Ross. D. (2008). Occupational communities and cruise tourism: testing a theory. *Journal of Management Development*, *27*(5), 467-479.

Lockyer, T. (2007). The international hotel industry: Sustainable management. New York: Haworth Press.

Lorenzen, M. (2006), "Collegiality and the academic library", *Electronic Journal of Academic and Special Librarianship*, 7*(2)*, 1-7.

Manning, P. (1995). Occupational culture. In W. G. Bailey (Ed.), *The Encyclopaedia of Police Science* (2nd Ed.), pp. 472-474. London: Taylor & Francis.

Mars, G. & Nicod, M. (1984). *The World of Waiters.* London: Allen & Unwin.

Marschall, D. (2004). *Fifty years of occupational community studies: A natural history of a sociological concept*. Paper submitted for consideration for presentation at ASA, San Francisco, California.

McColl, M. A., Law, M., Stewart, D., Doubt, L., Pollock, N., & Krupa, T. (2003). *Theoretical basis of occupational therapy* (2nd Ed.). Thorofare, NJ: SLACK Inc.

Nankervis, A. R. (2000). Human resource management strategies as a competitive advantage: A case example of the hospitality sector in SE Asia and Pacific Rim. *Research and Practice in Human Resource Management*, *8*(1), 111-133.

Pidd, K. (2005). Workplace culture and alcohol use. *Of Substance*, *3*(1), 18-21.

Pithouse, A. (1994). The happy family: Learning colleagueship in a social work team. In A. Coffey & P. Atkinon (Eds.), *Occupational socialization and working lives* (pp. 6-22). Aldershot, UK: Ashagate Publishing Company.

Riley, M. (1991). *Human Resource Management: A Guide to Personnel Practice in the Hotel and Catering Industry*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Royal Automobile Club of Queensland, (RACQ). (1997). *Accommodation and Touring Guide*, 8th Edition. Brisbane: RACQ.

Salaman, G. (1974). *Community and Occupation: An exploration of work/leisure relationships*. London: Cambridge University Press.

Sandiford, P. & Seymour, D. (2007). The concept of occupational community revisited: Analytical and managerial implications in face-to-face service occupations. *Work, Employment and Society*, *21*(2), 209-226.

Schein, E. H. (1992). *Organizational Culture and Leadership* (2nd Ed). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Shamir, B. (1975). *A study of working environments and attitudes to work of employees in a number of British Hotels*. PhD Thesis, School of Economics, University of London.

Shamir, B. (1981). The workplace as a community: The case of British hotels. *Industrial Relations Journal*, *12*(6), 45-56.

Shin, A. Y. et al. (2006). The Boston marathon study: A novel approach to research during residency. *Pediatrics*, *117*(5), 1818-1822.

Tolbert, P. S. (1996). Occupations, Organizations, and Boundaryless Careers. In M. B. Arthur & D. M. Rousseau (Eds.) *The boundaryless career: A new employment principle for a new organizational era* (pp. 331-349). New York: Oxford University Press.

Trice, H. M. (1993). *Occupational subcultures in the workplace*. Ithaca, NY: ILR Press.

Trice, H. M. & Beyer, J. M. (1993). *The Cultures of Work Organization*. Engelwood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Van Maanen, J. & Barley, E. R. (1984). *Research in Orgaizational Behavior*, *6*, 287-365.

Walsh, K. & Gordon, J. R. (1999). The work identity of professional service providers. Working paper accessed March 2003 and available from Cornell Hotel School at: http://www.hotelschool.cornell.edu/chr/pdf/showpdf/chr/research/working/workidentity.pdf?my_path_info=chr/research/working/workidentity.pdf

Watson, T. (2008). *Sociology, work and industry* (5th Ed.). New York: Routledge.

Vittanen, E. (2000). Characteristic of the occupational culture of physiotherapy in health centres. *Advances in Physiotherapy*, *2*(2), 83-91.