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Abstract

Tourism plays an ever more important role in Scotland’s rural economy. Although the tourism industry in rural areas is typically presented by small firms, knowledge of their role in sustainable rural development is limited. In particular, there has been little discussion about small tourism businesses’ (STB) contribution to social sustainability (SS). However, the literature suggests that STBs can contribute to SS through their relationship with the local community. While there is evidence to indicate that owner-managers’ (OM) views and beliefs relate to their business’ relationship with the local community, this aspect has received little attention by STB scholars to date.

This thesis explores how STB OM’s views of their business’ local community and its relationship with it can contribute to developing a better understanding of STBs’ role in SS. The research is informed by an interpretive-constructionist paradigm, and seeks to examine OM’s views from a different angle. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with 26 OM’s of small accommodation businesses across 19 villages and towns in three rural areas in Scotland. These were specifically selected for their differences regarding the geographic, economic and policy environment. Participants’ responses were analysed inductively and deductively to explore differences in their views, and to examine how their understandings reflect the current conceptualisation of lifestyle and profit oriented STB OM’s.

The results showed that the bifurcated conceptualisation of OM’s was unsuitable for addressing the research aim. An inductive threefold typology of OM’s emerged based on their views of their business’ local community and its relationship with it. Notably, the typology revealed additional and critical differences in OM’s understandings to those that emerged from the deductive analysis of lifestyle and profit oriented OM’s views. The differences revealed by the new typology have implications for STBs’ potential to contribute to SS locally and in the wider area.
Chapter One: Introduction

Although small tourism businesses (STB) have been recognised as an important force in the Scottish rural economy, their role in rural sustainability is unclear. Therefore, the overall purpose of this thesis is to contribute to a better understanding of STBs’ potential role in social sustainability (SS) by exploring their owner-managers’ (OMs) views of their business’ local community (LC) and its relationship with it. The research is informed by an interpretive-constructionist paradigm to reveal new knowledge about STB owner-managers and challenge assumptions about them. To achieve the research aim, semi-structured interviews were conducted with 26 owner-managers of small accommodation businesses across 19 rural villages and towns in three areas in Scotland: Dumfries and Galloway (DG), East Lothian (EL), and Loch Lomond and the Trossachs National Park (LLTNP). The data analyses combined an inductive and deductive approach, which is novel in the field of STBs. The key findings address research gaps regarding STBs’ relationship with the LC and have implications for STBs’ potential role in SS.

This chapter provides the rationale for this research by outlining the research problem, and presents the emerging research objectives and questions. The scope and limitations of the research are outlined, and a brief overview of the methodology is provided. The chapter concludes with a short summary of the purpose of each thesis chapter.
1.1. Small tourism businesses in rural Scotland

Tourism contributes close to £11bn annually to the Scottish economy (The Scottish Tourism Alliance, 2012). As a result, it has been identified as a key economic sector in Scotland’s economic strategy (The Scottish Government, 2015c), and as a growth sector for the rural Scottish economy (The Scottish Government, 2014). In contrast, the importance of agriculture as a source of income in rural areas has declined significantly, and has been replaced by tourism in some instances (Garrod et al., 2006). With the rise of adventure-oriented activities, rural destinations are increasingly in demand (Leslie, 2007). Tourism has more impact in many rural regions in terms of employment and the GDP than do forestry, fishery or farming (Leslie, 2007). Nature based tourism in Scotland generates the equivalent of 39,000 fulltime jobs, and around £1.4 bn annually (Scottish Natural Heritage, 2010). The industry’s benefits have been suggested to include enterprise growth, employment, and inter-cultural understanding (WTO, 2005). In rural areas, tourism has been argued to present a driver of change (Randelli et al., 2014), and as contributing to economic and social regeneration (Gannon, 1994; Kneafsey, 2000; Morrison, 2006; Sharpley, 2002, 2007). Additionally, tourism has been suggested to present a means for local residents to maintain local culture (Thompson, 2004) and, in the face of out-migration of the younger residents and unemployment, as a tool to diversify rural economies (Bramwell and Lane, 1994). These works suggest that tourism is conducive to economic development in rural economies.

At the same time, however, tourism has been said to present an unreliable source of income (Sharpley, 2002; WTO, 2005) and has received much criticism regarding its impact on the natural and social environment (Sharpley, 2002; Tovar and Lockwood, 2008; Wong, 2004; WTO, 2005), exacerbated by the size and continued growth of the industry. Lane (1994) suggests that tourism in rural areas has changed particularly in terms of the number of visitors to rural areas, resulting in increased pressures on local cultural and ecological resources. The rural environment may be particularly sensitive to negative impacts of tourism due to its physical and cultural “fragility” (Bramwell and
Lane, 1994:2). For instance, residents of rural communities have been observed to feel that tourism contributes to fire risk, erosion, degradation, vandalism, littering, and changes in local traditions and ways of life (Ghaderi and Henderson, 2012). The increasing dependency of rural economies on tourism (Marsden and Sonnino, 2008) highlights the need to recognise tourism's links to the LC and economy (Leslie, 2007).

‘Small’ businesses dominate in the tourism sector in Scotland (The Scottish Government, 2016). There has been much discussion about what constitutes a small firm and what discriminators to employ (Burrows and Curran, 1989). Definitions of STBs tend to be devised for specific research purposes (Thomas, 2000) and usually based on quantitative measures such as the number of beds, rooms and employees (Skokic, 2010). This research employs the definition devised by the European Commission in 1996, which has been widely adopted in research and policy (Thomas, 2000). According to this definition, small businesses are firms that employ less than 50 staff (EC, 2005). In rural areas, the tourism industry is typically composed of such small enterprises (Battisti et al., 2013; Irvine and Anderson, 2004). In the accommodation and food and beverage sector, for example, more than 97% of all businesses are classed as small, i.e. employ less than 50 staff (The Scottish Government, 2015b). The importance of STBs is also highlighted in the new Scottish Rural Development Programme, which draws attention to the importance of "small scale tourism development" (The Scottish Government, 2014). This implies that STBs may play an important role in Scotland’s rural economy.

The role of small – as opposed to large – businesses in economic development was highlighted more than 40 years ago by Schumacher (1973) in his seminal book *Small is Beautiful*. Schumacher (1973) challenges the notion of continued growth, and draws attention to the importance of ‘smallness’ in economic development. Small businesses have been suggested to play a key role in terms of employment, innovation and economic development in the long term (Storey, 1994). Additionally, they contribute to economic development by catering for niche markets, and provide a vital ecosystem of services and products to large firms (Carter and Jones-Evans, 2006). Keen
(2004) observes that STBs contribute to local development through their use of LC infrastructure and by engaging with the LC. Additionally, STBs' small size may contribute to a competitive advantage through the provision of services which are personalised and perceived as more 'authentic', and a particular atmosphere (Morrison and Teixeira, 2004), which is potentially beneficial for local economic development. Together, these studies indicate that STBs may contribute to economic development in their communities.

The literature also suggests that STBs might contribute to the sustainability of their local communities. For instance, small firms are described as having a distinct 'local' orientation based on their typically local ownership, purchasing practices, and economic impact (Fleischer and Felsenstein, 2004). Vernon et al. (2003:51) contend that micro sized tourism firms¹, “have a greater affinity with the values of sustainable development […] and that such businesses provide jobs, and so keep local cultures alive, in peripheral areas”. In contrast, large tourism businesses might pose a threat to the economic sustainability of rural communities, due to their business' potentially short-term orientation (Lane, 1994). Additionally, a dominance of larger firms in rural communities may be detrimental to local levels of equality and welfare, and contribute to social disruption (Lyson, 2006).

Woodland and Acott (2007) find that STBs in South Downs, UK, largely contributed to the sustainability of their LC. For instance, many of the participants in their study implemented practices to reduce their business' impact on the natural environment, employ local staff and promote local produce. Similarly, Tzschentke et al. (2008) observe that STBs were inclined to implement environmental management practices. Ateljevic and Doorne (2000) report on their findings from studies in which they examined STBs in New Zealand. They find that businesses showed an affinity to, and emphasised, values within the sustainability discourse, such as ‘collaboration’, ‘bottom-up’, ‘sense of place’, and ‘community identity’. Additionally, Carlsen et al.

¹ Micro firms are defined as businesses employing less than 10 staff (EC, 2005).
(2001) found that most of the STB owners in their sample engaged in positive environmental practices, such as recycling, water conservation or educating guests about conservation issues.

Other studies, however, question STBs’ contribution to sustainability. While Morrison (2006) observes that STBs may contribute to the economic, environmental and social sustainability of rural areas, she highlights that they are unlikely to present a transformational force on the tourism industry or society in general. Consequently, it has been argued that STBs’ impact on the rural economy is unclear (Iorio and Corsale, 2010). More recently, Morrison et al. (2010) question whether the current academic and political discourse has created a myth of STBs as a positive force to realise economic, environmental and social objectives, and present conflicting evidence from the literature regarding STBs’ contribution to sustainability. Indeed, Shaw and Williams (2010) contend that the evidence regarding STBs’ impact on their local economies is contradictory, and Louks et al. (2010) claim that the role of small and medium sized enterprises (SME) in fostering sustainable development is unclear. This implies a lack of clarity regarding STBs’ role in sustainable rural development.

It is possible that STBs vary in their role in sustainable rural development. In fact, studies have also found less positive attitudes and behaviour towards environmental sustainability among tourism businesses. Vernon et al. (2003) explore the points of view of micro tourism businesses in regard to positive environmental business practices in Caradon, UK. The authors observe a reluctance among the businesses to take responsibility or initiative so as to support the protection of natural resources. Another issue that emerges from their findings is that – unless prompted – owners were generally unaware of their impact on the environment, and tended to understand tourism’s impact on the environment as mainly caused by the tourists, but not their own businesses. Similarly, Revell and Blackburn (2007) draw on findings from surveys to suggest unwillingness among small firms to make voluntary changes to their

---

2 A definition of sustainable rural development is provided in chapter 3.1.
environmental performance. This suggests differences in small tourism firms’ implementation of business practices that contribute to environmental sustainability, as indeed observed by Dewhurst and Thomas (2003). Specifically, the authors (Dewhurst and Thomas, 2003) observe that STBs differ in their attitudes and behaviours towards environmental sustainability. One group labelled as “Unconvinced Minor”, appeared unconcerned with environmental issues, viewed these as local issues or relevant to larger firms, and were least likely to have employed environmentally sustainable business practices. “Anti-green Pragmatists” showed a particularly negative attitude towards environmental action and only implemented environmentally sustainable business practices due to a sense of social responsibility. The third group, “Committed Actors”, appeared particularly concerned with environmental issues, felt that the conservation of the environment concerns everyone, and were most likely to have changed business practices in response to their understanding of environmental issues. This suggests that STBs differ in their contribution to environmental rural sustainability in their LC.

STBs’ contribution to the social dimension of sustainability has received less attention, which Thomas et al. (2011) have recently criticised. The literature implies that SS is a pre-requisite for environmental and economic sustainability (see chapter 3.2). However, while a common definition of SS is lacking, a key theme in the SS discourse are the relationships between actors, suggesting that STBs can contribute to SS through their relationship with their LC. Nevertheless, even though a substantial literature exists on STBs’ – largely economic – ties and their possible economic implications (see chapter 3.4), there has been little discussion about how they relate to SS. This thesis argues, therefore, that shortcomings in current understanding of STBs’ relationship with their LC need to be addressed to better understand STBs’ potential role in SS. Specifically, STB OMs’ views of their business’ LC and its relationship with it have hitherto received scant attention. This is despite evidence that OMs’ understandings are a critical influence on STBs’ relationship with its LC (see chapter 2.1). As a result, this research seeks to explore how STB OMs’ views of their business’ LC and its relationship with it can enhance understanding of STBs’ potential role in SS.
1.2. Research objectives and questions

As already stated above, the main aim of this research is to conceptualise STBs in relation to their LC by exploring their OMs’ views to develop a better understanding of STBs’ potential role in SS. In order to achieve the research aim two key research gaps need to be addressed. Specifically, existing studies imply that the current conceptualisation of lifestyle and profit oriented STB OMs, which is based on their motivations to run the business, may be unsuited for examining their views (see chapter 2.2). Therefore, the first objective of this research is as follows:

To devise a new typology for exploring STB OMs’ views of their business’ LC and its relationship with it.

Two research questions arise from this objective:

How do STB OMs differ in their understandings of their business’ LC and its relationship with it?

How do STB OMs’ views of their business’ LC and its relationship with it relate to their initial motivations for running the business?

While numerous studies have examined STBs’ ties with their LC, and their potential – particularly economic – benefit for the LC, there has been little discussion about STB OMs’ views of the relationship (see chapter 3.4). This is despite evidence that OM’s views and beliefs are critical influences on business behaviour. So as to address this research gap, the second objective of this research is:

To examine possible implications of STB OMs’ views of their business’ LC and its relationship with it for their potential role in SS.

Two research questions emerge from this objective:

How can STB OMs’ understandings of their business’ LC and its relationship with it enhance knowledge of the potential within STBs’ relationship with the LC?
What implications do the research findings have for STBs’ potential to contribute to SS?

By achieving these objectives, this research seeks to contribute to developing an understanding of STBs’ potential role in SS, address research gaps regarding STB OMs’ views of their business’ LC and its relationship with it, and develop an analytical device for examining the STB-community relationship.

1.3. Research scope and limitations

In this thesis, the notion of SS is used to inform the theoretical framework employed to explore OMs’ views of their business’ LC and its relationship with it. The purpose of this research is not to examine how STBs contribute to SS, but rather to suggest possible implications of the research findings for STBs’ potential role in SS.

It is beyond the scope of this study to examine the suitability of all STB typologies for exploring their OMs’ views and understandings. Rather, the study focuses specifically on the current conceptualisation of lifestyle and profit oriented STB OMs, which is identified as the dominant typology in STB research (see chapter 2.3).

Participants were recruited from specific geographical, rural areas in Scotland. It follows that the research findings may not apply to different national or even urban contexts. Similarly, the OMs operate in a specific tourism sub-sector, i.e. accommodation. As a result, this thesis does not attempt to make claims regarding the generalisability of the research findings across other types of STBs. The rationale for focussing on small serviced accommodation businesses relates to calls in the literature to recognise the heterogeneity of small firms at the sectoral level (Burrows and Curran, 1989; Peacock, 1993), as well as the sub-sectoral level (Morrison, 1998), and the lack of attention awarded to small accommodation firms’ relationships (Lynch, 2000).
1.4. Methodology

The exploratory nature of this research called for an interpretive-constructionist research paradigm, to explain social realities by interpreting the meaning that actors ascribe to objects, subjects and actions (see chapter 4.1). This philosophical framework acknowledges the multiplicity of social realities, and assumes that individuals construct their realities using already existing meaning. Moreover, it emphasises the need to contextualise the realities that individuals construct, and encourages the researcher to view existing knowledge in a new light and challenge assumptions.

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with 26 OMs of small serviced accommodation firms in 19 towns and villages across DG, EL and LLTNP in Scotland. Research participants were recruited purposively to seek variation in their views and possible contextual influences on them (see chapter 4.2). Specifically, the businesses were located in villages and towns that differ regarding economic and tourism development, rural accessibility and the policy environment (see chapter 4.3). Through the interviews, the researcher sought to gain insight into OMs’ understandings of their business’ LC and its relationship with it. The data were analysed deductively and inductively (see chapter 4.7). Combining these data analysis methods allowed the researcher to explore OMs’ views, and also examine how they reflect the current conceptualisation of lifestyle and profit oriented STB OMs.
1.5. Thesis structure

The current chapter has situated this research in the relevant literatures, and justified the need for it. It presented the research objectives and questions, identified the research scope and limitations, and outlined the methodology employed. The remaining chapters of the thesis are organised as follows.

Chapter Two is the first of two consecutive literature review chapters. It argues that the current conceptualisation of lifestyle and profit oriented STB OMs may be unsuited for examining their understandings of their business’ LC and makes the case for devising a new STB typology.

Chapter Three suggests that SS is critical for sustainable rural development, and argues that STBs can contribute to SS through their relationship with the LC. It reveals that STBs’ relationship with the LC, and hence their role in SS, might vary, and identifies a gap in research regarding STB OMs’ views of their business’ relationship with the LC. Subsequently, based on the observations from both literature review chapters, a framework is devised for exploring STB OMs’ understandings of SS.

Chapter Four outlines the interpretive-constructionist philosophical framework underlying this research, and introduces the study areas. It describes the recruitment of research participants, and the collection and analyses of qualitative data gathered through semi-structured interviews with STB OMs.

Chapter Five explores STB OMs’ understandings of SS, and examines whether OMs’ views reflect the dominant typology of lifestyle and profit oriented STB OMs. A new inductive typology of STB OMs is introduced as an analytical device to explore STBs’ relationship with their LC.

Chapter Six examines possible implications of the research findings for STBs’ role in SS.

Chapter Seven concludes this thesis by reflecting on the research aim and objectives it set out to achieve. It summarises the key research findings and outlines their
contributions to knowledge. It also draws out the limitations of the study, makes suggestions for future research and identifies possible implications for policy.
Chapter Two:
Current conceptualisations of small tourism businesses

The aim of this research is to explore how small tourism business (STB) owner managers’ (OM) views of their business’ local community (LC) and its relationship with it can enhance understanding of STBs’ potential role in social sustainability (SS). This chapter is the first of two literature review chapters. It argues for exploring STB OMs’ views of their business’ LC and discusses the suitability of current conceptualisations for examining differences between them. Chapter Three devises a framework for conceptualising STBs in relation to their LC informed by the notion of SS and reviews existing literature on STBs’ relationship with their LC.

The chapter begins by identifying the need to consider STB OMs’ views of their business’ LC and differences between those views, to understand STBs’ relationship with it (2.1). STB OMs’ motivations are identified as a key focus in the extant literature (2.2). Subsequently, the suitability of current conceptualisations for examining STB OMs’ views are evaluated, with particular attention awarded to the dominant typology of lifestyle and profit oriented OMs (2.3). Next, shortcomings of the dichotomy are discussed (2.4) and the key observations from this chapter are drawn out (2.5).

2.1. Owner-managers’ views of their business’ local community

The literature suggests that OMs’ views and beliefs play a pivotal role in STBs’ relationship with their LC. Several studies have identified the OM as a key influence on STB behaviour (Dewhurst and Thomas, 2003; Fuller and Tian, 2006; Goulding et al., 2005; King et al., 2012; Lynch, 1998; Massey, 2006; Morrison and Teixeira, 2004,
Tzschentke et al. (2008) examine the adoption of environmental management practices among STBs and highlight the need to understand STBs' realities to appreciate their decision-making processes. In particular, the authors (Tzschentke et al., 2008) observe that OMs’ values and beliefs present a key force on their decision to implement certain business practices. Likewise, Parker et al. (2009) identify four ‘extreme’ types of small and medium sized enterprises (SME) in the literature based on their OMs’ orientation, which differ in their engagement in environmental business improvements. They observe that OMs may be driven to implement improvement practices by environmental improvement goals, the achievement of financial goals through those environmental improvement goals, compliance with regulations and customer demand, or a desire to maximise their profits by reducing costs. These studies stress the role of OMs’ views and understandings in STBs’ relationship with their LC.

Theories in economic sociology imply that STB OMs’ personal ties with their business’ LC relate to their business’ relationship with it. Economic sociologists, including Granovetter and Krippner, have long emphasised that economic behaviour is entwined with – and influenced by – social relations (Granovetter, 1985, 2005; Krippner, 2001; Krippner et al., 2004). Polanyi (1944) argues that individuals act with the objective to maintain their social status and assets, rather than individual interests and possessions. He contends that “the economic system” is driven by “non-economic motives” (Polanyi 1944:48). Krippner (2001:800) stresses the need to consider the social world as inseparable from the market and urges scholars to challenge the “residual economism” to overcome the separation of economic and social worlds. Within the small business literature, the need to consider the interrelation of economic behaviour and personal ties has been highlighted by Burrows and Curran (1989). They argue that scholars need to examine the social relations in which small businesses are ‘enmeshed’, and suggest that “[w]hatever problems may arise from the lack of an all embracing conceptualisation will, it may be argued, be more than compensated for by not having to compress respondents’ ‘lived cultures’ into
essentially arbitrary notions of a ‘small firm’ without reference to their own conceptions of the situation” (Burrows and Curran, 1989:531-2). Overall, these works emphasise the role that OMs’ understandings of their business’ LC play in their business’ relationship with it.

This notion is further supported by the STB literature. Several studies have identified the desire to move to a particular natural environment as a key dimension of OMs' motivations to run their business (Ateljevic and Doorne, 2000; Getz and Carlsen, 2000; Hallak et al. 2012; King et al., 2012; Komppula, 2004; Marchant and Mottiar, 2011; Paniagua, 2002; Williams et al., 1989; see also: Bosworth and Farrell, 2011; Getz and Petersen, 2005; Lardiés, 1999; Lee-Ross, 2012; Morrison et al., 2008). Carlsen et al. (2001:282) observe that STB OMs for whom the anticipation of living in a particular natural environment influenced their motivation to run an STB show a keen interest to conserve local environments (see also Getz 1994). Likewise, Tzschentke et al. (2008) observe that STB OMs, who emphasised that the desire to live in a particular natural environment played a role in their decision to run an STB, were more inclined to contribute to environmental conservation. These studies suggest a possible link between STB OMs’ desire to live in a particular location and their business’ relationship with the LC, further highlighting the need to examine OMs’ views of their business’ LC.

In the same vein, an increasing number of researchers have stressed the need to consider STBs in relation to their local social contexts. Specifically, conceptualisations of STBs have recently been criticised for failing to consider mediating factors, internal or external to the firm (Thomas et al., 2011). Thomas et al. (2011) warned that the limited discussion surrounding STBs has led to false assumptions about them in differing contexts. In the same vein, Morrison and Teixeira (2004) criticise STB studies that treat agency as separate from structure, i.e. the business as separate from its context. More recently, Morrison et al. (2010) argue that generalising statements that ignore sectoral differences may lead to false assumptions and the development of 'myths' in STB research. This echoes work by Curran and Burrows (1989) and Storey
(1994), who emphasise the need to acknowledge sectoral differences between small firms. Morrison et al. (2010) highlight the need to distinguish between 'myth' and 'reality' in STB research, be conscious of disciplinary lenses and methodologies used and aware of contextual differences, to develop a more holistic understanding of the STB sector. They stress that “it is important not to be guilty of academic laziness that is content with the identification of surface similarities, and to retain intellectual energy that endlessly pursues and opens eyes to the differences of economic, social and political context" (Morrison et al. 2010:746). Following on from this, the authors call for definitions of STBs that are grounded in their respective social and sectoral contexts, further emphasising the need to understand STBs in relation to their LC.

STB OMs’ reasons for choosing the location of their business may provide insight into their views of their business’ LC and differences between them. Specifically, the literature suggests that STB OMs’ motivation to run an STB and their decision to move to a particular environment are closely related. For instance, previous research by Williams et al. (1989) observes that tourism business OMs had typically migrated to their location. Likewise, Shaw and Williams (2004) and Williams and Hall (2000) suggest a strong link between tourism and migration. Getz and Carlsen (2000) come to a similar conclusion and describe STB OMs' locational preferences as one of the key distinctive features of the tourism sector. The lifestyle migration literature indicates that migrants’ choice of location gives insight into the lifestyle they wish to pursue (Benson and O’Reilly, 2009) and that their values and reasons for choosing a destination are reflected in the type of destination they choose to migrate to (Bijker et al., 2013). Similarly, Bijker et al. (2013) suggest that migrants' values are related to their ideas of the destination. In the same vein, Bosworth and Willett (2011) found that in-migrant firm owners’ expectations of – and therefore attitudes towards – the location influence their subsequent behaviour in it and, as a consequence, their embeddedness in the LC. This implies that OMs’ reasons for choosing their location are central to exploring STBs OMs’ views of their business’ LC and the meaning they attach to it.
So far, however, there has been little discussion about STB OMs’ reasons for choosing their business’ location. Only few studies question STB owners specifically about their reasons for selecting one location over another. One of those studies, unfortunately, does not discuss respondents’ answers concerning this matter (Di Domenico, 2003). Another work by Williams et al. (1989) explores STB owners' reasons for choosing a particular location to run their business in more detail. They find that STB owners' reasons for choosing to locate their firm in Cornwall, UK, were either related to economic or environmental factors, or they lived there already or encountered the location by chance. Research by Paniagua (2002) suggests that the attractiveness of a location from the STB OMs’ point of view might play a secondary role to their work-related motivations. In particular, the author (Paniagua, 2002) notes that tourism business owners’ motivations behind migration to the countryside are predominantly work related, which contrasts with Williams et al. (1989). These works imply that STB OMs might have different reasons for choosing their business’ location, which may relate to differences in their views of their business’ LC.

Indeed, differences in STB OMs’ reasons for choosing their location appear to be reflected in different preferences for specific environments. For instance, Shaw and Williams (2004) highlight a link between the types of tourism destinations and the migration patterns of tourism business owners. Likewise, King et al. (2012) observe that tourism business owners differ regarding the type of environment they choose to move to. This view is supported by Getz and Carlsen (2000; see also Carlsen et al., 2001), who suggest that there may be a link between the kind of location and the type of STBs in it. Indeed, geographical variations among STBs are implicit in previous research. For instance, while many studies find that STB OMs tend to be driven by lifestyle motivations to run their business (Di Domenico, 2003; Getz and Carlsen, 2005; Lashley and Rowson, 2010; Morrison et al., 1999; Mottiar, 2007; Thomas, 1997), Wilson (2007) found that OMs of tourism family farm businesses in Northern Ireland were primarily motivated to run their business to generate income. Similarly, research has found that STBs were usually driven by profit rather than lifestyle to run their
business in specific locations in Scotland (Glancey and Pettigrew, 1997), Croatia (Skokic, 2010; Skokic and Morrison, 2011), Malaysia (Ahmad, 2005), and Gabon (Cloquet, 2013). The observations from these works infer that STB OMs may differ in their preferences for particular environments and highlight the need to examine differences in STB OMs’ reasons for choosing their business’ location.

These studies collectively outline a critical role for STB OMs’ views of their business’ LC in understanding STBs’ potential to contribute to SS through their relationship with the LC. In other words, the studies indicate that STB OMs differ in their views of their business’ LC, which may relate to differences in STBs’ potential role in SS. However, OMs’ choice of location has received limited attention by researchers to date. Moreover, evident from the review of literature is the paucity of studies that examine the role that the LC plays in STB OMs’ reasons for choosing their location. This is despite research by Bosworth and Farrell (2011) and Hallak et al. (2012) who observe that the LC influences tourism business owners’ attraction to a particular location. This emphasises the need for research to examine the role that the LC plays in STB OMs’ reasons for choosing their location and the differences between them, to understand STBs potential contribution to SS through their relationship with the LC.

The remainder of this chapter discusses the suitability of current STB conceptualisations for exploring STB OMs’ views of the business’ LC and differences between them, through their reasons for choosing their business’ location. The next section reviews the literature regarding STB OMs’ motivations to run the business, which has emerged as a key focus in STB research.
2.2. Owner-managers’ motivations to run a small tourism business

Scholars tend to define STBs based on quantitative measures such as the number of beds, rooms, and employees (Skokic, 2010). However, the literature reviewed so far indicates that STBs need to be conceptualised based on their OMs’ views and understandings and, in particular, their OMs’ reasons for choosing their location. Indeed, Parker et al. (2009) argue that SME categorisations based on employee numbers are neither sufficient, nor effective indicators for business behaviour, and stress that SMEs should instead be characterised based on their OMs’ orientation. This lends support to Burrows and Curran (1989:531), who argue that "an unproductive size reductionism [based on turnover or numbers of employees] is to be avoided at all costs" in definitions of small firms. The intention here is not to deny the analytical usefulness of staff numbers; indeed, discriminating between businesses based on staff numbers has been observed as being useful by some scholars for the analysis of certain aspects of small businesses, such as training approaches (Kotey & Folker, 2007). This implies that, to understand STBs’ relationship with the LC, conceptualisations are required that are based on their OMs’ views and beliefs.

A growing number of scholars conceptualise STBs based on their OMs’ motivations to run the business. In the past, STB OMs were often presented as individuals whose “capacity” was restricted to running a small business, who were entrepreneurial when commencing their business, but had since settled or did not have the required "vision, drive or expertise to take their business further" (Morrison et al., 1999:33). Much progress has since been made regarding the understanding of tourism business OMs' motivations, and it has been recognised that many tourism firm OMs decide not to grow their operations (Mottiar, 2007; Sørensen, 2007). OMs' motivations have been described as complex and presenting an amalgam of economic and non-economic dimensions, the boundaries of which may be blurred in practice (Cloquet, 2013; Lynch, 1998; Shaw and Williams, 2010). Studies by Ateljevic and Doorne (2000) and Shaw and Williams (2004) highlight the inseparability of the consumption and production of
tourism, drawing attention to the importance of non-economic factors in OMs’ motivations to run their business.

The literature’s focus has been largely on the 'non-profit' attributes of OMs' motivations (Marchant and Mottiar, 2011; Thomas et al., 2011). Nevertheless, studies observe that the economic return of the business is generally important to STB owners (Getz and Carlsen, 2000; Getz and Petersen, 2005; Komppula, 2004; Lynch, 1998; Morrison and Teixeira, 2004, Mottiar and Laurincikova, 2009). For instance, a study of female accommodation OMs by Lynch (1998) identified that, although most were motivated by non-economic reasons to run their business, one-third described a financial dependence on their business. Morrison et al. (2008) provide a useful overview of OMs' motivations, highlighting their multidimensionality, as well as the role of economic factors. They categorise motivations into necessity and opportunity (see Table 2.1). Necessity factors are generally economic, especially a need for income, whereas opportunity factors tend to relate to a desire for a certain lifestyle, in particular regarding the business’ location, and the nature and quality of work. The emphasis placed on lifestyle and income highlight the interrelation of economic and non-economic factors observed by Shaw and Williams (2004), and Ateljevic and Doorne (2000) among others. These works imply that although STB OMs’ motivations may be mainly related to the desire to pursue a certain lifestyle, the economic return of their business is important for them.

A review of the extant literature on STB OMs’ motivations (see Table 2.2) reveals that while research into STB OMs’ motivations was initially largely descriptive and sought to reveal their various dimensions and influences on them (Ateljevic and Doorne, 2000; Getz and Carlsen, 2000; Lynch, 1998; Williams et al., 1989;), studies published after the year 2000 have become increasingly concerned with how OMs’ motivations relate to
Table 2.1. Necessity and opportunity factors influencing small tourism firm OMs’ motivations to run their business. Source: adapted from Morrison et al., 2008: 5-6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Necessity</th>
<th>Opportunity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Need to make a living/no alternative (Hampton, 2003; Kokkranikal and Morrison, 2002; Rogerson, 2005)</td>
<td>Opportunity to escape from an urban environment (McGehee and Kim, 2004; Thomas, 2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Desire to live in a particular/high-quality environment (Dredge and Jenkins, 2007; Getz and Carlsen, 2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to overcome labour market disadvantages (Dahles, 2004; Hampton, 2003; Wilson, 2006)</td>
<td>Rejection of corporate employment/career transition (Ateljevic and Doorne, 2001; Morrison, 2006; Smith, 2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to subsidise income from declining industries including farming (McGehee and Kim, 2004; Sharpley, 2001)</td>
<td>Freedom to work on own terms (Dahles and Bras, 1999; Lashley and Rowson, 2005; Wilson, 2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide financial bridge between employment and retirement (Ioannides and Petersen, 2003; Rogerson, 2005; Weber, 2006)</td>
<td>Balance work/life and family quality time (Getz et al., 2004; Massey et al., 2004; Morrison, 2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to realise tax advantages and generate retirement income from rural land holdings (Buckley et al. (in Moss 2006); Murphy and Murphy, 2001; Walmsley, 2003)</td>
<td>Relatively comfortable climate and familial/familiar links to the destination (Eaton, 1995; Lardies, 1999; Valero and Escandell, 1992; Jurdao and Sanchez, 1990; Williams et al., 1989)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams et al. (1989)</td>
<td>The interrelation of consumption and production of tourism in the industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynch (1998)</td>
<td>The interface of: labour market – small tourism firm OM motivations – hosting behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getz and Carlsen (2000)</td>
<td>Characteristics and goals of small tourism family businesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ateljevic and Doorne (2000)</td>
<td>How small tourism firm OMs’ lifestyle motivations contribute to economic development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paniagua (2002)</td>
<td>Motivations of migrant tourism business owners to rural Spain, and their participation in rural development programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.2. Chronological overview of research into small tourism firm owner-managers’ motivations to run their business. Source: Author.
Table 2.2. Chronological overview of research into small tourism firm owner-managers’ motivations to run their business. Source: Author.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Motivation dimensions</th>
<th>Key findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Di Domenico (2003)    | Characteristics and behaviour of lifestyle oriented small tourism firm OMs | • Initial motivations to run the business  
• Reasons for choosing location to run the business | • Lifestyle motivations dominate                                                      |
| Dewhurst and Thomas (2003) | Influences on small tourism firm OMs’ attitudes and behaviour towards environmental business practices | • Initial and current motivations to run the business | • OMs’ attitudes and behaviour toward environmental business practices relate to their current motivations to run the business |
| Morrison and Teixeira (2004) | Influences on small tourism business performance | • Initial motivations | • OMs’ initial motivations relate to business performance |
| Komppula (2004)       | Micro tourism business OMs’ motivations to grow their business and attitudes towards business success | • OMs’ initial motivations to run the business, and current motivations to grow it | • Variations in the importance of living in a certain location relate to OMs’ current growth-motivations  
• OMs are interested in growing their business but without increasing capacity |
| Goulding et al. (2005) | How seasonal trading behaviour relates to small tourism firm OMs’ motivations to run their business | • The importance of seasonal trading in OMs’ initial motivations to run the business | • Seasonal trading as a key motivation for OMs to run the business |
Table 2.2. Chronological overview of research into small tourism firm owner-managers’ motivations to run their business. Source: Author.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Motivation dimensions</th>
<th>Key findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Getz and Petersen (2005) | Profiling profit and growth oriented OMs and contrasting them with lifestyle-oriented OMs | - Initial and current motivations to run their business | - Variations in business types and ownership relate to initial OM motivations  
- Initial motivations relate to current growth ambitions |
| Sweeney and Lynch (2009) | Small tourism business OMs’ relationship with their commercial home | - Initial motivations to run the business           | - Variations in OMs’ attitudes towards work appear to be related to their initial motivations to run it |
| Marchant and Mottiar (2011) | Development of, and influences on, OMs’ motivations to run their business | - Temporal dimension of motivations                  | - Location as a key dimension of OMs’ initial motivations, influenced by past travel experiences  
- Motivations change over time |
| King et al. (2012)   | How OM motivations relate to their preferences for, and use of, channels of learning and information | - Initial motivations to run the business  
- Current motivations to grow their business | - Variations in OMs’ information seeking and consumption behaviour relates to their current motivations to grow their business  
- Variations in types of business relate to OMs’ initial motivations  
- OMs’ motivations are related to the type of environment they choose to move to |
### Table 2.3. Existing typologies of small tourism businesses. Source: Author.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types</th>
<th>Discriminators</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Petty tycoons</td>
<td>Motivation to run the business</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflictual owners</td>
<td>Relationship with guests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic owners</td>
<td>Attitude towards guests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexic-owners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real entrepreneurs</td>
<td>Owners’ motivations to run their business, professional experience, and age</td>
<td>Shaw and Williams (1998, 2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-entrepreneurs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrained entrepreneurs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyle-oriented</td>
<td>Owner-managers’ motivations to run their business</td>
<td>Ateljevic and Doorne (2000); Williams et al. (1989).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business-oriented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unconvinced minor participants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-green pragmatists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committed actors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circumstance-predisposed</td>
<td>Attitude and behaviour pertaining to environmental business practices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference-indisposed</td>
<td>Owner-managers’ motivations to run the business</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circumstance-constrained</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporal pragmatists</td>
<td>Owner-managers’ trading behaviours</td>
<td>Goulding (2006)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2.3. Existing typologies of small tourism businesses.

*Source: Author.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types</th>
<th>Discriminators</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Profit-motivated greens</td>
<td>• OMs’ motivations to adopt environmental management practices</td>
<td>Tzschentke-Hamilton (2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Practical greens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ethical greens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Holistic greens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Economic commercial homeowner</td>
<td>• Owner-managers’ relationship with their home</td>
<td>Sweeney and Lynch (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Eco-socio commercial homeowner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Socio-eco commercial homeowner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Social commercial homeowner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ego commercial homeowner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Non-working farm indirect interaction agritourism</td>
<td>• Nature of tourist-business interaction</td>
<td>Phillip et al. (2010); Flanigan et al. (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Non-working farm direct interaction agritourism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Working farm indirect interaction agritourism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Working farm direct staged interaction agritourism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Working farm direct authentic interaction agritourism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.3. Existing typologies of small tourism businesses. *Source:* Author.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types</th>
<th>Discriminators</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Rogues</td>
<td>• The type of capital the entrepreneur brings to the community</td>
<td>Moscardo (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Chaos-makers</td>
<td>• Owners’ motivations for running a tourism business or being involved in tourism-related development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Self-directed entrepreneur</td>
<td>• The outcomes of the tourism development for the LC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tourism leader/entrepreneur</td>
<td>• The owners’ connection to the LC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
various aspects of the business (Dewhurst and Thomas, 2003; Goulding et al., 2005; Getz and Petersen, 2005; King et al., 2012; Komppula, 2004; Morrison and Teixeira, 2004; Sweeney and Lynch, 2009). These works indicate a shift in STB research from exploring OMs’ motivations to run their business, to understanding how they relate to and influence aspects of the firm.

A considerable amount of the studies reviewed examined the relation between OMs' motivations and their business-related behaviour (Dewhurst and Thomas, 2003; Goulding, 2006; Goulding et al., 2005; King et al., 2012; Lynch, 1998; Morrison and Teixeira, 2004; Paniagua, 2002; Shaw and Williams, 2004), which is reflected in a recent study from Thomas et al. (2011). More specifically, the studies (Table 2.2) find that OMs’ motivations to run their business relate to OMs’ information seeking behaviour and consumption behaviour (King et al., 2012), attitudes towards work (Sweeney and Lynch, 2009) and environmental business practices (Dewhurst and Thomas, 2003). Additionally, the studies observe that OMs’ motivations to run the business relate to the type of business they choose to start (Getz and Petersen, 2005; King et al., 2012), their growth intentions (Getz and Petersen, 2005) and business’ economic performance (Morrison and Teixeira, 2004). These works indicate that STB OMs’ motivations to run the business relate to their business’ behaviour, and hence, STBs’ relationship with the LC. However, it is evident from these studies that there has been little discussion about how STB OMs’ motivations to run the business relate to their views of the business’ LC. This implies that STB conceptualisations based on their OMs’ motivations to run the business may be unsuited for exploring OMs’ views of their business’ LC.


2.3. Lifestyle and profit oriented owner-managers

It seems that extant STB typologies fail to provide insight into OMs’ views of their business’ LC. The strong interest that STB scholars have shown in OMs’ motivations to run their business is also reflected in common STB typologies. Numerous STB typologies have been proposed that conceptualise STBs in relation to their OM (see Table 2.3). It is noticeable that all typologies listed in Table 2.3 describe the OM of the firm (Darke and Gurney, 2000; Dewhurst and Thomas, 2003; Goulding, 2006; Moscardo, 2014; Shaw, 2014; Shaw and Williams, 1998, 2004; Sweeney and Lynch, 2009; Tzschentke-Hamilton, 2004), thus responding to the pleas by Parker et al. (2009), Burrows and Curran (1989) and Storey (1994) to move away from quantitative size-based definitions of STBs. Most of the typologies in Table 2.3 refer to OMs’ motivations to run their business. In particular, while some typologies employ OMs’ motivations as the sole discriminator (Ateljevic and Doorne, 2000; Williams et al., 1989), other typologies consider them in relation to their business’ behaviour (Dewhurst and Thomas, 2003; Goulding, 2006; Shaw and Williams, 1998, 2004; Tzschentke-Hamilton, 2004). Similarly, other typologies relate OMs’ motivations to their relationship with their business (Sweeney and Lynch, 2009) or their clients (Darke and Gurney, 2000). However, none of these typologies relates differences in OMs’ motivations to their attitudes towards their business’ local community. Similarly, although the typology by Phillip et al. (2010) is a welcome exception as it is based on the interaction between the business and tourists, rather than OMs’ motivations, it is unsuitable for exploring STB OMs’ views of their LC. Equally, although the typology proposed by Moscardo (2014) considers OMs’ personal relationship with their business’ location, it fails to provide insight into OMs’ views of the business’ LC.

The typology of lifestyle and profit oriented OMs (see Table 2.3: Ateljevic and Doorne, 2000; Williams et al., 1989), in particular, has generated much research, some of which indicates that these OMs might differ in their views of their business’ LC. The typology categorises OMs based on their prioritisation of economic issues: lifestyle oriented
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OMs prioritise non-economic factors, whereas profit-oriented OMs prioritise economic factors. The importance of lifestyle as a motivation to run an STB was first highlighted by Williams et al. (1989), and the "lifestyle-oriented" small tourism OM was identified by Ateljevic and Doorne (2000). Lifestyle orientation has been found to dominate among STB OMs (Di Domenico, 2003; Getz and Carlsen, 2005; Lashley and Rowson, 2010; Morrison et al., 1999; Mottiar, 2007; Thomas, 1997). Indeed, in a survey of 1300 STBs Thomas et al. (1997) find that nearly 80% prioritised non-economic motives. While lifestyle motivations are by no means unique to the tourism industry (Massey, 2006; Shaw and Williams, 2010; Spence and Rutherford, 2001), they have attracted significant attention from tourism scholars. Conversely, the attention paid to profit-oriented STB OMs has been limited. This type of OM tends to appear as a sub-topic in studies concerning the lifestyle-oriented OM (for a notable exception see e.g. Getz and Petersen, 2005).

Lifestyle-oriented tourism business OMs are described as individuals whose "lifestyle aspirations emphasise quality of life attributes such as personal relationships, personal development, benefiting from a slower pace of life, showcasing the domestic and local environment to visitors and compartmentalising work and leisure, among others" (Goulding et al., 2005:212). Variables that appear to influence lifestyle-oriented OMs' motivations in developed as well as in developing economy contexts include locational, familial, personal, experiential, financial, temporal, and technological aspects (Morrison et al., 2008:8). These works suggest that lifestyle-oriented OMs prevail among STB OMs and that there are numerous factors that drive lifestyle-oriented OMs to run an STB.

There may be differences between lifestyle and profit oriented STB OMs. Lifestyle oriented OMs have been found to have a high level of education and are motivated by past travel-related experiences; furthermore, the desire to live in a specific location or environment can be a key driver to run their business (Marchant and Mottiar, 2011). Family values, the desire for a less corporate career and a work/life balance are further
important motivators among small lifestyle tourism business OMs (Morrison and Teixeira, 2004). Lifestyle-oriented OMs' businesses have also been observed to be more resilient to external disturbances and shocks (Biggs et al., 2011), which may be due in part to a tolerance for poor financial performance (Ateljevic, 2007; Hall and Rusher, 2004). In developed economies, lifestyle-oriented OMs appear to have a preference for smaller businesses (King et al., 2012; Komppula, 2004), are often older than their profit-oriented counterparts, usually live in rural locations (King et al., 2012) and emphasise autonomy (Getz and Petersen, 2005).

In contrast, studies suggest that profit-oriented tourism OMs are younger, located in urban environments and are viewing the provision of good service as a means to the long-term success of their business (King et al., 2012). This group tends to run larger tourism businesses (Getz and Carlsen, 2000), offer services in addition to accommodation and breakfast (Komppula, 2004) and have a preference to purchase business premises, in particular accommodation businesses and restaurants (Getz and Petersen, 2005). Indeed, it has been suggested that the higher small tourism OMs' economic investment, the more interested they are in the economic return of their business (Getz and Carlsen, 2000). Likewise, Lynch (2005) finds that levels of dependence on their business' income were related to the size of the business. Getz and Petersen (2005) further observe that these OMs tended to identify and act upon opportunities they had spotted.

For lifestyle-oriented OMs, on the other hand, doing their job well is more about feeling part of the business community than a strategy for long-term business success (King et al., 2012). Lifestyle oriented OMs may play an important role in strengthening the service-orientation of the tourism industry, based on their desire to be recognised for the quality of service they provide (King et al., 2012). Additionally, lifestyle-oriented OMs have been observed as showing a more positive attitude towards sustainability, and as being more inclined to implement positive environmental business practices (Dewhurst and Thomas, 2003). In contrast to lifestyle-oriented OMs, the group of
profit oriented OMs has been found as demonstrating a more negative attitude towards sustainability and as being less inclined to implement positive environmental business practices (Dewhurst and Thomas, 2003). Taken together, these studies support the notion that lifestyle- and profit-oriented STB OMs differ in their preferences and behaviours, which may suggest differences in their OMs’ views and understandings.

There is a possibility of further differences among lifestyle-oriented STB OMs regarding their motivations to run the business. Research by Shaw and Williams (2004) and Ateljevic and Doorne (2000) implies that there are distinctions between lifestyle-oriented OMs ranging from those who are motivated by the desire to pursue a certain lifestyle and the prospect of business development, and those who operate within a distinct value system that emphasises local social, cultural and environmental relationships. Ateljevic and Doorne (2000) find that the latter group has led to the development of niche markets, which cater to tourists whose choices are informed by a value system similar to that of the business owners. Indeed, they argue that these OMs are key in developing tourism that reflects the values of the sustainability debate. Shaw and Williams (2004:111) conclude that there is a new type of lifestyle tourism entrepreneur who reflects "specific lifestyles related to new forms of tourism consumption". This suggests that there may be differences between lifestyle-oriented STB OMs, which may relate to variations in their views of their business’ LC.

Together, the literature reviewed here suggests that lifestyle and profit oriented STBs might differ in their views of their business’ LC and that there may be further distinctions in the former group of OMs. However, it seems that no attempt has been made to examine how the motivational differences between these two OM types relate to their views of their business’ LC. Likewise, researchers to date have awarded scant attention to possible differences in their reasons for choosing their business’ location, which can provide insight into OMs’ understandings of their business’ LC (see 2.1). This calls for research to examine the suitability of the binary categorisation for
exploring in STB OMs’ views and differences between them. The next section discusses conceptual shortcomings of the lifestyle/profit typology that need to be considered before employing it in the current study.

### 2.4. Conceptual shortcomings of the typology of lifestyle and profit oriented owner-managers

Several conceptual shortcomings regarding the binary categorisation of lifestyle and profit oriented STB OMs can be identified, which make it difficult to distinguish between the OM types. In particular, research suggests that motivations change over time. Marchant and Mottiar (2011) find that lifestyle-oriented tourism OMs may choose to expand their business in response to increasing demand. Equally, Shaw and Williams (2010) suggest that OMs’ motivations to run their business can change over time. This implies that many STBs might fall into the lifestyle and profit categories at different times, which challenges the distinctiveness of these OM types.

A further criticism pertains to the problematic and inconsistent definitions of lifestyle and profit oriented OMs. Like lifestyle-oriented OMs, profit-oriented OMs have been observed to emphasise autonomy and lifestyle goals (Getz and Petersen, 2005), stressing the lack of a clear-cut distinction between lifestyle and profit orientation (cf. Komppula, 2004). A recent review of STB research describes lifestyle-oriented businesses loosely as "operated in a manner that incorporates non-financial factors" (Thomas et al., 2011:965). Such a definition arguably blurs the distinction between lifestyle and profit oriented OM types further. Adding to the ambiguity of the current conceptualisation of STB OMs is that studies differ regarding the discriminators employed to distinguish between lifestyle and profit orientation. Whilst some researchers group OMs based on their initial business-related growth intentions (see e.g. Ateljevic and Doorne, 2000; Dewhurst and Thomas, 2003; Di Domenico, 2003;
Hollick and Braun, 2005; Kneafsey, 2000; Lardiés, 1999; Lee-Ross, 2012; Paniagua, 2002; Wilson, 2007), others consider OMs' current growth intentions (see e.g. Getz and Petersen, 2005; Komppula, 2004), or examine both sets of motivations (Cloquet, 2013; Di Domenico, 2003).

The difficulties relating to the definition of profit orientation (Getz and Petersen, 2005) complicate the differentiation of lifestyle and profit oriented OM types further. Research on profit-oriented STB OMs tends to refer to their interest in growing their business. The definition of growth and perception of success are subjective, however, and can vary between OMs (Komppula, 2004; Reijonen and Komppula, 2007; see also Getz and Petersen, 2005). Moreover, interest in profit appears unrelated to a desire for growth. Di Domenico (2003) observed that, while OMs were concerned with the profitability of their business, they showed no interest in growing it. Similarly, Komppula (2004) finds that, although many of the OMs of rural STBs in her study in Finland desire to increase their turnover, they do not want to expand their infrastructure or number of staff.

Despite the conceptual shortcomings of the lifestyle/profit dichotomy, few, if any, studies have critically examined the usefulness of these two categories by combining inductive and deductive approaches to data analysis. Indeed, scholars either apply the lifestyle/profit typology to their sample at the outset to explore the characteristics and behaviours of OMs in one or both categories (see e.g. Ateljevic and Doorne, 2000; Di Domenico, 2003; Getz and Petersen, 2005; Hollick and Braun, 2005), or relate their findings to the orientation of the OMs (see e.g. Dewhurst and Thomas, 2003; Sweeney and Lynch, 2009). Since researchers appear to choose different definitions and employ varying discriminators, it is impossible to assess whether their research supports or refutes the lifestyle/profit typology. Nevertheless, the dichotomy of lifestyle/profit orientation remains largely unchallenged in STB research. The inconsistencies in defining lifestyle and profit oriented OMs outlined in this section further indicate that the dichotomy may be unsuited for the purposes of this research, and emphasise the
need for developing a new STB typology for exploring STB OMs’ views of their business’ LC.

2.5. Chapter Summary

The aim of this research is to explore how STB OMs’ views of their business’ LC and its relationship with it can advance knowledge of STBs’ potential role in SS. This chapter identified the need to consider STB OMs’ views of their business’ LC, and differences between them, to understand STBs’ relationship with it. It argued that OMs’ views can be accessed through their reasons for choosing their business’ location, which, however, have been awarded limited attention by tourism scholars to date. Instead, tourism scholars have tended to focus on STB OMs’ motivations to run a business. While the extant literature suggests a link between OMs’ motivations and their business’ relationship with the LC, no studies were found which indicate that OMs’ motivations relate to their views of the business’ LC. Having established that the exploration of STB OMs’ views of their business’ LC requires the examination of their reasons for choosing their location, and identified conceptual shortcomings of the dominant typology of lifestyle and profit oriented STB OMs, it was argued that the dichotomy may be unsuitable as a tool for exploring differences in OMs’ views and understandings. As a result, a new STB typology is required that considers OMs’ views of their business’ LC. Chapter Three develops a framework informed by SS for conceptualising STBs in relation to their LC.
Chapter Three:
A framework for conceptualising small tourism businesses in relation to their local community

This thesis explores how small tourism business (STB) owner managers’ (OM) views of their business’ local community (LC) and its relationship with it can help to develop a better understanding of STBs’ role in social sustainability (SS). The previous chapter argued that OMs’ views of their business’ LC are key to understanding its relationship with it. It emerged that current conceptualisations of lifestyle and profit oriented STB OMs may be unsuited for exploring STB OMs’ views, and the case was made for a new typology that considers OMs’ reasons for choosing their location. The current chapter develops a framework informed by the notion of SS to explore OMs’ views and the differences between them.

This research is based within a rural context in Scotland. As pointed out in the Introduction to this thesis, there has been little agreement to date on how STBs contribute to sustainability. These businesses are increasingly important for rural economies, however, emphasising the need to understand the role they play in sustainable rural development. This chapter, therefore, begins by defining sustainable rural development. Interactions between individuals emerge as key to sustainable rural development and tourism is revealed as a possible driver of it (3.1). The chapter proceeds by examining the current SS discourse and definitions, and identifies relationships between actors as a key theme in the SS literature (3.2). In 3.3, social capital (SC) is examined as a dimension of SS, which refers to the potential in relationships between actors. It emerges that STBs’ ability to contribute to SS relates to the quality of their relationship with the LC. As a result, research about STBs’ ties with their LC is reviewed, revealing a gap in current understanding of OMs’ views of the relationship (3.4). The chapter concludes by presenting the conceptual framework
of this research, informed by the key observations from the current and previous chapter.

While the author acknowledges the lack of consensus and controversy around social sustainability and SC, the current chapter does not seek to provide a full review of these literatures, but rather to identify how these concepts can inform the conceptual framework of this research.

### 3.1. Sustainable rural development

The concept of sustainable rural development emerged in the late 1990s with the culture-economy approach developed by Ray (1998), and was later promoted by Marsden (1999); at the heart of which is the transformation of local knowledge into economic resources. This approach is a form of endogenous development, not restricted to rural areas, and is the result of internal as well as external influences and pressures on local communities, such as “the changing nature of post-industrial, consumer capitalism (the postmodernist perspective); the trajectory of rural development policy in the European Union; and the growth of regionalism as a European and global phenomenon” (Ray, 1998:4). It encourages building on local cultural resources – human as well as physical –, which is argued to positively affect the social and economic wellbeing of a community (Marsden, 1999). More specifically, it is suggested that communities that build on their own local resources are more independent and more able to adapt to change triggered by external forces, such as globalisation (Marsden, 1999).

The new model of sustainable rural development is presented as an “antithesis” to agro-industrialism and post-productivism (Marsden, 2009:125). Marsden (2009) defines it “as an active structural and behavioural change in the rural economy that
raises its competitive capabilities and resilience in the face of cost price squeezes, sustainability and vulnerability” (Marsden, 2009:124). The model emerged following critical incidents such as the crises of BSE, and Foot and Mouth. Coupled with the persistent economic difficulties affecting the farming sector, these events led to the reformation of relationships in the food production and consumption chains and triggered the re-consideration of agriculture and rural development, separately as well as their interrelationships (Marsden, 2009; Marsden & Sonnino, 2008; see e.g.: Lowe and Ward, 2007). In the UK this reformation is evident in the break-up of the Ministry of Food and Farming (MAFF) and the creation of the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra), highlighting a broader approach and understanding of rural development by the UK Government. The new model of rural development is characterised by a shift away from a sectoral towards a territorial approach. It promotes the rebuilding of local resources and the deepening of national as well as international relations (Marsden, 2009). Rural areas have become less self-sufficient and self-contained than before (Marsden, 1999), caused by forces such as commodification and globalisation (Lyson, 2006). In a move away from a production-intensive countryside to the consumption of it, tourism is understood as an opportunity for rural areas to compete in a more varied and entrepreneurial economy (Flora et al., 1997; Marsden, 1999; Marsden, 2009).

Conceptualisations of sustainable rural development have in common an emphasis on the relationships between rural actors (see, e.g.: Lowe and Ward, 2007; Marsden, 2010a). Marsden, in particular, examines this in great detail (see e.g.: Marsden, 2009, 2010a; Kitchen and Marsden, 2009). Based on Marsden, sustainable rural development is understood as resulting from innovative and new ways of combining rural resources, thereby fostering new activities, networks, and interactions; it can be seen as a process, which can have a synergistic effect once these new activities, networks, and interactions begin to reinforce each other (Marsden, 2010a). The quality and number of interactions between the different actors are central to this conceptualisation of sustainable rural development, and influence the sustainability of rural communities in
economic, environmental and social terms (Marsden, 2010a). Following on from this, and despite a lack of a “blueprint” for rural development (McAreavey and McDonagh, 2011:5), in this research rural sustainability is understood as a form of development that enhances the lives of rural actors now and in the future, economically, socially and environmentally, and promotes the survival of rural communities in the long-term. Central to this understanding of rural sustainability are the relationships between actors, which influence a community’s ability to transition towards sustainability.

Kitchen and Marsden (2009) suggest that tourism is a key driver of sustainable rural development. Indeed, tourism’s potential to contribute to sustainable rural development is further highlighted by its cross-sectoral nature, suggesting that tourism businesses are likely to interact with actors from different sectors. In particular, the works reviewed here, indicate that STBs can contribute to sustainable rural development through their ties with other actors. The next section identifies SS as central to sustainable rural development, and relationships between actors as a key theme in the SS discourse.

3.2. Social sustainability

SS may play a pivotal role in sustainable rural development. Typically, sustainable development is considered as comprising three interrelated dimensions: economic, ecological and social sustainability (Littig and Grießler, 2005; McKenzie, 2004). A growing number of scholars argue that SS is central to sustainable development, and indeed a pre-requisite for it. More specifically, it has been suggested that by splitting sustainable development into three separate elements, potential contradictions between the social and economic sustainability dimensions are concealed, and social issues are separated from economic issues despite being closely related (Kuhlman and Farrington, 2010). Similarly, Boström (2012, 2012a) argues that viewed from a social...
constructionist perspective, all dimensions of sustainable development are inherently social: social issues are inseparable from economic issues. In the same vein, Cuthill (2010) argues that environmental sustainability depends on SS and that economic development should be driven by considerations of SS. This is echoed by Hopwood et al. (2005:45), who describe sustainable development as “a human-centred view of the inter-relations between environmental and socio-economic issues.” Hopwood et al. (2005) and Giddings et al. (2002) indicate that humans are inseparable from the environment and depend on it, and that, as a result, solving environmental problems requires humans to alter their attitudes and behaviour. Indeed, Narayanan (2010) observes that, as the human is at the centre of the development process, human lifestyles must be altered so as to seek a more sustainable form of development, with the aim of fostering “a new global ethic” (WCED, 1987:3).

Conceptualisations of SS lend further support to the notion that SS is a pre-requisite for sustainable rural development. Vallance et al. (2011) identify that research concerned with SS can be grouped into three interdependent elements of SS, which they refer to as development, bridge, and maintenance SS. They define development SS as meeting people’s needs, bridge SS as positively adapting the human-environment relationship, and maintenance SS as maintaining or preserving certain social and cultural preferences and characteristics. Their conceptualisation highlights the economic (development SS) and environmental (bridge SS) dimensions of SS, and, therefore, the centrality of SS to achieve economic and environmental goals. Likewise, Littig and Grießler (2005:72) argue that SS concerns the satisfaction of human needs, conserving the natural environment in the long-term, and enabling social justice and participation – which relate to development, bridging, and maintenance SS, respectively. Understanding the social, ecological and economic aspects of sustainability as interrelated addresses corresponding calls from the literature (Colantonio and Dixon, 2011; Littig and Grießler, 2005; Scott, 2000). Moreover, this conceptualisation of SS shines light on internal conflicts inherent to it (Vallance et al., 2011): between, for instance, a desire to conserve the natural environment and the
use of non-renewable resources to satisfy basic needs. SS, then, is understood as the “bedrock” (Dillard et al., 2009:1) of sustainability, as “it is human-beings, individually and in the collective, that will determine economic and environmental well-being” (Magis and Shinn, 2009:38). It follows that SS is fundamental to achieving sustainable rural development, economically, environmentally and socially.

However, in the past, the economic and environmental pillars of sustainable development have received more attention than its social dimension (Bebbington and Dillard, 2009; Colantonio, 2007; Davidson, 2009; Dillard et al., 2009; Littig and Grießler, 2005; Partridge, 2005; Vallance et al., 2011). This implies that the debate surrounding SS is less advanced and that the concept is less understood. Indeed, SS has been criticised for its lack of conceptualisation and agreement on one valid definition (Bebbington and Dillard, 2009; Colantonio, 2007; Littig and Grießler, 2005; Spangenberg and Omann, 2006). In the absence of one common definition, relationships between actors emerge as a key theme from the SS discourse. Indeed, Dempsey et al. (2011:294) point out that, drawing on Dempsey (2006), “[w]ithout social interaction, people living in a given area can only be described as a group of individuals living separate lives, with little sense of community or sense of pride or place attachment”. A review of the literature reveals multiple elements that form part of SS and influence it, which are listed in Table 3.1. It is argued here that the implementation and communication of the values listed in Table 3.1 are dependent upon the relationships between people. Indeed, Koning (2001), drawing on the findings of an exploratory study in the Netherlands, argues that relationships between people are fundamental for SS. She explains that social relationships present an element of social infrastructure and that individuals can influence society through their interaction with others. Likewise, Littig and Grießler (2005) argue that social relationships and interactions are critical for the functioning of those social systems and institutions created for the purpose of meeting human needs: economy, politics, and culture. Similarly, other authors suggest that SC (see section 3.3), which is understood in this research as the potential within the relationships between social
actors, is an element of SS (Dillard et al., 2009, Koning, 2001; Messer and Kecskes, 2009) and a “theoretical starting point” for it (Cuthill, 2010:366). These works imply that the relationships and interactions between actors are central to the different elements of SS. Following on from these works, it is argued that SS should consider the relationships between actors and how they influence the sustainability of their community, and understand these relationships as deeply integrated into the

Table 3.1. Elements of social sustainability as identified in the review of literature.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of life</th>
<th>Social capital</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td>Social infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion</td>
<td>Social health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td>Social well-being</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Futures focus</td>
<td>Social relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory processes</td>
<td>Relationships with nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social justice</td>
<td>Resilience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality</td>
<td>Social institutions (e.g. family, community, education and government)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion</td>
<td>Intergenerational equity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfying human needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaged Governance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

actors’ LC. Such an understanding of SS highlights simultaneously the social (here, the community) context in which relationships exist and their potential influence on it. In relation to the research aim, this implies that STBs can contribute to SS through their relationship with their LC. To better understand how STBs can contribute to SS, the next section examines the concept of SC, which concerns the content of actors’ relationships.
3.3. Social capital

Bourdieu, Coleman and Putnam are three key figures in the development of the SC concept. While there is general consensus that SC is concerned with relationships between actors (see for example: Babb, 2005; Bourdieu, 1986; Coleman, 1988; Dayton-Johnson, 2000; Forrest and Kearns, 2001; Grootaert, 1998; Putnam, 1993), discussions diverge regarding the nature and ownership of SC. Bourdieu (1986) and Grootaert (1998), for instance, describe it as a collective good, whereas Dayton-Johnson (2000) describes it as a form of capital inherent to the individual. In the current study, SC is understood as the potential that lies within relationships between people (Babb, 2005; Bourdieu, 1986; Coleman, 1988; Forrest and Kearns, 2001; Putnam, 1993). The value of an individual’s resources is augmented through interaction with others (Woolcock, 1998), and allow actors access to e.g. information, solidarity, and influence (Adler and Kwon, 2002). As suggested by Adler and Kwon (2002), SC is what transforms an actor into a member of a community. As Forrest and Kearns (2001:2141) suggest, “[S]ocial capital, then, is important not for its own sake, but for what one does with it, or can attain by it.” It follows that relationships between individuals constitute a web-like foundation required to develop SC, the benefits of which can be accrued only through interaction with other actors in it.

Several authors have argued that SC presents a fundamental element of SS, and a means by which to measure SS (Boström, 2012, 2012a; Colantonio and Dixon, 2007; Cuthill, 2010; Koning, 2001; McKenzie, 2004; Partridge, 2005), which itself was reviewed in the previous section. It features implicitly also in the work by Littig and Grießler (2005), who emphasise the importance of relationships in society. Koning (2001) cautions that SC and social sustainability have been used interchangeably in the past, and highlights the need to differentiate between them. Following on from the definition of SS provided in section 3.2, relationships between actors are understood as a key dimension of SS, whereas SC is understood as the potential within the relationships through which actors can contribute to SS.
The literature suggests that SC can result in positive economic and social effects. In particular, SC has been described as important for the sustainability, strength and success of communities (Cuthill, 2010; Grootaert, 1998; Putnam, 1993). Other authors have identified SC as important for tourism development in rural areas (Johannesson et al., 2003; Jones, 2005; Moscardo, 2014; Nordin and Westlund, 2009), more so than financial and physical capital (Moscardo, 2014). Pertaining to the subject of this thesis, Hall (2004) stressed the importance of SC among small rural tourism businesses for the development of competitive regions. He found that SC reduces the uncertainty related to new business creation for STBs, as it provides OMs access to knowledge, resources and information, which is echoed by Zhao et al. (2011). Similarly, Louks et al. (2010:184) argue that the costs of “doing business” are reduced in communities with higher levels of SC due to an increased sense of community. Additionally, SC has been argued to influence tourism business behaviour (Fuller and Tian, 2006), related to welcoming attitudes among residents toward tourists (Ooi et al., 2014), and as influencing the tourist experience (Bosworth and Farrell, 2011).

Regarding possible social effects, SC has been suggested as binding communities (Kwon and Adler, 2002) together, as presenting “the ‘glue’ that holds societies together” (Grootaert, 1998:iii). This notion is supported by Putnam (1995) and Woolcock and Narayan (2000), who suggest that generalised reciprocity, trust, and cooperation are manifestations of SC. Other studies have related SC to an increased sense of community, sense of empowerment, and community participation (Ooi et al., 2014). SC can also contribute to community resilience by mitigating against adverse effects of economic deprivation (Poortigna, 2012). This is also supported by Adler and Kwon (2002:25), who argue that SC facilitates the development of communities with shared interests, encourages a sense of obligation, common identities, and “commitment to the common good.” In the same vein, Kawachi and Berkman (2000:175) argue that SC is evident in an “absence of latent social conflict,” and the “presence of strong social bonds.” Together, these studies imply that SC can relate to positive economic and social outcomes in communities.
Typically, scholars distinguish between two different types of SC: bonding and bridging SC. Putnam (1993) describes bonding SC as existing in the ties within a group of people. The definition offered by Woolcock (2001) is more specific and refers to the more intimate relationships with friends and family, which resemble the strong ties described by Granovetter (1985, 2005). The definitions of bridging SC offered by Woolcock (2001) and Putnam (1993) show more similarities. Specifically, the authors relate this type of capital to the relationships that bridge between different groups of people and social classes, e.g. work-related acquaintances (Putnam, 1993; Woolcock, 2001), which is comparable to the weak ties described by Granovetter (1985, 2005). These works suggest that bonding SC relates to homogeneous and bridging SC to heterogeneous ties between actors.

There appear to be multiple levels of bonding and bridging SC. Ooi et al. (2014) define forms of SC based on the quality of relations. Like Woolcock (2001) and Granovetter (2005), Ooi et al. (2014) suggest that bonding SC is restricted to close friends and family, and bridging capital relates to ties with actors outside such close-knit networks. The approach offered by McGehee et al. (2009) is broader as they suggest that the nature of ties is defined by shared interests. Specifically, they argue that strong ties, i.e. bonding SC, refer to relations within a specific group of individuals with a common interest, and bridging ties, i.e. weak ties, to relations between groups with different interests. On the other hand, Shakya (2016) differentiates between the different types of SC based on their geographical scope. She describes bonding SC as relationships within a particular community of place, and conversely bridging SC to relations between communities of place. This implies that there are different scales of bonding and bridging SC, which reflects work from Adler and Kwon (2002), who argue that types of capital are defined by the level of analysis employed by the researcher. In the context at hand, bonding SC can exist in a community of place as well as in its ‘sub-communities’ of interest. Bridging SC, on the other hand, can serve as links between communities of place, and between sub-communities of interest.
The potential within relationships is related to the social norms that characterise them. In particular, the development of SC requires common social norms, including trust and reciprocity (Forrest and Kearns, 2001; Portes and Sensebrenner, 1993), which are pivotal for managing conflict (Kawachi and Berkman, 2000). SC indicates a ‘general’ trust in other actors (Grootaert, 1998; Putnam, 1995), which Fukuyama (1995) describes as the actors’ belief in the predictability of others actors’ behaviours. High levels of trust allow groups of individuals to accomplish more (Coleman, 1988), while generalised reciprocity encourages collective action (Adler and Kwon, 2002). Arguably, social interaction among actors in a community facilitates the diffusion of social norms and their enforcement. For instance, trusting relationships discourage behaviour that might harm other group members (Grootaert, 1998). Conversely, a lack of interaction implies a limited awareness of existing social norms, which may result in behaviour that is detrimental to the community.

Studies suggest that bonding and bridging SC relate to different economic and social effects. For instance, Sørensen (2007) finds that the strength of ties between tourism firms, i.e. bonding or bridging ties, are a key determinant of the type of information that flows between actors within social networks. More specifically, bridging SC has been observed as being conducive to STB development (Johannesson et al., 2003; Karlsson, 2005), vital for innovation in tourism development (Jones, 2005), pivotal for destination development (Haugland et al., 2011), and important for tourism development in rural areas (Johannesson et al., 2003; Jones, 2005; Moscardo, 2014; Nordin and Westlund, 2009). In contrast, bonding SC can help individuals get by in everyday life, reduce social conflict and contribute to social cohesion (Forrest and Kearns, 2001; Kawachi and Berkman, 2000). Additionally, while bonding SC has been argued to be conducive to business set-up and to provide access to social groups (Woolcock, 1998), bridging SC, i.e. weak ties, has been claimed to encourage the flow of information and interaction between groups (Granovetter, 1985). Importantly, while bonding SC may encourage cohesion within a group of individuals, bridging SC can facilitate cohesion between social groups (Poortinga, 2012). Similarly, bonding ties
have been argued to allow individuals to influence others and thereby encourage behaviour that benefits a particular group. Bridging ties, on the other hand, can bring people together, encouraging interaction between individuals from different groups in the community (Besser, 2009).

However, increasing levels of social bonding and bridging capital do not necessarily lead to greater social and economic benefits. Woolcock (1998) suggests that there is a balance to be met between bonding and bridging SC for it to be conducive to economic development, and highlights that “collectively they are resources to be optimized, not maximized” (Woolcock, 1998:158). Specifically, the author points out that too much or too little of one type of SC might hamper economic development. As a result, and contrasting with human and financial capital, rising levels of SC will not necessarily increase the value of SC. In the same vein, Putnam (2000) argues that it is the combination of social bonding and bridging capital that is conducive to community development. Indeed, bonding SC can prevent access to communities and social or professional groups, and too much of it might result in economic or non-economic claims from community members that inhibit economic development (Atterton, 2007; Woolcock, 1998). Likewise, Portes and Sensebrenner (1993) draw on the literature to argue that high levels of bonding SC can result in strong social obligations towards family members and may lead individuals to purposively distance themselves from their community to pursue particular economic or social goals. Likewise, the authors indicate that high social bonding capital can be restrictive to individual expression and social mobility. Furthermore, high levels of bonding SC in a community may increase the possibility of conflict between communities (Kearns and Forrest, 2000). These studies suggest that the socioeconomic effects that SC can have are related to the levels and combination of bonding and bridging SC.

Moreover, the effects of SC may relate to local social and economic circumstances. Portes (2000) questions whether the benefits linked to SC in the past might be related to other socioeconomic characteristics instead, and cautions that “[SC] risks becoming
synonymous with each and all things that are positive in social life” (Portes, 2000:3). Indeed, as Amin (2005), Das (2004) and Kearns and Forrest (2000) highlight, the stock and significance of SC within a community are likely to be subject to the economic well-being of actors involved, as well as to local contextual forces, such as economic and political circumstances. In particular, Das (2004) observes that if individuals only have few resources to share (e.g. knowledge or money), SC brings no, or limited, benefits to those involved. Amin (2005) argues that, rather than presenting SC as a solution to economic development, attention must be placed on the material circumstances of a community and potential alterations of them. Together, these works indicate that while actors may contribute to socioeconomic development in their LC through their relationships, the potential in their relationships pertains to the nature of their ties, as well as local social and economic circumstances.

Overall, the studies examined here suggest that STBs’ potential to contribute to SS relates to the nature of their relationship with the LC and local socioeconomic factors, and that types of SC are defined by the level of analysis employed by the researcher. The following section will review previous studies concerned with STBs’ ties and relationships, and the potential within them.

3.4. Small tourism businesses’ relationship with the local community

There has been a lack of discussion of STB’s contribution to SS. Typically, research concerned with STBs’ role in sustainable development focuses on the environmental dimension of sustainability (Thomas et al., 2011. See e.g.: Chan, 2011; Dewhurst and Thomas, 2003; Ferrari et al., 2010; Frey and George, 2010; Karatoglou and Spilanis, 2010; Louks et al., 2010; Maher et al., 2010; Nilsson et al., 2005; Revel and Blackburn, 2007; Schaper and Carlsen, 2004; Tzschentke et al., 2008). While much research has examined the social impacts of tourism in general (for a detailed review see: Deery et
al. 2012), the limited attention awarded to tourism’s role in SS has been pointed out by Robinson (1999), and more recently by Thomas et al. (2011) in relation to STBs. A search in academic databases and Google Scholar using the terms “small tourism” and “social sustainability” returned no relevant articles about STBs’ role in SS. This suggests that few if any, studies have examined STBs’ role in SS.

As established in sections 3.2 and 3.3, research into STBs’ relationship with their LC can contribute to developing an understanding of their contribution to SS. The literature suggests that STBs’ ties with their LC generate local economic benefits. In particular, STBs’ ties with the local business community have been found to be significant for business success (Komppula, 2004), and to play a key role in creating and maintaining a competitive advantage over other tourist destinations, for example by creating seamless tourism products and experiences, and joined-up marketing initiatives between STBs and other tourism businesses (Mottiar and Ryan, 2007). As a result, STBs’ interaction with the local business community can contribute specifically to tourism promotion in rural areas (Saxena et al., 2007), and to tourism development in general (Kokkranikal and Morrison, 2011). Additionally, STBs’ interactions with other STBs as well as their participation in tourism networks, has been argued to be conducive to rural sustainability (Oliver and Jenkins, 2005; Saxena et al., 2007). In particular, STBs have been found to contribute to collaboration and co-operation in rural destinations (Di Domenico, 2003; Moscardo, 2014; Nilsson et al., 2005; Haven-Tang and Jones, 2005). The importance of STBs’ interaction in rural areas is emphasised in the Scottish Rural Development Programme, which describes co-

---

3 A search for “small tourism” AND “social sustainability” on Web of Science returned no relevant results. The same search on Sciencedirect returned five results. However, reading the abstracts revealed that none of the articles were concerned with STBs’ role in SS. For example, Lemelin et al. (2015) devise a framework of indicators for, and evaluations of, success, and Lee (2001) examines the role of cleaner production in the development of sustainable tourism destinations. Although both studies refer to SS, it does not form part of their study or discussion of findings. Similarly, searches on JSTOR and Tandfonline returned no relevant research pertaining to STBs and social sustainability. A search in Google Scholar was also conducted. Although the search returned 170 results, a review of the listed publications revealed that many did not mention social sustainability at all. This suggests that the returned search results are not accurate, as a result of which the researcher instead consulted academic databases for peer reviewed works.
operation as “integral” to rural development. Moreover, it identifies co-operation between small firms to develop and market tourism as a sub-measure of encouraging co-operation among rural actors (Scottish Government, 2014:605). The studies mentioned in this paragraph highlight the potential in STBs’ relationship with the LC to generate economic benefits for it.

Research regarding tourism networks provides further insight into the possible benefits arising from STBs’ interaction with their LC. Network ties are understood as the economic ties between tourism stakeholders (Chell and Baines, 2000). Tourism networks have been observed to provide access to knowledge, resources, markets, and technologies, which is beneficial for increasing innovation and competitiveness among tourism SMEs, and within tourism destinations (Costa et al., 2008. See e.g.: Hall, 2004). Networks have also been found as being key for the exchange of and access to information, which is used as strategic knowledge in destinations (Kokranikal and Morrison, 2011; Pavlovich, 2001). Similarly, Kokranikal and Morrison (2011) found that tourism networks benefit tourism destinations in terms of improved business activities, and creating complementary sources of income. Additionally, tourism networks have been found to contribute to sustainability by managing the use of natural resources for tourism purposes, providing education on environmental issues, and advocating environmental management practices (Halme and Fadeeva, 2000; Pavlovich, 2001). These studies strengthen the notion that STBs’ ties with the LC, and the potential within them, are vital for their local economies.

3.4.1. Possible differences in small tourism business’ potential to contribute to social sustainability

It is possible that the potential in STBs’ relationship with their LC vary. The literature suggests that STBs interact with different actors in their LC and beyond, implying differences in the potential of their ties (see 3.3). In particular, STBs have been observed to maintain ties with businesses in the tourism sector and other industry sectors, industry and trade organisations, governmental bodies, environmental groups,
LC members and community groups (see Figure 3.1). The literature indicates that STBs’ ties are typically informal and that relationships tend to take the form of recommendations to and from other businesses, the provision of complementary services, and overflow referrals (Costa et al., 2008; Mottiar, 2007). These works suggest that STBs have multiple means for accessing and contributing to SC in their LC.

At the same time, research implies differences regarding the types of actors that STBs interact with. Findings from King et al. (2012) infer that some STBs have informal relationships with other businesses, and interact with their local and non-local tourism business-community, whereas other STBs might engage in more formal co-operation and interact more with their local non-tourism business-community. Differences between STBs are also implicit in other studies. For instance, Curran et al. (2001) observe that small businesses in their study were particularly disconnected from the
local social and political – as opposed to economic – environment, irrespective of the sector they operated in. Likewise, Mottiar (2007) found that STBs tended to interact only with the local business community. In contrast, Paniagua (2002) observes that tourism business owners in rural Spain also tend to have links to their local non-business community, and finds that these are usually related to the owners’ personal connection to the community. In accordance with this, Keen (2004) explores STB OMs’ ties with the local non-business community and observes that tourism business owners maintained personal relationships with it. Bosworth and Farrell (2011) make similar observations and find that STBs tend to have ties with their local non-business community. These studies are an indication that STBs’ relationship with the LC differs, regarding both the actual and the potential relationship.

Equally possible is that the nature of STBs’ relationship with the LC differs. For instance, research by Lynch (2000) identified differences in density of STBs’ economic ties. While some OMs were part of dense tourism networks, others were part of less dense networks, and some did not seem to participate at all. Similarly, Chell and Baines (2000) found variations in the quantity of ties small businesses had, and the frequency of their interactions. Another study by Sweeney and Lynch (2009) found variations in STBs’ relationship with their local business community. Specifically, they observe that some OMs had a more competitive relation with their local business community than others, while another group appeared to work closely with their LC. These works lend additional support to the argument that STBs might differ in their potential to contribute to SS through their relationship with their LC.

This argument is further supported by studies that identify differences in STB OMs’ motivations to interact with the LC. More specifically, STB OMs’ appear to be driven by different motives to engage with their business’ LC. For instance, O’Donnell and Cummins (1999) observe that STBs network with other businesses to achieve a tangible economic benefit. Similarly, Mottiar (2007) and Costa et al. (2008) identify expectations of economic benefit as an influence on STBs’ economic ties. Costa et al.
(2008) find that business owners described the main advantages of their economic relations as including credibility and representativeness, and access to training and support (formal relationships to tourism associations), as well as opportunities for strategic partnerships, informal networking, and legal support (affiliations with organisations in their respective sector). Likewise, studies by Chell and Baines (2000), Hallak et al. (2012), Mottiar (2007) and King et al. (2012) suggest that STBs’ relationship with their LC is driven by an interest in economic benefits. In contrast, Fuller and Tian (2006) observe that tourism SMEs’ interaction with other businesses related to their owners’ non-economic motivations. Furthermore, they find that when SME owners’ behaviour is informed by a sense of responsibility towards others, it results in stronger ties than when driven by a concern with commercial benefits. Another study by Hallak et al. (2012) notes that tourism SMEs’ relationship with their local business community is related to their OMs’ understandings of their ability to pursue lifestyle goals in it. It follows from these studies that STB OMs might have different reasons for engaging with their business’ LC.

Similarly, studies regarding in-migrant tourism business owners indicate that STBs might differ in their relationship with the LC. In his study on migrant tourism business owners in rural Spain, Paniagua (2002) identifies that differences among in-migrant tourism entrepreneurs to successfully integrate into their local non-business communities related to their personal relationship with it. Specifically, the author finds that, while all owners integrate to a certain extent, those who had links with the area in the past or chose the area strategically to run their business were more successful. Paniagua’s (2002) work is complemented by Akgün et al. (2011), who observe in their systematic literature review that tourism entrepreneurs’ interaction with their local business and non-business community is related to their personal relationship with it. Those entrepreneurs who had in-migrated to the LC were less likely to interact with the local business and non-business community than those who originated from the community. This echoes research by Carlsen et al. (2001), who found differences regarding the behaviour of STB OMs who were born in the community and those who
had immigrated. Together, these studies emphasise the need to consider possible differences in STBs’ relationship with their LC.

It is possible that differences in STBs’ interaction with their LC relate to local economic and tourism development. Drawing on theories of reasoned action and business strategy frameworks, Dewhurst and Thomas (2003) developed a framework to analyse STB engagement in environmental sustainability practices, and identify external factors, including political, economic and social forces, as well as the more immediate geographical and sectoral environment including competitors and suppliers, as influences on STB behaviour. Additionally, Doxey’s Irridex model from 1975 (see Fletcher 2005) proposes that resident attitudes towards tourists deteriorate with increasing tourism development, going through several stages: euphoria, apathy, irritation, antagonism and final, the latter of which indicates tourists’ move toward other tourist destinations. Allen et al. (1993) find that the level of local economic activity also plays a role. In particular, the authors (Allen et al., 1993) observe among rural communities in Colorado, USA, that communities with high levels of economic activity and low levels of tourism development, as well as those with low economic activity and high levels of tourism development both demonstrate more negative attitudes towards tourism. This, they argue, is related to the communities’ lack of interest in tourism development; because of perceived sufficient economic activity in the case of the former and unfulfilled economic expectations of tourism development in the case of the latter. In contrast, they found that communities where expectations of tourism were fulfilled (high economic activity and high level of tourism development), or where tourism was perceived as a potentially valuable source of economic income in future (low economic activity and low tourism development), attitudes towards tourism were favourable. These observations are further supported by Getz (1994), who found that resident attitudes towards tourism are likely to be influenced by the performance of the industry, and the destinations’ economic dependence on it. The author (Getz, 1994) suggests that a destination that is more dependent on tourism is more tolerant to negative changes in the industry’s
performance than a destination that has a more varied economic base. Likewise, Hao et al. (2010) and Andereck et al. (2005) highlight a relationship between the economic benefits a person receives from tourism and their attitude towards it. This implies that local economic and tourism development may influence the relationship between STBs and their LC.

The literature suggests rural accessibility as a further influence on STBs’ relationship with their LC. In her study of firms’ networking behaviour in accessible and remote locations in Scotland, Atterton (2007) observes that business owners in the most remote rural town are more likely to have long-standing social ties, and links with their family. Owners in this town tended to have local ties, comparatively fewer extra-local relations and were more inward-looking. Similarly, Sutherland and Burton (2011) observe that small-scale farmers in remote locations were more dependent on local economic relationships to source staff and equipment than those in more accessible locations. In contrast, Atterton (2007) finds that businesses in accessible locations had weaker ties to their LC, and were more likely to engage with actors in the city to exploit possible opportunities. Based on her findings, she argues that in the most rural location it was more likely that the strength of ties would lead to an overriding of economic arguments, as norms and social obligations result in high opportunity costs. This research therefore suggests that STBs’ potential to contribute to SS through their relationship with the LC relates to the accessibility of their location.

The studies reviewed thus far indicate that STBs might differ in their relationship with their LC and hence their potential to contribute to SS. They also emphasise the need to consider how local economic and tourism development as well as rural accessibility relate to the STB-community relationship. Moreover, they stress that the nature and potential in the STB-community relationship relates to their OMs’ personal ties with it, which echoes the literature reviewed in Chapter Two (see chapter 2.1).
3.4.2. Owner-managers’ views of their business’ relationship with the local community

Considering all of these studies, it seems that STBs’ relationship with their LC and differences between those relationships relate to their OMs’ understandings and expectations of it. Yet, studies tend to approach the study of STB-community relations with apriori definitions and concepts of relationships and interaction, such as collaboration, co-operation, or network (see e.g.: Costa et al., 2008; Di Domenico, 2003; Moscardo, 2014; Mottiar and Ryan, 2007; Nilsson et al., 2005; Pavlovich and Kearins, 2004). This suggests that knowledge of the relationship between STBs and their LC is limited, and, while research has provided empirical evidence that reinforces existing concepts and constructs, it has failed to reveal new meanings and challenge current assumptions (Gioia et al. 2012).

Indeed, a study by Mottiar and Ryan (2007) illustrates the discrepancy in STB OMs’ understandings and researchers’ definitions of the relationship. Specifically, Mottiar and Ryan (2007) asked STB owners about their cooperative ties with other businesses, in response to which participants showed a lack of awareness of such ties. However, when the researchers prompted the participants about specific relationships with other businesses the participants confirmed these ties. This suggests that what was initially interpreted as a lack of awareness among participants by the authors may instead point towards differences in OMs’ and researchers’ understandings of STBs’ relationship with their LC. Indeed, Saxena (2015) highlights that STBs’ relationships with others may be less tangible than co-operation, collaboration and networking imply and instead be imagined with little or no interaction. This suggests that STB OMs’ views of their business’ relationship with its LC may be distinct from current knowledge of them, and emphasises the need to understand the OMs’ view of the relationship to conceptualise the business in relation to its LC.

Similarly, researchers need to be critical of how their conceptualisation of STBs might influence their findings regarding the STB-community relationship. For instance, Hallak
et al. (2013) explore the support provided to the LC by tourism SMEs. The main limitation of their study is that they employ survey questions that predefine the type of support firms might provide to the LC. As a result, their findings provide a limited, and potentially skewed, insight into firms’ support toward the LC. In particular, two of the seven questions they posed relate to financial assistance. However, smaller firms, in particular, may have limited financial resources (Storey, 1994), implying that their ability to support the LC financially may be reduced. Nevertheless, these businesses may support their LC through other, non-financial means, which may be equally important as financial support. Conversely, had the authors employed questions that examined exclusively non-financial contributions to the LC, it is possible that a different group of businesses would have emerged as providing the highest support to the LC. As a result, it is argued here that, while the approach followed by Hallak et al. (2013) may be suitable for examining the support provided by larger companies or corporations that have the necessary financial resources, it may obscure other forms of support that smaller tourism firms provide to their LC. This highlights the need for researchers to be critical of how their research methods relate to current conceptualisations of STBs, whether they provide empirical evidence for existing theory, or can reveal new insights, and potentially challenge assumptions about businesses.

Collectively, these works highlight a research gap regarding STB OMs’ views of their business’ local community, and outline their critical role for understanding STBs’ potential to contribute to SS. The key observations that emerge from this chapter are summarised subsequently to develop the conceptual framework for this research.
3.5. Chapter summary and conclusions

Chapter Two argued that STB OMs’ views of their business’ LC are critical for understanding the potential in STBs’ relationships. However, current conceptualisations of lifestyle and profit oriented STB OMs may be unsuited for exploring their OMs’ views of their business’ LC, stressing the need for a new STB typology. The aim of this chapter was to develop a theoretical framework for exploring STB OMs’ views and understandings. It emerged that STBs can contribute to sustainable rural development through their interactions with others, and it was argued that, to advance knowledge of STBs’ role in sustainable rural development, a better understanding of STBs’ contribution to SS is required. The SS and SC literatures indicate that STBs can contribute to SS through their relationships. In particular, it was argued that their role in SS relates to the potential in their relationships. Existing research implies that STBs’ relationship with their LC may vary, which may relate to local economic and tourism development and the geographic accessibility of locations. While many studies have examined STBs’ ties and possible economic benefits, there has been little discussion about OM’s attitudes towards their business’ relationships.

Yet, as highlighted in Chapter Two (see 2.1), OMs’ beliefs play a central role in STB behaviour. Indeed, further evidence emerged which suggests that STBs’ relationship with their LC relates to their OMs’ views of it. It follows that, to understand the differences in STBs’ relationship with the LC, and hence their potential role in SS, research also needs to explore OMs’ views of the relationship. Therefore, to address the shortcomings in understanding regarding STBs’ role in SS that were revealed here, it emerges as a research objective to examine possible implications of STB OMs’ views of their business’ local community and its relationship with it for their role in SS.

The conceptual framework of this research is presented in Figure 3.2 and draws on the key observations from the previous and current chapter. This framework allows the researcher to devise a new STB typology that can be used as an analytical device to
address the research gaps that were identified in the literature regarding STBs’ relationship with their LC and their potential to contribute to SS through it.
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**Figure 3.2. Conceptual framework. Source: Author.**

The framework assumes that SS is fundamental to sustainable rural development (see 3.1) and that STBs’ contribution to SS relates to the potential in their relationship with the LC (see 3.2 and 3.3). Critical for understanding the potential in STBs’ relationship are their OMs’ views of their business’ LC (see chapter 2.1) and its relationship with it (see 3.4), i.e. their understandings of SS, which are influenced by economic and tourism development, as well as the geographic accessibility of their business’ location.
(see 3.4). The next chapter outlines the methodology employed in this thesis to explore STB OMs’ understanding of SS through their view of the STB-LC relationship.
Chapter Four: Methodology

Chapter Two argued for exploring how small tourism business’ (STB) owner managers (OM) view their business’ local community (LC) and its relationship with it, to advance understanding of STBs’ potential role in social sustainability (SS), and revealed that current conceptualisations of STBs are unsuited for exploring STB OMs’ views. Chapter Three developed a framework informed by the notion of SS for conceptualising STBs in relation to their LC. The current research aims to explore how STB OMs’ understandings of their business’ relationship with their LC can enhance understanding of their potential role in SS. In particular, it addresses research gaps regarding STBs’ role in SS, and their OMs’ reasons for choosing their location, and their views of their business’ LC and its relationship with it.

This chapter outlines the methodological approach taken by the researcher. It begins with an outline of the epistemological and ontological framework underlying this study (4.1), and continues by justifying the number of research participants (4.2). Subsequently, it provides an overview of the three study areas and describes how the research participants were identified (4.3). After the approach to seeking ethical consent is outlined (4.4.), the process of recruiting research participants is explored (4.5), and the processes of data collection (4.6) and data analysis (4.7) are described. Then, reflections on the methodology are provided (4.8), and a justification of the research approach followed in this study is provided in the concluding section of this chapter (4.9).
4.1. The epistemological and ontological framework

Researchers’ philosophical assumptions influence the research, its design and outcomes greatly (Crotty, 1998). Revealing the researchers’ epistemological and ontological approaches is particularly important in qualitative research, as clarity and credibility of the study are influenced by the researchers’ awareness of her philosophical underpinnings on the one hand, and by the application thereof to every aspect of the research process on the other (King and Horrocks, 2010). Thus, this section explains the beliefs and values underlying the design of this research to show how the researcher draws the conclusions outlined in Chapters Five and Six.

Ontology concerns the study of being, of what is real or true. Epistemology refers to the study of knowledge, i.e. how we know what we know. Depending on how one sees the world (ontology) one goes about understanding it (epistemology). Within the literature ontologies are frequently referred to as epistemologies and vice versa, the reason being that a researcher’s epistemology determines, and at the same time is determined by, her ontology. As a result, the ontological assumptions outlined here may be referred to as epistemologies elsewhere.

Typically, a distinction is drawn between subjectivist, objectivist and constructionist ontologies. Subjectivist ontology assumes that meaning is imposed on the object by the subject and is influenced by, for example, dreams, religion, individual consciousness, but not by any interaction with the object. Instead, understanding of the object is assumed as being influenced by subjectivities and purely based on subjective meaning(s). Scholars who ascribe to subjectivist ontology understand reality as created by the individual. An extreme form of subjectivism is solipsism, according to which everything we see is a product of our imagination (Crotty, 1998).

In contrast, objectivism as ontology assumes that reality exists, as opposed to being created by individuals. Specifically, scholars who ascribe to this ontology argue that
there exists one, and only one, truth external to the individual, which can be discovered by means of scientific research. Research based on positivist or post-positivist epistemologies is traditionally informed by this ontology (Crotty, 1998; Guba and Lincoln, 1994). Scholars who refer these epistemologies seek explanation to predict and control phenomena and understand the researcher and the researched as independent entities (Guba and Lincoln, 1994, 1998).

Constructionism borrows from subjectivist and objectivist traditions. While it shares with subjectivism that reality is understood as created by the individual, Crotty (1998) describes it as a separate ontology, distinct from subjectivism. He suggests that constructionist ontology assumes the existence of multiple realities and that the realities of a group of people might overlap, i.e. they might share a common ‘truth’ (Crotty, 1998). He goes on to explain that such shared meaning is not called into existence (as subjectivist ontology implies), but the result of combining elements that already exist. In other words, meanings and realities are constructed using what we have available to us in the world. Similar to objectivist ontology, therefore, constructionism assumes that there exists meaning outside the individual; however, there exist multiple meanings, hence there is not one external ‘truth’ as objectivist ontology implies.

Crotty (1998) argues that meaning be constructed by societies, and people are born into a world full of already constructed meaning, such as culture. This is not to say that people do not construct meaning(s) individually as well; rather that the process of meaning construction will be influenced by meanings that were previously socially constructed (Crotty, 1998), i.e. that there exists a reality outside the individual as well. Similarly, Eagleton suggests that, “[B]elonging to a culture means that not everything is up for grabs all of the time, as it might be for a cultureless being like God. It means that the world comes to us not as brute fact or raw material, but as already signifying” (2007:109). The notion that realities are constructed socially and do not exist as objective entities highlights the importance of the local context within which
individuals construct their realities (Cope, 2009) and the meaning that already exists within these local contexts.

Constructionist ontology generally informs interpretivist epistemology, which aims at understanding human as well as social realities (Crotty, 1998). Presupposed is that meaning is constructed, and discovered by interpreting the meaning that people ascribe to objects, interactions and actions (Hesse-Bieber and Leavy, 2011). As Geertz suggests, “[B]elieving, with Max Weber, that man is an animal suspended in webs of significance he himself has spun, I take culture to be those webs, and the analysis of it to be therefore not an experimental science in search of law but an interpretive one in search of meaning” (1973:5). Researchers that ascribe to an interpretive-constructionist approach to research seek to understand phenomena and perceive the researcher as well as the researched as closely entwined and influenced by each other (Guba and Lincoln, 1998). This emphasises the need for self-reflexivity, which requires the researcher to carefully consider how her beliefs, role and past experiences might influence the interaction with the participant (Tracy, 2013). Constructionism is a relatively new research approach in tourism studies (Pernecky, 2012) and was applied recently in STB research by Komppula (2014) to enhance understanding of STBs’ role in destination competitiveness by examining their views of it.

A constructionist-interpretive approach was considered most suited to address the research aim, as it allowed the researcher to explore STB OMs’ views and understandings, and make sense of them by interpreting the meaning they ascribe to their business’ LC and its relationship with it. It was pointed out in Chapter Three that STB researchers have to date tended to employ a-priori definitions in studies regarding STBs’ relationship with their LC, such as collaboration, co-operation, and networks (see chapter 3.4), and awarded little attention to STB OMs’ views of the relationship. Examples from the literature were provided to show how failing to consider OMs’ views may lead to false assumptions about STBs’ interaction with their LC. The paucity of research about STB OMs’ understandings of their business’ LC and its relationship
with it calls for an exploratory research approach (Denscombe, 2010). It follows that the emphasis in this study is not in the explanation of one external truth, as pursued by objectivist researchers. This study rather seeks to examine STB OMs’ multiple realities and how they make sense of their world (Gioia et al., 2012), to explore the similarities and differences in their views.

4.1.1. The constructionist researcher

In his seminal work, the sociologist Émile Durkheim (1982) points out that, “[The reader’s] mind should always be conscious that the modes of thought with which he is most familiar are adverse, rather than favourable, to the scientific study of social phenomena, so that he must consequently be on his guard against first impressions.” In this vein, the constructionist researcher must be aware of the constructed meanings around her, and be prepared to see phenomena in a new or different light to identify aspects that are significant, yet have not been discovered previously (Kvale and Brinkman, 2009). Crotty (1998:55) argues that we are all shaped by our experiences in life and influenced by culture, based on which we acquire a certain worldview. He refers to Ann Oakley to explain that it is critical for the researcher always to remember that a, “way of seeing is a way of not seeing” (1974:27). In other words, when seeing the world through a lens of already defined concepts and established knowledge, we run the risk of overlooking aspects that do not fit into our pre-defined concepts (Crotty, 1998). Key is to be aware that a concept is unable to reflect the multi-dimensionality of phenomena (Crotty, 1998:81). Hence, the constructionist researcher continuously searches for new meanings and knowledge and is aware of how her worldview influences her research. The constructionist ontology approach used here therefore responds to Pernecky (2012) who criticises the lack of tourism scholars that challenge current assumptions.
Based on this interpretive-constructionist approach, the researcher resembles the ‘traveller’ persona described by Kvale and Brinkman (2009), who engages in conversation with actors to explore their lived worlds. They go on to suggest that meanings unfold in this process through the traveller’s interpretation of them and that this journey might unveil previously unchallenged values and customs. As a result, this approach lends itself well to exploring and interpreting STB OMs’ narratives and encourages the researcher to be aware of meanings and knowledge that challenge current conceptualisations of STBs and their relationship with their LC. Indeed, Pernecky (2012) describes constructed identities in tourism as an avenue for further research in tourism studies and calls for more tourism research informed by constructionist ontology.

4.1.2. Qualitative semi-structured interviews

In alignment with the interpretive-constructionist philosophical framework of the current research, it was essential to obtain ‘thick’ descriptions (Geertz, 1973) to explore the meaning OMs’ ascribe to their business’ LC and its relationship with it (King, 2004). Qualitative data was considered most suitable as they “are a source of well-grounded, rich descriptions and explanations of processes in identifiable local contexts” (Miles and Huberman, 1994:1). Indeed, tourism scholars have urged for more qualitative research to explore the understandings of those involved in tourism (see e.g. Pernecky and Jamal, 2010). As pointed out by Morrison et al. (2010:747), qualitative, rather than quantitative methodologies are more suitable for exploring aspects such as STB OMs’ values, meanings and attitudes. While quantitative data are appropriate for e.g. testing causal relationships between variables, or measuring frequency or distribution of phenomena (Dan et al., 2008), a qualitative approach allows the researcher to interpret meaningful relations within the data, rather than quantifying data (Kvale, 1996). Moreover, OMs’ attitudes and understandings are qualitatively variant, context dependent and, as a result, are not suited for quantification (Sayer, 1992).
Qualitative interviewing allows the exploration of phenomena from the participant's point of view (King and Horrocks, 2010). As a result, semi-structured interviews were chosen as the most appropriate device to explore meaning and to obtain 'thick' descriptions. The semi-structured nature of the interviews meant that they did not necessarily follow the same order of questions, which allowed for the development of a more natural flow of conversation and enabled the participant to actively shape the flow of the interview (King, 2004). The semi-structured qualitative interview provides insight into individuals' lived worlds (Kvale and Brinkman, 2009), and therefore allowed the researcher to explore the meaning OMs ascribe to their business’ LC and its relationship with it (Seidman, 1998). Although interview data do not provide access to people’s actual behaviour and interaction with others (Coffey and Atkinson 1996), the behaviour of individuals depends on their interpretation of their world (Bogdan and Taylor, 1975), emphasising the need to examine their understandings of it. The researcher was aware that while assumptions about the truthfulness of OMs’ accounts and responses cannot be made, their “statements may still express the truth of the person’s view of him- or herself” (Kvale and Brinkman, 1998:252). In line with the theoretical assumptions underlying this research, therefore, and drawing on Gioia et al. (2012:3), participants in this study were understood as “knowledgeable agents”; since they construct the realities that the researcher sought to explore, they are understood as knowing “what they are trying to do and can explain their thoughts, intentions, and actions.”

An interview is a joint production (Packer, 2011; King and Horrocks, 2010) in which both participants and the interviewer engage in the co-production, i.e. co-construction, of knowledge (King and Horrocks, 2010:22). In qualitative interviews the researcher is understood as the research instrument (Kvale and Brinkman, 2009; Cooper and White, 2012) and as an active participant in the process (Symon and Cassell, 2004). However, Kvale and Brinkman (2009:33) highlight that there is a “clear power-asymmetry” between researcher and participant due to the structural positions during the interview. They go on to describe the interview as a one-way dialogue in
which the researcher seeks information from the participant. During the interviews, the researcher verified her interpretations of OMs’ responses by posing follow-up questions and clarifying key elements of their responses, which contributed to the quality of the interviews (Kvale and Brinkman, 2009). The researcher avoided value-laden terms during interviews, asked open-ended, non-leading questions, sought to build rapport with the participant and was aware of and sought to minimise any issues of power dynamics (King and Horrocks, 2010).

4.1.3. Summary

This section situated the research in an interpretive-constructionist framework. In contrast to subjectivist and objectivist ontologies, constructionist ontology assumes that STB OMs construct their reality by combining subjective truths with meaning that exists outside them, resulting in multiple realities that may overlap. Interpretivist epistemology presupposes that understanding the relationship between STBs and their LC requires the interpretation of the meaning they attach to it. Together, the literature reviewed in this section suggest that an interpretive-constructionist approach lends itself well to addressing the research questions that this thesis set out to achieve, as it encourages the researcher to be aware of and examine differences between STB OMs. To be more precise, it allows the researcher to explore differences in STB OMs’ views of their business’ LC and its relationship with it, i.e. understandings of SS (Research Question 1), and to examine how STB OMs’ views of their business’ LC and its relationship with it, relate to their initial motivations for running the business (Research Question 2). Answering these Research Questions will allow the researcher to examine how STB OMs’ understandings of SS can enhance knowledge of the potential within STBs’ relationship with the LC (Research Question 3), and identify possible implications of the research findings for STBs’ potential to contribute to SS (Research Question 4).
Qualitative data will be collected through semi-structured interviews with STB OMs to explore – through interpretation – how they understand, and the meaning they ascribe to, their business’ LC and its relationship with it. This allows new knowledge to emerge and existing assumptions to be challenged. This approach addresses the paucity of studies that consider STBs as economic actors interrelated with and influenced by their local social context. Additionally, whereas previous research has typically approached the study of STBs’ interactions with their LC with predefined concepts and categories such as co-operation and collaboration, the methodology employed in this study will give voice to the OMs by examining their understandings of the relationship.

4.2. Population frame

The population of small rural serviced accommodation businesses in Scotland is unknown; but even if every business that met the criteria for selection (see 4.3.4) in each of the three study areas had been interviewed, there would still be no way of knowing if this population would be representative of all related small sized rural serviced owner-managed accommodation businesses in Scotland, i.e. some total or target population. Therefore, seeking representativeness in the sample was not feasible. Neergard (2007:254), citing Mankelow and Merrilees (2001), suggests that it is often “a nearly impossible task” to identify a population of small rural businesses, due to a lack of relevant statistics and legal restrictions regarding access to databases. As a result, this research makes no claims relating to the generalisability of the research findings, for which quantitative research approaches are more suited (Neergaard, 2007). Indeed, the researcher sought to explore in detail the views and understandings of a small number of participants, to reveal and explain complexity (Neergard, 2007).
The final number of research participants of this PhD thesis consisted of 26 OMs of small sized rural serviced accommodation businesses located across 19 villages and towns in Dumfries and Galloway (DG), East Lothian (EL), and Loch Lomond and the Trossachs National Park (LLTNP). There exist several PhD theses that are based on a similar sized sample as the author’s own thesis. For instance, in her qualitative PhD study, Sweeney (2008) examined the views of commercial home hosts on their relationship with their home. The sample consisted of 25 OMs of commercial homes in rural and urban Scotland. A further example is the PhD thesis by Tinsley (2004). His qualitative study explores STB networks in Scotland and India and is based on a sample of 34 participants across different sectors, and with different roles (OMs of small retail, food or accommodation businesses, as well as community representatives). Further examples include the PhD research by Di Domenico (2003) and Tzschentke-Hamilton (2004), which include 30 STB OMs each.

There are also articles published in high ranking journals with similar sample sizes. Kneafsey (2001; Annals of Tourism Research) for instance, based her ethnographic research of tourism development in Brittany on participant observation and 26 semi-structured interviews with a range of different people, including business owners, tourism officials, politicians and development officers. Another example of a similar sample size is provided by Komppula (2014), published in the Journal of Tourism Management. For her study into STBs’ contribution to destination competitiveness, she conducted six narrative interviews and nine semi-structured interviews with tourism entrepreneurs.

Although the number of participants in this PhD, and those referenced above, may be considered as relatively small, O’Reilly and Parker (2013:6) contend that in qualitative research sample size is determined by the “appropriateness” of the data, not the number of participants. Similarly, data saturation in qualitative research is not measured by frequency of occurrences but by variety, depth, and breadth of information (Morse, 1995). As a result, the researcher ensured variety of OMs in each
region in terms of their location and interviewed as many OMs as was possible in the time provided. Moreover, it is argued here that focussing on one specific sub-sector within tourism further strengthened the appropriateness of the sample.

The number of research participants in this PhD also reflects findings of studies concerned with the size of qualitative research samples. Specifically, in a content analysis of 560 PhD theses that used qualitative approaches and qualitative interviews as the data collection method, Mason (2010) found that the mean sample size was 31 participants. Guest et al. (2006) argue that data saturation is reached with an even smaller sample comprising of 12 respondents. In their systematic examination of the degrees of data saturation and variability, the authors (Guest et al., 2006) observed that data saturation occurred after the 12th qualitative interview, of a total of 60. Similarly, Nielsen and Landauer (as cited in Guest et al., 2006:78) found in their study of technology usability that 80% of usability problems were uncovered after six participants and approximately 90% after 12 participants. This highlights that there is a point after which the marginal return of further interviews, in terms of insight and data, diminishes in qualitative research (Mason, 2010).

Data saturation in this study occurred after the 23rd OM interview when no new themes emerged from the data, and no further differences or similarities were revealed between the three inductive OM types. Three additional interviews were conducted, which provided no new insights or themes. This suggests that the sample was large enough to reveal the scope of OMs’ views of their business’ LC and its relationship with it, but also ensured that it was small enough to avoid repetition (Mason, 2010). This also concurs with Wolcott (as cited in Baker and Edwards, 2012:4), who argues that the aim of qualitative research is not to identify frequencies, but to reveal the “RANGE of responses” (emphasis in original).

Drawing on the literature, this section justified the number of research participants. It was argued that the purposive selection of participants and the variety sought among
them in terms of their business types and local contexts ensured the appropriateness of the sample and enabled data saturation. The study areas and process for identifying research participants are described next.

4.3. Geographical study areas

Potential participants were chosen purposively for the study, as they were considered able to provide information most relevant for the ambition of the research (Yin, 2011). For the purposive selection of STB OMs, OMs’ characteristics were deliberated at the individual, the business, and the context level (Neergard, 2007). This ensured variety among OMs and their worldviews. The criteria for selecting participants were derived from the literature and address the research gaps identified. As a point of reference, the conceptual framework is replicated in Figure 4.1.

Dumfries and Galloway (DG), East Lothian (EL), and Loch Lomond and the Trossachs National Park (LLTNP) were selected as study areas (see Figure 4.2) as they differ in terms of their levels of economic and tourism development, which were identified in Chapter Three as possible influences on STB OMs’ views of their business’ LC and its relationship with it (see chapter 3.4). Additionally, in line with Neergard’s (2007) advice for qualitative business research, one study area was chosen specifically for the different policy environment. It was reasoned that including a National Park as one of the study areas would provide variety in terms of OMs’ sensitisation towards sustainability issues. Policy is a common tool employed to influence behaviour, and so it is possible that a policy environment oriented toward sustainability, as in a National Park, influences STB OMs’ views of their business’ LC and its relationship with it.
Drawing on official statistical data and documents, and complimented by OMs’ descriptions of their environment, this section seeks to introduce the three study areas, pointing out similarities and differences between them, and aiming to convey the areas’ differing characters from the participants’ point of view. Pseudonyms are used for each participant, and the village or town their business is located in.
Figure 4.2. Location of study areas. Source: University of St Andrews.

4.3.1. Dumfries and Galloway

DG is the largest of the three study areas in terms of its geographical scope and population (Scottish Government, 2016). The villages and towns visited in DG are classed as remote rural. That being so, OMs interviewed in DG resided in more geographically isolated locations than OMs in EL and LLTNP. Some OMs in DG indicated that the remoteness of their location contributes to their personal and their businesses dependency on the LC for social interaction and services. Additionally, one OM emphasised the lack of public transport and the difficulties this poses for the mobility of people living in the area. The remoteness of locations visited in DG also appears to
influence OMs’ ties with the LC. Some OMs in this area highlighted the closeness of relations in the LC, a dependency among them, and emphasised the support available.

Economically, DG is considered as one of the most deprived areas in Scotland (The Scottish Government, 2010). Surprisingly, this was not discussed or commented on in any detail by OMs interviewed in this area. Tourism is described as the single most important contributor to the economy in the most recent Tourism Strategy (Dumfries and Galloway Council, 2016). Income generated from the tourism sector amounted to £302 million in 2015, and 7000 jobs are registered as related to tourism (Dumfries and Galloway Council, 2016). Income generated from tourism is higher than in LLTNP, even though LLTNP attracts a higher number of visitors. DG recorded 2.43 million visitors in 2015 (Dumfries and Galloway Council, 2016) and has a lower number of tourists per square mile than EL and LLTNP. Indeed, OMs in DG described the area as a destination that tourists come across accidentally. Carla explained that, “[t]he specific thing I think about this part of the world is people don’t really know about it, so, they either stumble across it by accident when they’re driving, because they’re following the coast road, a lot of tourists seem to do.” Likewise, Dan suggested that, “[…] nobody’s heard of Dumfries and Galloway […] it’s the least known bit of Scotland”. There appears to be little competition among tourism businesses, as OMs suggested that they work together to attract tourists to the area to enhance the visitor experience and extend the time visitors stay in the area.

4.3.2. East Lothian

All villages and towns visited in EL are classed as accessible rural, i.e. have fewer than 3000 inhabitants and are within 30 minutes’ drive from the next settlement of more than 10,000 inhabitants (The Scottish Government, 2012). EL has been described as the “commuter territory to Edinburgh” (Tourism Resources Company, 2006:475). Indeed, some OMs in EL highlighted the ease of access to the area. For instance, Sally, who runs a B&B in Abbeytown emphasises the accessibility for tourists, pointing out
that “[f]rom Edinburgh it’s so easy to get in to [...]”. Jeffrey, who runs a Hotel in Abbeytown where he lives with his wife and children, highlights that many people in Abbeytown work in Edinburgh, “[...] a mix of people who work on the land locally and [...] go into Edinburgh. So it’s a dormitory town for Edinburgh really now”. Likewise, and in contrast to OMs in DG, OMs in EL tended not to describe a dependency on their LC for services or interaction.

EL is the smallest of the three study areas, measuring 270 square miles (East Lothian Council, 2012a). It has the highest population density of the study areas and is one of the most affluent regions in Scotland, with a median income higher than the national average (East Lothian Council, 2012b, 2015). This was also reflected in OMs’ descriptions of the area. Sam, who has lived in Grasmere for over 30 years with his wife and runs a B&B, refers to the wealth of people in the LC: “[...] traditionally, there have been a lot of more elderly and quite wealthy people living here”. Similarly, Holly in Edenhall suggests that residents, in particular farmers, are wealthy: “[...] there's a lot of wealth here [...] Most of the farmers are wealthy landowners”. Jeffrey highlights the wealth of local residents too, saying that, “ [...] a lot of East Lothian’s got a lot of money and a lot of people who done well, live out here or second house out here [...]”. Income from tourism in EL amounts to £210 million, resulting in the highest spends per visitor among the study areas (East Lothian Council, 2015).

Tourist influx to EL is higher than in DG, attracting 1.4 million tourists in 2011 (East Lothian Council, 2015), resulting in 5185 visitors per square mile in this area in 2011, which is comparable to LLTNP. The area’s proximity to Edinburgh and its reputation among golf tourists are likely to contribute to its popularity among tourists. Indeed, EL was referred to as the “cradle of Golf” in a report by VisitScotland (VisitScotland, 2013:88). Similar to DG, there appears to be little competition among tourism businesses, which was suggested to be due to a lack of supply to satisfy the demand for accommodation. In contrast to DG, however, OMs in EL did not emphasise a need
to attract tourists to the area, which is likely to reflect the high tourist influx to the
area.

4.3.3. Loch Lomond and the Trossachs National Park

Similar to EL, participants from LLTNP were located in villages and towns classed as
accessible rural, i.e. less than 30 minutes’ drive from the next settlement of more than
10,000 inhabitants (The Scottish Government, 2012). In contrast to EL, however, it was
suggested by participants in LLTNP that the accessibility of the area hinders interaction
within the LC, as residents travel to nearby towns for groceries and social activities.
Regarding economic development, LLTNP is mixed, including some of the most
deprived and most affluent areas in Scotland (Stirling Council, 2012). This was indeed
reflected in OMs’ accounts. John, who runs an Inn in Aikton stressed the mixed
economic backgrounds of residents in Aikton: “[...] if I was brave enough I would say yes, it’s quite a low income area. We have extremes, we have multi-millionaires, and then we have lots of people on low incomes”. James in Allerby points out that, “[I]t’s not a particularly well off community”.

According to the Park Authority, visitor figures for the year 2002 were estimated at
2.06 million (Loch Lomond and the Trossachs National Park Authority, 2005). Visitor
figures have increased significantly since: in 2011 the Park recorded four million visitor
days (Loch Lomond and the Trossachs National Park Authority, 2011). While LLTNP
records the highest numbers of visitors, it has the lowest population density, resulting
in the highest ratio of tourists to residents (see Table 4.1). The Park’s popularity is
highlighted in VisitScotland’s ‘Tourism Development Plan for Scotland’, which
describes it as one of “Scotland’s most recognised tourism assets” (VisitScotland,
2013:46). The Park measures 729 square miles (Loch Lomond and the Trossachs
National Park Authority, 2013), resulting in 6858 visitors per square mile in 2011 – the
highest level of tourist influx within the study areas. Accordingly, the bedstock in
LLTNP is the largest of all study areas. Nevertheless, income from tourism in LLTNP is
low compared to EL and DG, generating £95million in 2012 (VisitScotland, 2013); this is significantly lower than tourism revenue in EL, even though these areas have comparable visitors per square mile. Similarly, spend per visitor amounts to only £23 in LLTNP, compared to £124 and £151 in DG and EL, respectively. Although LLTNP compares with EL in terms of tourist influx, OMs in LLTNP suggested that there is a competitive atmosphere among tourism businesses and that competition has been increasing, which may relate to the low income generated from tourism, and potentially an oversupply of accommodation.

Visitors to the park tend to pass through it on their way to their final destination, as opposed to staying multiple nights (Tourism Resources, 2012), which was also commented on by OMs. Harry, who moved to Allerby with his wife less than 10 years ago to take over a B&B, explains that tourists stay in the area en-route to their destination: “[...] we get a lot of visitors come off [...] a plane at Glasgow airport, which is about an hour down the road from here and so people are quite happy to get in the hire car and do about an hour on the first day [...] we’re also good for people coming back who will want to get to the airport, don’t want to be too far away [...] also people going for ferries as well. We get lots of people stopping here before they go on and get a ferry out to the islands”. This was echoed by James, who additionally suggested that the area is suitable for day-trips for people living in Glasgow, “especially if they live in Glasgow [...] they’re not too well off dare I say, this is a perfect arrangement, they can come here by bus, by train [...]”. This suggests that visitors to LLTNP tend to stay for shorter periods of time than in EL and DG, and may explain why tourism-related income in LLTNP is comparatively low.

4.3.4. Identifying possible research participants

So far, this section revealed key differences between the study areas regarding economic and tourism development, and the policy environment. Key contextual features of the study areas are summarised in Table 4.1. To recruit research
participants, the researcher identified villages and towns within the three study areas that met specific criteria pertaining to rural accessibility, and a maximum travelling distance of four hours from Glasgow by public transport. STBs were required to be located in villages or towns in Scotland classed as remote rural in DG, and accessible rural in EL and LLTNP. Specifically, the villages or towns they were located in needed to have fewer than 3000 inhabitants and are more than (remote rural), or within (accessible rural), 30 minutes’ drive from a settlement of more than 10,000 people (The Scottish Government, 2012). Rural accessibility had emerged in Chapter Three as a possible influence on STB OMs’ views of their business’ LC and its relationship with it (see chapter 3.4). Using population estimates for settlements and localities published by the General Register Office for Scotland (2010), the researcher identified eight remote rural villages and towns in DG, and 12 and five accessible rural villages and towns in LLTNP and EL, respectively.
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**Figure 4.3. Criteria considered in the selection of participants. Source: Author.**

Additionally, participants were required to be the OM of the business, as they were assumed to be most knowledgeable about their business’ local social context, and its relationship with it. Indeed, OMs’ understandings and reasons for choosing their business’ location emerged as a potential influence on STBs’ relationship with their LC in from the literature review (see chapter 2.1, and chapter 3.4). As already mentioned
in the introductory chapter, participants were required to owner-manage a small serviced accommodation business (see chapter 1.3).

The approach followed in this research for identifying suitable participants ensured variety in participants’ worldviews, increased confidence in the research findings (Yin, 2011), and allowed the researcher to explore how OMs’ realities vary or overlap. Selecting three different study areas recognises the spatial variations of STBs observed in the literature, and therefore avoids generalising at the national level which Burrows and Curran (1989) call researchers to avoid. Moreover, selecting multiple study areas mitigated against ‘context-myopia’, which has been highlighted by Morrison et al. (2010) as an issue in STB research. The criteria considered in the purposive selection of participants are summarised in Figure 4.3.

This section introduced the three study areas and outlined the process for identifying suitable research participants. A purposive approach to identify potential participants, which reflects the interpretive-constructionist paradigm employed by the researcher. More specifically, participant characteristics were considered as several levels to contribute to variety among STB OMs and possible influences on their views of their business’ local community and its relationship with it. Potential participants were identified in DG, EL and LLTNP. References by participants relating to tourism and economic development, as well as rural accessibility were considered here to provide a sense of the differences between the study areas, and how they might influence OMs’ understandings. These factors had been identified as possible influences on OMs’ views in chapter 3.4, and will be returned to in the discussion of the research findings (see chapter 5.3).
Table 4.1. Key contextual characteristics of DG, EL and LLTNP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographical location and accessibility</th>
<th>DG</th>
<th>EL</th>
<th>LLTNP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geographical location and accessibility</td>
<td>Remote rural: more than 30 minutes’ drive away from the next settlement of more than 10,000 inhabitants.</td>
<td>Accessible rural: less than 30 minutes’ drive away from the next settlement of more than 10,000 inhabitants.</td>
<td>Accessible rural: less than 30 minutes’ drive away from the next settlement of more than 10,000 inhabitants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical size of area (square miles)</td>
<td>2380</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist influx in million</td>
<td>2.43 in 2015</td>
<td>1.4 in 2013</td>
<td>4 million in 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourists per square mile</td>
<td>1021 in 2011</td>
<td>5185 in 2013</td>
<td>5487 in 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of bed spaces available per square mile</td>
<td>15.2 in 2011</td>
<td>14.4 in 2012</td>
<td>26.5 in 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income from tourism</td>
<td>£302 million in 2015</td>
<td>£210.78 million in 2013</td>
<td>£95 million in 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income per tourist</td>
<td>£124</td>
<td>£151</td>
<td>£23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism-related employment</td>
<td>7000 in 2015</td>
<td>3890 in 2013</td>
<td>2400 in 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic circumstances</td>
<td>One of the most deprived areas of Scotland</td>
<td>One of the most affluent areas of Scotland</td>
<td>Includes some of the most deprived and most affluent areas of Scotland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: VisitScotland (2012); East Lothian Council (pers. comm., 30/07/2013); Loch Lomond and the Trossachs National Park Authority (2011); Tourism Resources Company (2011); Tourism Resources Company (2006); Tourism Resources Company (2012); The Scottish Government (2010); East Lothian Council (2012b); Stirling Council (2012); Dumfries and Galloway Council (2016), VisitScotland (2013); The Scottish Government (2016, 2016a); HIE (2014); East Lothian Council (2015).
4.4. Ethical consent

Ethical approval of the project was granted by the University Teaching and Research Ethics Committee (Ethics Reference no: GG8347, see Appendix A4.). The participant consent forms (anonymous data and coded data) and the participant information sheet were provided to the OMs in person on the day of the interview (see Appendix A3.). The researcher went through the participant information sheet and consent forms with the participant to answer any questions they had, and to make sure that they understood what data would be collected, how their data will be anonymised, used and stored, and that they could withdraw from the study at any time and without giving a reason. The researcher then asked each participant to sign the forms. All OMs agreed to take part, and all gave their consent to being audio-recorded.

4.5. Recruiting research participants

The researcher devised the population frame using various online search tools and directories: Google, national, regional and local online accommodation directories, and yell.com. This approach is similar to that followed by Di Domenico (2003), who used the Yellow Pages to create the population frame for her study of STB OMs in Scotland. Likewise, Hall and Rusher (2004), Page et al. (1999), and Shaw and Williams (1987) used accommodation directories and the Yellow Pages to identify STBs in the UK and New Zealand. A database was collated of possible participants in the villages and towns identified as eligible in the three study areas. To comply with the criteria of size and ownership (see chapter 4.3), large hotels and businesses that were part of a hotel chain or group of hotels were not included in the list. The list of potential participants included 88 businesses: 21 businesses in DG, 25 in EL, and 42 in LLTNP.
Businesses were selected from the database created by the researcher from A-Z. OMs were essentially selected randomly in terms of OMs’ personal characteristics from the final list of potential participants. Initially, the researcher contacted business OMs by phone to enquire about their interest in participating in the study and to verify the eligibility of the business. To participate, businesses were required to meet the following criteria, introduced in section 4.3:

- Serviced accommodation business,
- Classed as small based on staff numbers (less than 50 employees), and
- Owner-managed.

In total, 67 OMs were contacted across 19 villages and towns in DG, EL, and LLTNP. In some cases, the OM was busy and asked to be called back another time, or requested the information to be sent by e-mail. 42 OMs declined to participate or were excluded after multiple unsuccessful attempts to contact them. A further 21 businesses were later excluded as the business was either very difficult to reach by public transport, or because data saturation had been reached in a particular category of business.

If the business met the criteria, a brief outline of the project and their role in it was provided to the OM. In the case that OMs agreed to take part, the location, date and time for the interview were set during the call. If businesses did not meet the criteria, the researcher explained why they could not participate and thanked them for their time. In the case that an OM was unavailable, did not meet all criteria, or did not agree to participate, the researcher contacted the next OM on the list.

The phone call was followed-up with an e-mail to thank the OM for agreeing to participate and included an information sheet with details of the study (see Appendix A3.). To keep track of who had been contacted, what day they wanted to be called back and what dates interviews were arranged for, a log of the participant recruitment process was kept. The recruitment of participants generally proved to be
straightforward, without any complications. The final list of participants included 26 small rural serviced accommodation business OMs with businesses spread across 19 villages and towns in DG, EL, and LLTNP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DG</th>
<th>EL</th>
<th>LLTNP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B&amp;B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guest House</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inn</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The researcher purposively sought variation among STB types. The type of business was defined by the business OM, on their website or during the interview. It emerged that the more services a business offered in addition to accommodation, e.g. a pub or restaurant, the more difficult it was to reach the OM, and the more likely it was that they refused to participate. Specifically, it was easiest to recruit B&B OMs, and most difficult to recruit OMs of Inns and Hotels. Moreover, it proved most challenging to recruit OMs in EL, as they were repeatedly unavailable to speak to over the phone, did not respond to e-mails, or did not want to participate. The types of businesses included in this study are listed in Table 4.2, and the process of recruiting the OMs is summarised in Figure 4.4. Key features of each research participant, regarding their motivations to run an STB, reasons for choosing their location length of time residing at their location, the household situation and their membership of local associations or organisations, are summarised in Appendix A5. Similarly, details regarding the services that each business offers and their locations are listed in Appendix A6.
Figure 4.4. Outline of the process for recruiting STB OMs. Source: Author.
4.6. Data collection

Three pilot interviews were conducted with STB OMs in LLTNP in February 2012 to identify whether the questions included in the initial interview guide provided the insight into OMs’ understandings of SS and whether the questions were understood by participants. Following the analysis of the pilot interviews, the researcher added one further question to interrogate OMs’ understanding of their business’ role in the SS of their LC. The questions elicited the desired information, and as a result remained unchanged.

The subsequent interviews with OMs took place between February and July 2012. All OMs agreed to the interviews to be audio-recorded. The interviews usually took place in the OMs’ home, which in most cases was also their place of business. The majority of participants were extremely welcoming, and rapport was generally established easily and quickly. The researcher once again outlined the purpose of the project, without providing too much information that might influence how OMs would respond to the interview questions. Once the researcher felt that participants were aware of their role in the research and the use of their data, participants’ questions were answered, and the consent forms signed (see Appendix A3), the researcher began the interview. The interviews lasted between 76 and 20 minutes. Significant ideas and thoughts that emerged during the interview were written down in situ. The atmosphere throughout the interview was largely relaxed without being too casual. The researcher generally enjoyed the interview process and, based on participants’ oral feedback as well as their behaviour during the interviews, it seemed that the OMs also enjoyed them. The researcher was not under the impression that the interviews were influenced by social desirability bias. For example, some OMs were rather straightforward about their lack of interest in engaging with the LC and simultaneously highlighted that they felt that they should engage with them and, for instance, patronise local shops.
The researcher ensured that she had time after each interview to think about and reflect on the interview, noting down any further ideas and thoughts related to the interview. Participants usually expressed great interest in the research and emphasised that they would welcome a synopsis of the findings once the project was completed. The researcher e-mailed the OM after the interview on the same day or the following day to thank them for their participation and advised that she would be in touch once findings were finalised.

The interviews with the OMs sought to explore their understandings of their business’ LC and its relationship with it. With the aim to reveal possible “taken-for-granted assumptions” about STBs (Starks, 2007:1373), the initial interview guide was designed to elicit information regarding the role that the LC played in OMs’ motivations to run the business and their reasons for choosing their location, their understandings of their business’ LC and of their business’ relationship with it, i.e. their understandings of SS. The final interview guide consisted of nine interview questions and keywords to guide the researcher and to facilitate probing issues in further detail (see Table 4.3.).

The initial questions sought to elicit descriptive information and be easy to answer (Cassell and Symon, 2004) to introduce the OMs to the topic (Payne, 1980). It emerged from Chapter Two (see chapter 2.4.) that STB OMs’ reasons for choosing their business’ location may be related to their understandings of SS. As a result, it was essential to examine OMs’ initial motivations to run their business, and to ask OMs specifically about their reasons for choosing their location to understand the role that the LC played in them. The third question examined OMs’ understanding of the role that the local natural environment plays for their business and sought to reveal the value that OMs ascribe to it. This question was later excluded from the analysis, as it did not add any interesting insight.
Table 4.3. Final topic guide for interviews with OMs. Source: Author.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview question</th>
<th>Key words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Could you tell me how you came to open <em>name of business</em>? Tell me in as much detail as possible about ...?</td>
<td>Background – intentions – goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What were your reasons for locating the business here?</td>
<td>Values - rural environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What role does the local natural environment play for your business? What is your opinion on...?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What role does the LC play for your business? What is your opinion on...?</td>
<td>Community – trust – cultural &amp; social values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could you describe your LC to me? What is your opinion on...? How does your business influence...?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could you describe to me the relationship between your business and your community? What is your opinion on...? How does your business influence...? How is your business influenced by...?</td>
<td>Collaboration – ties – cohesion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could you describe to me any ties between your business and your community? (...any contact between your business and the community?) What is your opinion on...? How does your business influence...? How is your business influenced by...?</td>
<td>Collaboration – ties – cohesion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What about any more far reaching relationships that extend beyond your community?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the term social sustainability mean something to you? (what would you say does social sustainability mean?)</td>
<td>Local community – collaboration – ties – cohesion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What role would you say does your business play in the social sustainability of your community?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questions four to 10 sought to explore OMs’ understanding of SS. Specifically, the fourth question explored OMs’ understandings of their business’ LC. Questions five to eight sought to interrogate OMs’ understanding of the relationship between their
business and its LC, asking them to explain how they understand the relationship, what role the LC plays for their business, and what ties they feel exist between their business and the LC. Questions nine and ten sought to obtain complementary insights into OMS’ understandings of SS. OMs were asked to define SS (question nine), and to explain how they view their business’ contribution to SS in its LC (question ten).

4.7. Data analysis

The first phase of analysis sought to answer the first research question: *How do STB OMs differ in their understandings of their business’ LC and its relationship with it?* It involved two stages: preparing and getting acquainted with the data, and generating descriptive codes and identifying themes. An excerpt from the interview transcripts can be found in Appendix A2. To prepare and familiarise herself with the data, the researcher transcribed each interview, while thoughts and ideas for themes were recorded separately. To comply with the anonymity promised to the OMs during the interview, all identifiers were removed from the transcripts, and each transcript labelled with a pseudonym for the OM and their location (see Appendices V and VI). Subsequently, the transcripts were loaded into Nvivo and were read multiple times to allow the researcher to immerse herself in the data. Thoughts relating to specific sections in the transcripts were logged as memos in Nvivo, while general thoughts and further ideas for themes were recorded separately.

The OM data were initially coded in Nvivo using an apriori coding template based on the interview guide (see chapter 4.6). Each code took the form of a node in Nvivo. The length of text coded at a node varied from a few words to entire paragraphs to ensure that the meaning of the excerpts was conserved and not de-contextualised. The researcher went through the data again to identify additional codes. This phase was considered complete once no new codes were detected and all data had been
examined with the final list of nodes without adding new ones, i.e. no text was coded at a new node.

Nodes in Nvivo were organised by combining similar ones and removing those that were no longer considered relevant. Each time nodes were merged, all data coded at the respective node was re-read to ensure its fit and accuracy. All deleted nodes, along with the data coded at them, were saved to a separate file and re-examined once the final list of nodes was complete, to make sure that no data had been overlooked or nodes erroneously deleted. The data were re-examined to make sure that they were accurately reflected by the final list of nodes. In Nvivo nodes are organised hierarchically, and so each node represents a theme and each child-node a sub-theme. In total, the analysis revealed 73 themes and sub-themes. Where most participants were coded at a main node, this was considered a key theme. Where most of those coded at a child-node, this was considered a key sub-theme. The coding framework is attached in Appendix A1.

All 73 themes and sub-themes that emerged from the first stage of analysis were placed into a matrix; themes were arranged by column and interview participants by row. This allowed the researcher to explore differences in OMs’ views of their business’ LC and its relationship with it. In line with the researchers’ constructionist ontology, therefore, this stage of analysis sought to see STBs in a new light. As a result, OMs were not grouped according to their initial motivations to run the business. Instead, the researcher sought to identify differences between OMs based on their views and understandings. A threefold typology of OMs emerged: ‘Community-oriented’, ‘Independent’ and ‘Disconnected’. The findings are discussed in Chapter Five.

The deductive phase of analysis sought to address the second research question: How do STB OMs’ views of their business’ LC and its relationship with it relate to their initial motivations for running the business? All OMs in the sample were divided into lifestyle-
oriented or profit-oriented based on their descriptions of their initial motivations to run an STB. OMs who said that they had been driven to run an STB by a desire to pursue a certain lifestyle were classed as lifestyle-oriented. OMs who explained that they had been motivated by a desire to generate profit were labelled as profit-oriented. While definitions of lifestyle and profit oriented OMs vary, the approach followed in this research is in line with previous STB studies (see for example: Ateljevic and Doorne, 2000; Di Domenico, 2003; Morrison and Teixeira, 2004; Lynch, 1998; Sweeney and Lynch, 2009). Using the theme matrix, the researcher was then able to explore differences between lifestyle and profit oriented STB OMs’ views of their business’ LC and its relationship with it. These findings are examined in Chapter Five as well. The results from the inductive and deductive analyses provided the basis for answering the third and fourth research questions: How can STB OMs’ understandings of SS enhance knowledge of the potential within STBs’ relationship with the LC? What implications do the research findings have for STBs’ potential to contribute to SS? These findings are discussed in Chapter Six.

As pointed out in Chapter Two (see chapter 2.3), many tourism scholars approach the study of STB OMs by either applying the lifestyle/profit typology to their sample from the outset or relating their findings to OMs’ motivations in their discussion of findings. Moreover, researchers tend to either pursue a deductive or an inductive approach to data analysis. It follows, that the approach taken to data analysis in this study is innovative in the field of STBs, as it combined a deductive and an inductive method, which allowed the researcher to contrast the results obtained with each approach.

4.8. Methodological reflections
The researcher encountered some difficulties in the process of data collection. Specifically, it emerged that in EL there were fewer potential research participants, as many were located in urban, as opposed to rural areas. This made the recruitment of participants in EL more difficult than in DG and LLTP. Moreover, while the researcher was able to recruit OMs of B&Bs in EL, it proved problematic to recruit OMs of STBs other than B&Bs: these OMs were more likely to be unavailable and more likely to decline participation than in DG and LLTP.

OMs’ responses provided the insight required and allowed the researcher to explore their understandings of their business’ LC and its relationship with it. Nevertheless, conducting more interviews with a larger number of OMs across Scotland would have enabled the researcher to examine spatial differences in OMs’ understandings in more detail. Additionally, follow-up interviews with OMs a year after the initial interview would have given the researcher a means to examine how OMs’ understandings might change over time. This would have been particularly interesting considering that one group of OMs had typically lived in their location for less than 10 years (see chapter 5.3 and chapter 7.2).

Moreover, as the researcher is not an English native speaker, there were some instances of ambiguity during the interviews and subsequent transcription of recordings. In the former, the researcher asked the participant to clarify what they meant, in the latter, the researcher asked a native English speaker to listen to the relevant section of the recording and to verify the accurateness of the transcript.

Additionally, the researcher excluded data obtained through interviews with Expert Informants. In particular, it emerged after further reflection on the research aim and objectives, and substantial changes to the main argument of the thesis, that the data did not enhance or complement the research findings.

4.9. Chapter Summary
The aim of this research was to explore how STB OMs’ views of their business’ LC and its relationship with it can enhance understanding of STBs’ potential to contribute to SS. In particular, it sought to devise a new typology for examining STBs’ OMs’ views of their business’ LC and its relationship with it (Research Objective 1), and to examine possible implications of STB OMs’ views for their role in SS (Research Objective 2). An interpretive-constructionist epistemology was deemed most suitable for this research undertaking as it seeks to understand phenomena by interpreting the meaning individuals ascribe to objects and their interaction with it, and by examining them in a new light to reveal taken-for-granted assumptions. An interpretive-constructionist approach, therefore, may reveal new knowledge about STBs and their OMs, and challenge existing assumptions about them. Objectivist and subjectivist epistemologies were considered inappropriate. Specifically, the former would not have allowed the researcher to examine the multiplicity of OMs’ realities, or reveal taken for granted assumptions about OMs as it assumes that truth is external, i.e. independent of, the individual. Subjectivist ontology, on the other hand, would not have allowed the researcher to examine OMs’ realities as embedded within their local context, as it assumes that realities are created by the individual and that reality does not exist outside it.

To examine OMs’ understandings, the researcher needed to obtain ‘thick’ descriptions from OMs, which qualitative data provide. Qualitative semi-structured interviewing was considered as the most suitable method for collecting data, as it allowed the researcher to explore the meaning that STB OMs’ attach to their business’ LC and its relationship with it. The small number of participants was appropriate for this study, as it sought to explore OMs’ understandings in-depth, which would not have been possible with a larger sample in the time given. Participants for the study were recruited purposively based on several criteria and from 19 villages and towns across DG, EL, and LLTNP. This sought to ensure variety in OMs’ worldviews, increased confidence in the research findings and mitigated against context-myopia. The data
were examined inductively and deductively for qualitative and spatial differences, which presents an innovative approach in STB research.
Chapter Five: Challenging current conceptualisations of small tourism businesses

This thesis aims to explore how small tourism business (STB) owner-managers’ (OM) views of their business’ local community (LC) and its relationship with it can enhance understanding of STBs’ potential role in social sustainability (SS). Research suggests that STBs can contribute to SS through their relationship with their LC. Previous studies indicate that OMs’ views of their business’ LC and its relationship with it are central to understanding the potential in STBs’ relationship with the LC and, therefore, their possible role in SS. However, the literature review revealed that conceptualisations of STBs based on their OMs’ motivations for running their business might be unsuited for exploring their views and understandings and possible differences between them. It was argued that, to enhance knowledge of their role in SS, a new typology is required that conceptualises STBs in relation to their LC. A framework was developed in Chapter Three informed by the notion of SS to allow for the exploration of STB OMs’ views of their business’ LC and its relationship with it.

The current chapter seeks to address the first research objective, namely to devise a new STB typology to examine STB OMs’ views of their business’ LC and its relationship with it. In particular, it seeks to explore how STB OMs differ in their understandings of their business’ LC and its relationship with it (Research Question 1), and how STB OMs’ views of their business’ LC and its relationship with it relate to their initial motivations for running the business (Research Question 2).

The results reported here are based on the inductive and deductive analyses of data (see chapter 4.7), and draw on the key themes that emerged from OMs’ responses to the interview questions (see Appendix A1). OMs’ responses were analysed inductively with the aim of identifying patterns and differences in their views of their business’ LC and its relationship with it. An inductive categorisation of OMs emerged revealing
nuanced and coherent differences in their attitudes, which allows subdividing Community-Oriented, Independent, and Disconnected OMs. These three OM types are compared in section 5.2 in relation to their motivations to run the business (5.2.1), their views of their business’ LC (5.2.2) and business’ relationship with it (5.2.3), and of the ties between their business and the LC (5.2.4). Additionally, the data were analysed deductively to explore how STB OMs’ understandings of their business’ LC and its relationship with it relate to their motivations to run the business, i.e. their orientation towards lifestyle or profit. The findings from the deductive analysis are discussed first (5.1). They provide further support to the argument developed in Chapter Two that STB conceptualisations based on their OMs’ motivations to run the business are unsuited for exploring OMs’ views of their LC and its relationship with it. Thereafter, the new threefold inductive typology is presented, and its suitability as an analytical tool for exploring STB OMs’ views demonstrated (5.2). The key findings are discussed in section 5.3. At all times pseudonyms are used for the participants, their locations, as well as for people or locations that they refer to, which could otherwise jeopardise the anonymity of participants.

5.1. Lifestyle and profit oriented OMs’ understandings of social sustainability

It emerged from the literature review that conceptualising STBs in relation to their OMs’ motivations to run the business may limit understanding of STBs’ potential to contribute to SS (see chapter 2.2). This is further supported by the results of the deductive data analysis (see 4.7). For this phase of analysis, all research participants were divided into lifestyle-oriented or profit-oriented OMs based on their initial motivations to run their business. This approach did not show any link between STB OMs’ initial motivations to run the business and their views of their business’ relationship with the LC. The key findings are summarised in Table 5.1. What is more,
the deductive analysis of OMs’ responses suggests that the twofold typology may be masking a divide in the nature and size of their businesses. It was observed that profit-oriented OMs tended to have additional public facilities, such as a restaurant or a pub, whereas their lifestyle-oriented counterparts usually provided exclusively serviced accommodation. Indeed, this finding coincides with previous studies by Komppula (2004), King et al. (2012) and Getz and Carlsen (2000), who find that profit-oriented OMs tended to run larger businesses, with an extended service offering and public facilities including, for example, gastronomic facilities. Lifestyle-oriented firms, on the other hand, typically offer only accommodation (Komppula, 2004). Arguably, additional public facilities offered by profit-oriented OMs may be of more interest to the local non-business community than accommodation services. Indeed, research suggests that running a larger business with additional public facilities increases interaction with, and support to, the local non-business community (Cabras and Regiani, 2010; Hallak and Brown, 2011). This may explain why profit oriented OMs generally described ties with the local non-business community, which lifestyle-OMs typically did not. However, the findings suggest that, while the additional public facilities many profit-oriented OMs had may influence the quantity of the business’ ties with the local non-business community, they do not seem to relate to the quality of their ties. For instance, Jeffrey, who runs a Hotel with a pub and restaurant in Abbeytown, showed a disinterested attitude towards the LC and seemed to have a problematic relationship with it. Another OM, Nicole, who also runs an Inn with a pub in Abbeytown, showed affection towards the LC, an awareness of how her personal behaviour towards it influences her business and seemed to be driven largely by commercial interest to interact with it. The differences in Jeffrey and Nicole’s views of the LC and their business’ relationship with it indicate that the size and nature of STBs public facilities are unrelated to the quality of the relationship between the STB and its LC.
Table 5.1. Differences in lifestyle and profit oriented owner-managers’ understandings of social sustainability. Source: Author.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key themes in the data</th>
<th>Lifestyle-oriented OM</th>
<th>Profit-oriented OM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The role of the LC in their choice of business location</td>
<td>The LC played no role in their choice of business location.</td>
<td>The LC played no role in their choice of business location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude towards the LC</td>
<td>Positive attitude towards the LC.</td>
<td>Positive attitude towards the LC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with the LC</td>
<td>Relationship with the LC seems largely commercially driven.</td>
<td>Relationship with the LC seems largely commercially driven.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ties with the local business and non-business community</td>
<td>Feel embedded only in the local business community.</td>
<td>Feel embedded in the local business and non-business community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ties with extra-local businesses</td>
<td>Interact with businesses and organisations outside the LC.</td>
<td>Limited awareness of ties with actors outside the LC.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These findings suggest that the dichotomy of lifestyle and profit oriented STB OMs masks differences in the structure and size of STBs, which hints that the lifestyle/profit typology may fail to address calls from the literature to define STBs based on their OMs’ views and beliefs (Morrison and Conway, 2007; Parker et al., 2009; Tzschentke et al., 2008). Moreover, size-based criteria have been condemned by scholars such as Burrows and Curran (1989) in the past and have been argued to be unsuitable for research concerned with the sustainability-related behaviour among medium sized enterprises (SME) (Parker et al., 2009).

The observations presented here imply that OMs’ understandings of SS contradict the dichotomous categorisation of lifestyle and profit orientation. Moreover, they suggest that researchers concerned with STB OMs to date have failed to critically examine the applicability of the lifestyle/profit typology in different contexts, from different angles,
and paying attention to – and interrogating – any similarities between OMs across the two groups. Instead, scholars appear to have continuously reinforced the dichotomy by attributing differences they find between STBs and their OMs to the extent to which these OMs prioritise economic motives in the running of the business, arguably contributing to the development of ‘myths’ in small tourism business research that Morrison et al. (2010) caution against. This highlights the need to interrogate assumptions about STBs and their OMs, and critically examine variations between them before attributing them to differences in STB OMs’ incentives to run the business. More importantly, this suggests that conceptualisations based on motivations to run a business are unsuited for examining STBs’ relationship with the LC and their contribution to local SS.

It emerged from the inductive data analysis that responses of STB OMs gathered in the semi-structured interviews fold out into a ternary typology, revealing key differences in their understandings of SS. The remainder of this chapter discusses the results of the inductive data analysis and demonstrates the usefulness of the new typology for developing an understanding of STBs’ potential role in SS.

5.2. Community-Oriented, Independent and Disconnected OMs’ understandings of social sustainability

As stated above, the inductive analysis of interview data revealed that OMs’ responses divide into the following threefold typology: Community-Oriented, Independent and Disconnected OMs of small tourism businesses. This section first outlines the key observations and then explores the differences in STB OMs’ views in detail (5.2.1-5.2.4). Only a few similarities emerged between these inductive OM types. They had typically migrated to their current location and lived on the business premises, which mirrors findings in previous research (Ateljevic and Doorne, 2000; Getz and Carlsen,
They usually felt embedded within their local business community, which reflects findings within the tourism networks literature (see also: Di Domenico, 2003; Haven-Tang and Jones, 2005; Moscardo, 2014; Mottiar and Ryan, 2007; Nilsson et al., 2005; Saxena et al., 2007).

The analysis revealed several differences in OMs’ attitudes regarding their business’ LC and its relationship with it, which are coherent within the three OM groups. For Community-Oriented STB OMs, the LC generally influenced their choice of location, which appears to be reflected in the particularly affectionate attitude these OMs largely demonstrated towards their LC, and the emphasis they typically placed on being part of the LC, interacting with and contributing to it. Representatives of this group seem to be driven mainly by a personal interest to interact with their LC, and largely felt embedded within the local business and non-business community. Additionally, these OMs tended to show an interest in ties with actors outside the LC, seemingly driven by an understanding that they benefit their LC. This group of OMs tended to express an awareness of, and desire to adhere to, local social norms, including reciprocity, ‘giving back’, and business differentiation. Additionally, they largely showed a sense of trust towards the LC and a feeling of safety within it.

In contrast to their Community-Oriented counterparts, Independent OMs typically had no intention to run an STB when they moved to their location and were largely motivated to run their business by a desire to generate income. Independent OMs’ responses also emerged as being coherent – specifically, that their decision to run the business was mainly motivated by a need to generate income seems related to their accentuated commercial, as opposed to personal, interest in the LC. Moreover, the largely affectionate attitude these OMs displayed towards the LC appears to be encouraged by their awareness of how their personal behaviour towards the LC influences their business. Furthermore, their reduced interest in their personal relationship with their business’ LC appears to cohere with the limited role that the LC
played in their choice of business location, indicating that the LC might play a less important role for these OMs personally. While they largely felt that they were embedded in the local business and non-business community, they tended to show little awareness of ties with extra-local actors.

Similar to Independent OMs, the LC played no role in the Disconnected OMs’ choice of business location, which seems to be mirrored in the lack of personal interest they tended to show towards the LC. Additionally, however, members of this group typically showed a negative attitude towards their LC, which may relate to unmet expectations, or a sense of disappointment pertaining to living in a rural environment. Their views of the LC seem coherent with their views of their business’ relationship with it. Namely, Disconnected OMs generally described a difficult relationship with local tourism businesses, a lack of interaction with the business-community in general, and typically did not feel that there exist any ties with the local non-business community. Additionally, they usually showed limited awareness of, much less interest in, ties with extra-local actors.

The remainder of this section explores the views of these three OM types pertaining to their business’ LC and their business’ relationship with it, and their motivations to run the business. For the purpose of analysis, the results were grouped into four overarching themes: ‘Motivations for running a small tourism business, ‘The local community, ‘The relationship with the local community’, and ‘Ties with the local community’. This allows for the comparison of Community-Oriented, Independent, and Disconnected OM types. The researcher acknowledges that OMs’ views may change over time, and that, as a result, the findings discussed in this section present a ‘snapshot’ of participants’ understandings (see chapter 7.2). As OMs’ motivations to run the business were revealed as being unrelated to their views of their business’ LC and its relationship with it (see 5.1), the discussion of STB OMs’ motivations is shorter and less detailed. The threefold typology is offered as a first step towards developing a more
useful analytical tool to examine STBs’ potential to contribute to SS through their relationship with the LC.

5.2.1. Motivations to run a small tourism business

Community-Oriented and Disconnected OMs were largely motivated to run their business by a desire for a different lifestyle, particularly to change their working life. Usually, their decision followed a change in their personal circumstances. Karl explained that he and his wife Lena had considered changing their careers for a long time, but that it took a significant change in their lives to see it through:

“I got kicked out of a job [...] well for various reasons no point in going into detail. But, a nearly 30-year career came to a crashing end due to the death of the owner [...] My wife, who was [...] a teacher’s assistant for special needs children. She was also getting fed up of all the politics and bureaucracy [...] So we decided to give up on two, rather comfortable salaries and put all our effort into a different lifestyle, which is something we’ve been talking about for MANY\(^4\) years. And, talking probably 20 out of the 30 of my career [...] But the day had arrived, I was at the cusp of jumping into something new, and we had discussed all sorts of jobs, from barman to painter and decorator, to car mechanic to gardener, whatever. Just something different. And getting away from office and bureaucracy. Fed up with it. So Lena comes along and says, ‘I am too, let’s do it together as we’ve always discussed.’ We’ve watched all those TV programs about getting away from it all, no going back. These ‘life in the country kind of things’. We’d see people going to open Hotels, and [...] restaurants and breweries and all kinds of different small, micro businesses. That allow them to do what they really like doing and be their own bosses. And also, somewhere beautiful” (Karl, Community-Oriented OM, 50s, owner-

\(^4\) Capitalised words in quotes denote a strong vocal emphasis by the OM.
manages a B&B with his wife in Waitby, DG. They moved to their location less than 10 years ago).

Other Community-Oriented OMs explained that they sought a change in their working life to reduce their working hours, to be able to work from home, or to turn a personal interest into a career. Similarly, Disconnected OMs suggested that their decision to run an STB was related to a desire to reduce their working hours, to reduce their workload, or as a bridge to retirement. For instance, Donna described how together with her husband James, they decided to run an STB for the flexibility it offers, and the reduced working hours:

“[...] [W]e thought about [...] opening a B&B for quite a long, a few years, and when we lived [...] down south in England [...] we then sort of took the plunge about two years or 18 months ago, when we actually put our house down south on the market. With not really any idea where we were coming to [...] [running a B&B] is quite a good living, and its flexible, it [...] allows you to [...] pick and choose when you’ll be open and when you’ll be closed [...] and with only having a small B&B, I think a big B&B is a lot more time, but having two bedrooms, even when we’re full, we’re finished by what, one o’clock in the afternoon” (Donna, Disconnected OM, 60s, runs a B&B with her husband in Tebay, LLTNP. They moved to the location less than two years ago).

The emphasis Disconnected and Community-Oriented OMs place on their desire for a different lifestyle, and work-related motivations reflect characteristics commonly associated with the lifestyle-oriented STB OM (see for example: Ateljevic and Doorne, 2000; Lashley and Rowson, 2010; Morrison, 2006). Additionally, Karl’s description illustrates the interrelation of the decision to pursue a different form of employment and the decision to move to a different, “beautiful” location. The desire to move to a particular location was generally mentioned by Community-Oriented OMs, and supports previous research that found migration and tourism to be closely entwined
(Ateljevic and Doorne, 2000; Getz and Carlsen, 2000; King et al., 2012; Komppula, 2004; Marchant and Mottiar, 2011; Paniagua, 2002; Williams et al., 1989). The desire to live in a particular environment emerged as a key theme only among Community-Oriented OMs.

Independent OMs’ reasons for running an STB differed from Community-Oriented and Disconnected OMs’ accounts. Typically, they were driven to run an STB by the necessity to generate income and chose the business’ location based on its suitability to address their commercial needs. As a result, in contrast to Community-Oriented OMs, their decision to run an STB was generally unrelated to a desire to live in a particular environment. For instance, Tim explains that he and his wife Christine decided to open a B&B to be able to maintain the family farm:

“[…] We moved up here in 1986. I retired from the army, and Christine’s grandmother bought this farm and this house in 1952. And […] she had […] two children, Christine’s father and his sister. Christine’s father lived up here for a bit, having left the royal navy, and […] Christine’s brother is a professor of pure math at Sheffield University. And […] clearly he had no interest in farming […] so we decided, we would move from Hampshire in southern England, up here, take over the farm, and we moved up in 1986 with three quite small children, 12, 10 and 8. And […] have never looked back since! […] we realized financially the farm of 350 acres in this sort of environment […] and at that time farming was not the easiest thing, and it needed a lot of work and capital expended on this farm, and we did up the house as we wanted. And then Christine’s brother decided - they were partners in the farm - that he wanted his share out financially. So we were faced with some fairly raw decisions to make. One was to sell and go to ways […] or to take out a huge mortgage and carry on, and the third was to do that, but also farming in a slightly different way. And we opted for part three, so what we decided, we would take out a huge mortgage, buy him out […] in two trenches, and would look at EVERY possible way we could of increasing the
cash-flow of the farm. ‘Cause clearly agriculture on its own was not going to work [...] we also explored Christine going to work in Edinburgh [...] she has a degree in History and [is a] bright person [...] decided that with a family here and [...] the action of transport that would negate the whole thing. So we looked very close to home and decided that Bed and Breakfast was probably the best option...and we started relatively tentatively and have been doing it ever since. And there is absolutely no doubt about it, it saved us financially, and physically”

(Tim, Independent OM, 50s, owner-manages a B&B with his wife Christine in Briery, EL. Moved to their location more than 20 years ago).

He highlights that the B&B “saved” them financially, suggesting that they depend on it economically. Likewise, other Independent OMs explained that they had chosen to run an STB following the closure of their previous business, or to generate additional income to support their family. This is in line with previous studies that found that the prospect of generating income is important for STB OMs (Getz and Carlsen, 2000; Getz and Petersen, 2005; Komppula, 2004; Lynch, 1998; Morrison and Teixeira, 2004, Mottiar and Laurincikova, 2009).

The results presented here suggest that Community-Oriented and Disconnected OMs were largely motivated to run an STB by the desire to change their lifestyle. Independent OMs, on the other hand, were generally motivated by the need to generate income. Only Community-Oriented OMs tended to indicate that the desire to move to a different environment influences their motivations to run an STB. The literature suggests that STB OMs’ reasons for choosing their location and their views of their destination influence their relationship with the LC (Benson and O’Reilly, 2009; Bijker et al., 2013; Bosworth and Willett, 2011; Carlsen et al., 2001; Tzschentke et al., 2008). Yet, this dimension of STB OMs’ motivations has received only limited attention in the literature. The next section, therefore, will examine the role that the LC played in STB OMs’ reasons for choosing their business’ location, and their views of it.
5.2.2. The local community

OMs in all three groups had typically moved to their location and usually lived on the business premises. It follows, that for OMs in this research their business and personal LC are typically the same. Community-Oriented OMs tended to have personal ties to the area or a similar environment before moving. They largely suggested that they had visited the area previously on holiday, or that their parents had a house in the area, and liked the area so much that they decided to in-migrate. For instance, Anna explained that she lived in a rural environment before moving to Talkin in DG, and demonstrated her preference for remote rural locations:

“We [Anna and her parents] did live in Orkney for nearly four years [...] and loved it [...] always liked living in villages. Just ’cause you get that kind of more community feeling. You say hello to people. I lived in London for about four years ‘cause I went to Uni down there. And it was just, soul-less. You know nobody knew anybody, if you smiled at somebody they thought you were weird [...] so it was just, there was no quality of life [...] you went to work, you came home, you knew a tiny circle of people [...]” (Anna, Community-Oriented OM, 30s, owner-manages a Hotel with her parents in Talkin, DG. Moved to the location less than 10 years ago, has one young son).

This suggests that she knew what to expect from living and running a business in a rural location (Bosworth and Willett, 2011). Indeed, she highlights that it is the “community feeling” that she desired, in particular, the social interactions, which she felt was not possible in a city. Similarly, Abigail explained that she had always intended for moving to a rural location with her husband and that she had lived in a similar environment before. She highlighted the appeal of the natural environment, and, similar to Anna, showed her fondness of the “small community” and the social proximity within it:
“I was brought up in a rural area and we’ve always lived in the middle of nowhere [...] it’s interesting, some of our friends come here and they say, ‘how can you live so far from everything? ’ And we don’t really even think about it [...] no it’s all part of the lifestyle that we wanted to live somewhere [...] with a small community and countryside, and especially the beach with the children just sort of all worked out right...wherever we would have bought, we would have ended up in a similar situation, as in: rural...it’s what we were looking for [...] And like I say the community and the school was one of the big reasons, the big pull [to move here] [...]” (Abigail, Community-Oriented OM, 40s, owner-manages a B&B with her husband in Rampside, DG. Moved to their location less than 10 years ago, have two young children).

Illustrated by Abigail’s account, Community-Oriented OMs typically migrated to their location with the intention to run an STB. The role of previous experiences observed among Community-Oriented OMs’ choice of location concurs with research by Lardies (1999) and Shaw and Williams (1989), and may imply that Community-Oriented OMs were aware of challenges they might face in running a business in a rural area (Bosworth and Willett, 2011). Reflecting their work-driven motivations to run an STB, Community-Oriented OMs largely chose their business’ location strategically to fit their commercial needs. The strategic approach to choosing their location is described by Anna:

“[...] [W]e were looking over this way. The remit for my parents was within an hour of the motorway, ‘cause I've got two brothers. So they wanted to be able to [...] see them as well. That was their remit, otherwise I would have gone up to the Highlands! [...] we actually came to look at the other Hotel in the village, but it wasn't really kind of what we were looking for. And then we spotted the Bell on the corner, and then when we got back we actually noticed that that one was for sale as well. So, when we went in, it suits us because of the layout, it's got rooms, it's got the bar it's got a restaurant, it's got a garden. So it had a
bit of everything. And the accommodation upstairs kind of suited us, ‘cause it’s kind of parents on one side, we’re on the other side, so it gave us the space that we needed as well [...] it just kind of fit the bill really. And Talkin, with it being kind of a little village, you know, we wanted somewhere where there was a school. Kind of on our door step. We wanted a village school. So [...] it was just an ideal kind of little community really [...]”

Anna’s account illustrates that, while the location needed to satisfy emotional requirements pertaining to her parents’ desire not to be too far away from her brothers, the business itself had to meet certain criteria in terms of its layout. The emphasis on work-related motives for running an STB in a rural environment and the commercially driven choice of location reflects research by Paniagua (2002). Additionally, Anna’s account reveals that the LC influenced their choice of location. She suggested that the local school was important, and expressed her feelings about the community, describing it as an “ideal” and “little community”. Similarly, Abigail and other Community-Oriented OMs expressed their fondness of the LC and indicated that it had influenced their choice of location.

The observation that Community-Oriented OMs value the LC in which they live was also reflected in their views of it. They tended to display a desire to belong to their LC, and showed a particularly affectionate attitude towards it, describing the LC as “friendly”, and commenting that they “love it”. For example, Abigail showed her affection for the LC and indicated that she enjoys the social proximity and the support available within it:

“[…] [I]n a small community, the chances are, it’s not going to happen, but if I left my husband everybody in the community would know about it, but having said that, they’d be knocking on the door. And I, personally, love that. I think that’s great! So I don’t have a problem with that at all, so, no I mean we love it.”
Later on in the interview, Abigail indicated that customers share her affection towards the LC, and referred to a “nice community feel”:

“I think one thing that we notice, is anybody that comes to stay [...] a lot of feedback we get is how lovely the community is. How nice the people in the area are [...] How nice the village shop is [...] I mean there’s a nice community feel [...]”

Like Abigail, Karl emphasised that he values the “closeness” and “familiarity” he feels in the LC, and his personal interaction with it. Similar to Anna, he also indicated that this kind of social interaction was not possible in city environments, revealing notions of a rural idyll common among certain lifestyle migrants (Benson and O’Reilly, 2009):

“[Waitby,] it’s a small place. And everyone knows everybody else. And [...] we take comfort from that. Because, we can take a walk up to the local Coop, and it’s only a two, three-minute walk, and [...] you probably stop six times [...] and once you get into the Coop, or the Post Office, everyone knows you, and has a quick chat, it takes ages, you know. Just go and get a loaf and some milk, and an hour later you’re back thinking ‘I met so and so, so and so, so and so!’ And that’s what community brings. It’s that closeness and familiarity. I think you lose that in the bigger cities, don’t you? Where everyone shuts down in their own little space, and [...] tries to ignore the outside world, ‘cause they’re busy getting on with their bit. And [...] they appreciate other folks that are busy getting on with their bit. Whereas here it’s more relaxed and folks have got time to stop, and pass the time of day with you. Even if it’s only commenting on the rain and the clouds and the [...] lack of sunshine, the wind keeps blowing, how cold it is. The weather is number one of course!”

His account highlights his personal interest in the LC, a desire to be part of it, and a sense of trust towards it. Another Community-Oriented OM, Dan, emphasised his and
his partners’ interest in interacting with the LC, and indicated a sense of belonging: “[...] One of the nice things is, that we are part of the community [...]” Furthermore, evident in Karl’s account, Community-Oriented OMs generally expressed a sense of trust towards their LC. For instance, Anna commented that she felt the community provided a “safe” environment for her son to grow up in, where “he can run around”. Other Community-Oriented OMs pointed out that there was little crime, or that people “don’t lock their doors”. Community-Oriented OMs’ emphasis on being part of the LC and their trust towards it suggests that they seek a sense of social belonging, which has been observed in previous studies among STB OMs (Ateljevic and Doorne, 2004) and lifestyle migrants (Benson and O’Reilly, 2009). Equally, their appreciation for interacting with the LC is in line with Halfacree (1994), who observes that anticipation of social interaction and social activities is a key element of migrants’ motivations to move to a rural location.

In contrast to Community-Oriented and Disconnected OMs, Independent OMs generally moved to their location without any intention of running an STB. Similar to Disconnected OMs, they typically had no ties to the area or a similar environment before moving. However, they had generally lived in their location for several years before deciding to run an STB. For instance, Tim explained that he moved to the location with his wife Christine to take over her parents’ farm. Likewise, Sally in Abbeytown indicated that she moved to her location for her ex-husband:

“[I moved here] just because I met him [...] having moved here [...] we’d bought a place out there and I’ve been here all the time. Unfortunately, it didn’t go the whole distance [...] He’s moved into Edinburgh [...] but I would never go back to Edinburgh again, never. Even though as I said I thought I was a towny, I like my nightclubs and bars and stuff like that. I can’t remember the last time I was in a pub now, I just don’t go” (Sally, Independent OM, 40s, owner-manages a B&B in Abbeytown, EL. She moved to the location more than 20 years ago with her ex-husband).
Similarly, other Independent OMs explained that they had moved to the location because their spouse owned property there, or to be able to send their children to a particular school. Moreover, unlike Community-Oriented and Disconnected OMs, some Independent OMs did not live in the community in which they operate their business, and instead lived nearby. Typically, these people chose the location for its infrastructure and facilities. Independent OMs tended not to mention the LC as an influence on their choice of location, or express their feelings towards it, which may indicate that they are less concerned with, and place less value on, the LC than Community-Oriented OMs.

Indeed, while Independent OMs tended to display a positive attitude towards the LC, they showed – unlike Community-Oriented OMs – less affection towards it, and generally did not describe a desire to be part of the LC. This is evident in Greta’s description:

“There’s quite a lot that happens in the village […] we’ve got a very, very busy village hall which is close […] they have a cinema there once a week […] they do pantomimes, there are dances held there, people hold functions there, there are yoga classes” (Greta, Independent OM, 60s, runs a B&B with her husband Sam in Grasmere, EL. They moved to their location more than 30 years ago).

Her account illustrates that, while she refers to the facilities available, and the activities in the “village”, and shows appreciation for it, she does not demonstrate the affection that Community-Oriented OMs expressed, nor does it reveal a desire to be part of it, as is further exemplified by her use of the pronoun “they” instead of “we”. John described the people that live in the LC and showed his appreciation for them:

“[...] We’re in an area that’s called Strathard, that’s the Trossachs and we’re in Strathard [...] 1200 people, about 900 I believe in the village [...] in Aikton. So the others come from Kintown [...] places like that. Describe them? Some real
go-getters amongst them [...] some, NOT a lot of people [...] make things happen and the ones who wanna make things happen seem to be the same people right through the community, you know. Doesn't matter what, if it's a fete, it's this group of people. If it's building a business partnership it is the same group of people [...] Good community, good people [...] influential people here [...] Got a guy helping out in the garden at the minute. He's doing it completely off his own back. He's doing it 'cause he wants to do it. You know, that's nice. And it's nice that you can create a relationship with somebody like that and they want to help you. But, the, the same guy does a lot for the community; he's not just helping me. He does an awful lot for the community in large. And he's an old partner. He's retired. But a good guy!” (John, Independent OM, 50s, owner-manages an Inn with a pub in Aikton, LLTNP. He moved to the location more than 20 years ago with his children and ex-wife).

While John’s description of the LC reveals affection for the LC, it lacks – Similar to Greta – the sentiment encountered among Community-Oriented OMs. These observations indicate that for Independent OMs personally the LC may be less important than for Community-Oriented OMs, which indeed seems reflected in the limited role it played in their reasons for choosing their business’ location.

Analogous to Community-Oriented OMs, theirDisconnected equivalents had typically moved to their location with the intention to run an STB and chose their location specifically for commercial reasons. They generally did not have any ties to the area or a similar environment before moving to their location, which implies that, unlike Independent OMs, for this group of OMs it was the first time that they were living in a rural environment. As they moved with the intention to run an STB, this may indicate that their expectations of living in a rural environment were based on less information than the expectations of Community-Oriented and Independent OMs about living in a rural location and, as a result, less aware of the potential challenges that they might face in running their business (Bosworth and Willett, 2011).
The appeal of the local natural environment or the LC generally played no role in Disconnected OMs’ choice of location, which they share with Independent OMs. For instance, Dawn indicated that the reason for choosing their location was related to a personal preference for the area and the appeal of the premises, but not the LC:

“Now, we stayed in Clydebank at the time. And we had always had a passion for Loch Lomond. So he [Dawn’s husband] drove up Loch Lomond and he phoned me while I was working in Glasgow and he said, 'so there's a house for sale, just your type of house, you’d love it’ [...] so it wasn’t the thing to go onto the Internet at that time and look and browse and all that. So I was like, ‘oh, well, maybe go and look at it’. I hadn't really committed to leaving the house that I had, but I was feeling a bit sorry for him, out on his own, so anyway....I went up to see the house with my mother and [husband] and we drove up. And as soon as we were through the gates I thought, 'it’d be good to live here!' [...] the house is 130 years old, and it was a lot more than we could have afforded, and my mum was, 'you need help, I'll help you', and all that [...] and then we went in. So we'd already bought it before we went in, which was strange [laughing]” (Dawn, Disconnected OMs, 50s, owner-manages a B&B in Tebay, LLTNP. She moved to the location more than 10 years ago with her husband).

Likewise, Tom explained that he had previously lived in a town nearby, and chose Catterlen because he liked the area. However, like Dawn, the LC did not emerge as an influence on his choice of location:

“[…] I've got no other family, no brothers, sisters, I'm not married, don't have any kids, so I thought, 'well there's no point in moving anywhere else'. I've been in this area since 1996 [...] I know the area, I like the area [...] so I will look for somewhere in this area. So, hence why this place” (Tom, Disconnected OM, 50s, owner-manages a B&B in Catterlen, DG. He moved to the location less than 10 years ago).
This suggests that Disconnected OMs typically did not choose their business’ location for the appeal of the LC, and may imply that this group of OMs, similar to Independent OMs, ascribe a limited value to their LC.

Disconnected OMs commented on the difficulties concerned with life in a rural area, which may reflect their lack of prior experience in a rural environment. Donna explained that she regrets having moved to their location, and indicated that her expectations of “living in the country” were unfulfilled:

“[...] [W]e were both brought up in cities, and had always been attracted to the idea of living in the country [...] Although it is a beautiful area and we are busy, lots of tourists, both British and foreign, I do now wish we’d perhaps rented a place in the area for a short while. I would have discovered very quickly that contrary to what I always thought, I do not particularly enjoy country living [...]”

Similarly, Leigh pointed out that living in Tebay requires individuals to be “tough”:

“You’ve got to be relatively tough to spend your whole year, you like to get wee escape holidays every so often, get out the place” (Leigh, Disconnected OM, 70s, runs a B&B in Tebay, LLTNP. She moved to the location more than 30 years ago together with her husband and son, who no longer lives in the area).

Dawn described the “reality” of living in a rural location and expressed a sense of lack of community: “[...] [T]he reality is, it's bloody cold, it's wet and it's very miserable and, there is [...] no community [...]” Dawns’ account indicates that her expectations may have been informed by the notion of the ‘rural idyll’, as a result of which her anticipation of a rural community, and life in it, may conflict with her lived experiences. Disconnected OMs’ descriptions suggest that, in contrast to Community-Oriented and Independent OMs, these OMs find it difficult to live in a rural environment. Indeed,
they were the only group that largely displayed a negative attitude towards their LC. Francis explained that she has no desire to be part of or interact with the LC:

“[...] I could live anywhere [...] community, I'm not in to community [...] I don't get involved in village fetes or anything like that [...] purely because, it doesn't interest me. I know a lot of people [...] they like to have a community, personally I don't. Probably because we've worked for so many years [...] and out with you don't have time for things like that [...] the community social thing, doesn't interest me at all really” (Francis, Disconnected OM, 50s, runs a B&B in Murton, EL. She moved to the location with her husband less than 10 years ago).

Dawn, on the other hand, felt there is no community, “I don't think there is actually a community [...] they don't tend to socialise”, and suggests that the community “keep to themselves”, which was also echoed by Donna. Disconnected OMs’ responses further indicate that, while they have in common with Independent OMs that the appeal of the LC generally did not influence their choice of location, they tended to show a negative attitude towards the LC, and indicate a sense of disillusion and frustration.

The results presented here show that STB OMs differ in their views of their business’ LC and that these are reflected in their reasons for choosing their business’ location. More specifically, it seems that Community-Oriented OMs have a desire to be part of the LC, which did not emerge from Independent and Disconnected OMs responses. Similarly, Community-Oriented OMs largely showed a particularly affectionate attitude towards the LC, whereas Independent OMs showed appreciation towards it, but seemed less concerned with it personally, and Disconnected OMs typically demonstrated frustration towards it.
This section revealed differences in OMs’ views of their business’ LC. The literature suggests that STB OMs’ views of their business’ LC relate to their understandings of its relationship with it. To be able to explore this relation, the next section examines OMs’ understandings of their business’ relationship with the LC.

5.2.3. The relationship with the local community

The lifestyle migration literature indicates that STB OMs’ reasons for choosing their location and their views of it, relate to their business’ relationship with the destination community (Benson and O’Reilly, 2009; Bijker et al., 2013). Similarly, Bosworth and Farrell (2011) find that STB owners’ views of their LC relate to their integration in it, while Hallak et al. (20012) observe that they relate to the support STB OMs provide to it. Likewise, other studies imply that STB OMs’ views of their LC relate to their business’ relationship with it (Carlsen et al., 2001; Getz and Carlsen, 2000; and Tzschentke et al., 2008). This suggests that OMs who indicate that the LC influenced their choice of location, i.e. Community-Oriented OMs, may express a stronger desire to interact with the LC than Independent and Disconnected OMs for whom the LC played no role. It is, therefore, possible that Community-Oriented, Independent and Disconnected OMs might differ in their understandings of the relationship.

Indeed, differences were observed in OMs’ views of their business’ relationship with the LC that appear to reflect their views of their business’ LC. When asked to describe the relationship, Community-Oriented OMs typically described their personal relationship and interaction with the LC. Laura felt that the relationship was “really good”, because they had previous personal ties to the LC, and “know people”:

“I would describe [the relationship between the business and the LC] just as really good! [...] and has been from the start. I think it helped that, as an on and off for probably three years I worked at the Duke [Hotel], so I knew quite a lot of people. And, what I thought was lovely [...] obviously my mum and dad knew
that we were trying to buy this, but […] we didn’t want to sort of say anything until it was done and dusted. ‘Cause […] things can easily change and sales can fall through and everything. And so we hadn’t said anything, but then the previous owners told their best friend, who told their best friend, and at a funeral, somebody came running up to my mum and said, ‘we hear it’s your Laura who’s bought The Ashton’. And it was then, it got out that it was a local girl, who was coming back. And I thought that was really, really nice. It’s not all, ‘god it’s a couple from Glasgow’ […] and then, the fish van spread the news [laughing]” (Laura, Community-Oriented OM, 30s, owner-manages a Guest House in Garrigill, DG. She moved to the location less than 10 years ago with her husband and their daughter).

She highlighted the role that her personal ties with the LC play in the relationship with it, and suggests that, as a result of these, she is considered as a “local”, and not “a couple from Glasgow”. Likewise, Abigail felt that “there’s a good relationship” and, similar to Laura, described her personal relation with the LC. Abigail indicated that her personal involvement in the LC is encouraged by her children who go to the local school:

“[…] there’s a good relationship. I don’t really see that there would be anything other, you know. We’re sort of a quiet, quietly ticking away. We’re not running a disco every Saturday night […] I think the relationship’s good with the community […] we […] put an advert in the local church magazine as well […] we don’t sort of feel it’s justifiable as in bringing guests to the area, but we do it because the church magazine needs the sort of funds and that […] but having said that […] we have had a few people book […] grand-ma’s booking their families in, that say that we’ve got a good reputation. Within the community […] So yes, our relationship is great […] because we’ve got the children, most our activities outwith work are through the school and we just muck in […] I’m the chair of the parent council at the school […] I occasionally go to meetings
for the school, so I'm involved in any activities that they have [...] a community like this [...] just [...] last week, they had a like a healthy walk, so I took some food in, everybody takes food in.”

Carla felt that distinguishing between her personal and the business’ relationship with the LC was difficult, and proceeded to describe her personal relationship with it:

“...I don't know how on earth you’d put that into words. I think possibly there is like many places in rural and sea-side, particularly sea-side areas [...] younger people can’t afford to buy the property, so, it's incomers that come in...and they buy the property and they use it [...] for holidays and they don't actually put anything back into the [LC] [...] whereas we've been accepted because we HAVE put something back in [...] and we don't just move in and then complain about everything and not do anything...Stephen [...] my husband's a first responder [...] he's [...] on call, on a rota [...] and things like that [...] if somebody has a heart attack. I'm on the LC association, and I help the week-long fair that we have here in the summer. And I work on the caravan site on a part-time basis as well” (Carla, Community-Oriented OM, 50s, owner-manages a B&B with her husband in Patterdale, DG. They moved to their location less than 10 years ago).

For Carla, the relationship between their business and the LC is defined by her and her husband being accepted by it. She justified her feeling accepted in the LC by differentiating herself and her husband from other “incomers” because they have “put something back in [to the LC]”, and proceeded to outline how they interact with the local non-business community. Her account indicates that there may be an expectation in the LC of “incomers” to “give back”, a norm of generalised reciprocity, and that the failure to adhere to this social norm may be sanctioned, pointing towards the exclusionary characteristic of networks (Atterton, 2007; Chell and Baines, 2000). An
awareness of local social norms was also displayed by Anna, who indicated that the close ties within Talkin influence how the LC interacts:

“[…] [Y]ou have to be very careful who you annoy! [laughing] You have to be nice to everybody! […] You have to be much more diplomatic […] but that’s not necessarily a bad thing [laughing] […] you do have to be very careful about what you say and who you say it to […] but […] that’s village life really. Things spread very quickly. And bad things spread a lot quicker than good things.”

Like the accounts from Laura and Carla, Abigail indicated that it is a “great” relationship and that they have a “good reputation” because of their personal interaction with the local non-business community, the financial support they provide to the church, their involvement in school activities, and because they are “not running a disco every Saturday night”. Carla, Laura, and Abigail illustrate the awareness of local social norms typically demonstrated by Community-Oriented OMs, which may encourage a positive relationship with the LC.

Independent OMs’ views of the relationship with the LC differed from Community-Oriented OMs’ understandings, which appears to mirror the differences in their views of the LC observed in 5.2.2. Specifically, Independent OMs generally emphasised the commercial dimension of the relationship and tended not to show a personal concern with it, or even a desire to belong to it. Additionally, while they usually described their personal interaction with the LC, these ties tended to be exclusively through the business. Holly indicated that, while she interacts with the LC, she is not involved in it personally, and felt that this is conducive to the commercial success of the business:

“[…] [P]eople meet here, people congregate here for a reason […] people use it for social […] on every level […] We’re completely independent. To everything that goes on. Because I’m not involved in anybody's issues […] we’re completely neutral […] you don’t get involved in people's [issues] […] as I said,
'my dad fell out with her 50 years ago’ [...] and you will get that in communities [...] everybody's welcome here. If they decide not to, because such and such is sitting there at the bar, it's up to them [...] And that's just part and parcel of it. So as much as I like community life and village life, I do have a life outwith” (Holly, Independent OM, 40s, owner-manages an Inn with her husband in Edenhall, EL. They live in a nearby village).

Importantly, Holly is one of the few participants in this research that does not live in the community in which her business is located. This implies that her relationship with the LC may be mainly driven by the business. Indeed, she notes that, “I only see [the LC] through the business’ eyes! [...] I don't live here, so [...] I don't participate in, I only participate in [...] community life within the village [...] THROUGH the business.” Similarly, John, who lives and owns a business in Aikton, emphasises the commercial nature of the relationship with the LC, and the need to be aware of it: “It's a good business relationship, which is what we are at the end of...the day. You have to maintain that. You have to keep that focus in mind [...] it's a very delicate balance.” This suggests that, unlike Community-Oriented OMs who generally referred to their personal ties with the LC outside their business, Independent OMs’ relationship with the LC may be driven mainly by commercial motivations. Unlike Community-Oriented OMs, Independent OMs generally did not describe ties with the LC that were unrelated to their business. Indeed, this seems to mirror Independent OMs’ views of their LC, which were revealed to generally lack expression of a desire to belong to or participate in their LC.

Similar to Independent OMs, Disconnected OMs generally described their interaction with the LC through their business, as opposed to personal relations with it. Additionally, however, these OMs indicated a lack of interaction or indeed problematic relationship with the LC. For instance, Jeffrey described his interaction with local residents who use the business’ facilities. Reflecting the negative attitude many OMs in
this group displayed towards their LC, he expressed the discontent he felt towards them:

“[…] [W]e get it, maybe a odd diner or whatever else. But again, they want to pay 12 pounds, 15 pounds. They don’t pay what we would normally be charging […] so there’s a cost factor in there […] we run […] a 900 code, so […] the regular customers get a slightly discounted price on […] beer. And so, so if you’re drinking here every day, you’re gonna get […] the 900 code. But again, some people reject to that. They think that’s dual pricing. So it’s ridiculous” (Jeffrey, Disconnected OM, 50s, owner-manages a Hotel with a pub and restaurant in Abbeytown, EL. He moved to the location less than 10 years ago with his wife and children).

Tom in Catterlen noted a lack of interaction with the LC, which he related to the “location of the place”, and also suggested a lack of social activity, saying that, “there’s not a very big hub to be part of”:

“[…] [T]he relationship is […] I was gonna say distant, but that’s not true. We are part of the community because we’re here. Everybody knows who we are, everybody knows Sandyford, the same as everybody in Rampside knows Milton House, which is Peter and Abigail’s place […] it’s part of the community as far as that’s concerned, but there is not a close interaction. Between us and the community and the community and us […] I mean I would say, because of the location of the place […] the lack of social interaction is probably because of location rather than anything else. I mean we’re not exactly in the hub of things, and even if we were in the hub of Catterlen there’s not a very big hub to be part of.”

Evident in these accounts is also that Disconnected OMs typically did not display a desire to be part of the LC. Coupled with their often negative attitude towards the LC,
these observations suggest that Disconnected OMs may interact sparsely with the LC, and that their relationship with it is problematic. This indicates that Disconnected OMs differ from Community-Oriented and Independent OMs in their views of the relationship, who, respectively, tended to emphasise in particular their personal relationship with the LC and their desire to interact with it, and seemed to be driven mainly by commercial considerations to maintain a positive relationship with it.

While it has been widely acknowledged that economic behaviour is interrelated with social relationships (Burrows and Curran, 1989; Granovetter, 1985, 2005; Krippner, 2001; Krippner et al., 2004; Polanyi, 1944), and observed in previous studies regarding STBs’ interaction with their LC (Bosworth and Farrell, 2011; Lynch, 2000; Mottiar and Ryan, 2007; Pavlovich, 2001; Pavlovich and Kearins, 2004; Saxena et al., 2007), the observations from this research indicate that there may be important differences in the extent to which STB OMs’ personal and business relations overlap. While Community-Oriented OMs generally described personal ties with the LC that, while acknowledging that the personal economic spheres are closely entwined, were separate from the business, Independent and Disconnected OMs tended to describe exclusively their personal interaction with the LC through their business. This indicates that, while for Community-Oriented OMs the relationship with the LC is largely defined by their personal relationship with it, Independent and Disconnected OMs appear to view their business’ and personal relationship with the LC as largely distinct. In other words, Community-Oriented OMs may be more concerned with their personal relationship with the LC, while Independent and Disconnected OMs may be more concerned with the commercial dimension of their ties with it, which indeed reflects the variations observed in section 5.2.2. pertaining to their views of the LC. It is possible that OMs’ views of the relationship relate to the nature of their business’ ties with the LC. The next section, therefore, explores STB OMs’ understanding of how their business interacts with the LC.
5.2.4. Ties with the local community

This section examines OMs’ descriptions of their business’ ties with the local community and actors outside it. The results are grouped into the three sub-themes *Ties with the business community, Ties with the non-business community, and Extra-local ties.*

**Ties with the business community**

Community-Oriented, Independent, and Disconnected OMs all tended to describe ties with the local business community; naturally, these were mostly with other tourism businesses and suppliers. Dan explained that he recommends local businesses to his guests and that they use local suppliers:

“[…] Well you’ve got things like, the Wellington Story and the museum in there, so we’ll direct people into to that. That’s true for anything, we always like to know what people are interested in and then send them out to the various places…’cause further up the road you’ve got Martha’s animal world, and […] if we’ve young kiddies staying, then they’ll love the animals […] we always let people know […] But, can’t think of other than […] I’d say, buying locally and […] using as many local shops as we get […]” (Dan, Community-Oriented OM, 30s, owner-manages a B&B with his wife in Greenrow, DG. They moved to the location less than 10 years ago).

OMs in all three groups also tended to describe using local facilities and services for the business and personally, being recommended by local businesses and in turn recommending local businesses to their guests, and referring guests to, as well as receiving referrals from other local accommodation providers. While OMs typically described informal ties with local businesses, which supports previous studies (Costa et al., 2008; Mottiar, 2007), some also described more formal relationships with other
tourism businesses. For instance, Abigail suggested that she participates in a local group of accommodation providers, and Katie described that she works with the tourist information centre in the LC to “take some of that pressure off”:

“[...] And I work with the tourist board in Grizedale [...] not a lot of people work with the tourist board, I’m about the only one. ‘Cause it is very expensive. But I work with them, because [...] we’re so busy, the tourist board can take some of that pressure off me. And they do a lot of my bookings for me” (Katie, Disconnected OM, 40s, runs a Hotel in Grizedale with her husband. She lives in the near-by town with her husband and their youngest son).

However, OMs’ responses suggest possible differences in the quality of the ties with the local business community. Community-Oriented and Independent OMs tended to emphasise the reciprocity of their ties, which Disconnected OMs usually did not. For instance, Nicole highlighted the interdependence between her business and local suppliers:

“If your little bistros, your hotels, your bars, or whatever, if they didn’t use your local suppliers, then obviously they wouldn’t be [there] [...] with everything that’s going on just now with the recession what have you. It’s really important to try and support everyone as much as you can. And if you look after your suppliers, they will look after you in return [...]” (Nicole, Independent OM, 30s, owner-manages an Inn with her husband in Abbeytown, and lives in a nearby town).

Likewise, Laura explains that she works together with other local businesses, including a possible competitor, and highlights that these relationships benefit her business:

“[...] We’re kind of in our own little niche, that we’re not competitive with anybody [...] I mean probably our closest competitor is the [name of Hotel]
across the road, ‘cause they’re kind of similar priced to us, but we still work really well together. I’ll refer people to them, they refer people to me. I’ll send people across there for a meal...there’s been a couple of times that they’ve run out of sheets or something like that. And [...] instead of saying ‘tough, these are my sheets’ [...] I help them out. Touch wood, I don’t think I’ve ever run out of anything. But I know, that if there was something, I could go across there and say ‘look, can I borrow a big pot?’, or, something. We just, we work together [...] it’s not competitive, nobody’s kind of, sitting there empty saying ‘I’m doing fine’ [...] it’s kind of, I don’t know what you’d call it! I suppose we just try and help each other out! [...] ‘cause it’s good for me if I can say ‘there are four nice places to eat’, whereas if I were saying to people ‘of yeah, you can come and stay here but to get, to have a meal you have to drive 8 miles to [nearby town]’ [...] that doesn’t work. So it kind of is to everyone’s benefit that we work together.”

Laura suggests interdependency between her business and other businesses in the LC, indicating that she benefits from local businesses because they enhance the visitor experience, and that local businesses benefit from her business as she recommends them to her customers. Likewise, Abigail emphasised the importance of ties with other local businesses for the exchange of information, especially in the initial start-up stage of their B&B, which echoes the literature on STB networks (Hall, 2004; Kokrannikal and Morrison, 2011; Komppula, 2004; Pavlovich, 2001):

“We have [...] Rampside Breaks, which is a little group [...] And we support each other in various ways [...] when I first moved here, I had never done B&B before, so it was nice to have Rampside Breaks, because everyone is quite honest about what they do [...] if Alex said to me, ‘oh what do you serve for breakfast?’ I’d be quite happy to, nothing’s precious, ‘cause we’re all out there to achieve the same aim at the end of the day, and I think that’s to offer a good service to visitors to the area [...] and then we also do the referral [...] if
we’re full we will give them Alex’ number, or The Arlington’s number or [...] and I also say to people you know ’if anyone in Rampside Breaks can’t help you, do give me a call back and I’ll ring round’.”

A sense of being part of the LC and a desire to contribute to it is also evident in Abigail’s comment, as they are “all out there to achieve the same aim at the end of the day”, which reflects Community-Oriented OMs’ views of their LC (see 5.2.2.). The interviewees’ accounts also reflect research by Pavlovich (2008), who emphasises the interdependence of actors in tourism networks, and Mottiar and Ryan (2007), who argue that collaboration among small tourism businesses allows them to offer a ‘seamless’ product to their customers. Additionally, the reciprocal nature of their ties influences their business’ success (Miller et al., 2003). Similarly, Sally pointed out that businesses work together to accommodate tourists:

“[…] We interact very well with the hotels. The hotels are full, they’ll phone us. Equally, if nobody wants to pay the hotel prices, they’ll phone us […] we all work off each other […] Like [if] I was full, I couldn’t take two people, so I’ll phone one of the hotels, to see if they can take two and do it at a good price […] we all work like that together.”

Tim also suggested that accommodation providers work together, and pointed out that his business’ reputation influences his relations with other businesses:

“[…] There’s a big community of B&B ladies who […] they can’t fit somebody in so they try and fit them in somewhere else […] there’s a network in there […] I think Crichton Farm is quite, quite well known in the area with a couple of others as well. So, yeah, it all fits in.”

Notably, Community-Oriented and Independent OMs indicated that the reciprocity of their ties with tourism businesses relates to a lack of competition among them. Laura
explained that her business is in its “own little niche”, which was also mentioned by Carla: “[...] I would hate to have the feeling that I was competing with other people actually. I quite enjoy being the only one in the village so to speak.” Sam suggested that the lack of competition between accommodation businesses is due to a lack of supply: “[...] [T]here's a great shortage of B&B in Grasmere [...] we're always looking for more, rather than fighting each other for business.” These accounts emphasise the role that the distinctiveness of tourism businesses, regarding their product and service offering, plays for the relationships between them. Tinsley and Lynch (2008) suggest that market differentiation is a social norm within rural destinations, and argue that adherence to this norm ensures a balance between competition and collaboration among tourism businesses. Community-Oriented and Independent OMs’ responses imply that they adhere to this norm, which may be conducive to their integration in the LC.

Disconnected OMs, on the other hand, indicated a lack of interaction with the local business community, and competitive relations with local tourism businesses. Helen notes that the competition among tourism businesses has increased over time:

“[...] [F]rom it being a nice family kind of group, they became very aggressive, and ambitious and wanted to steal business from everybody [...] it's very unfortunate, it's all disappeared, and so everybody does their own thing now” (Helen, Disconnected OM, 70s, owner-manages a B&B with her husband in Dearham, LLTNP. Moved to their location more than 30 years ago).

Likewise, Gemma points towards the competition among tourism businesses:

“[...] [A]s more competition comes in, you're having to struggle to get your clients [...] we all swear blind that, there's a company called Easy Ways, that [...] just do the West Highland Way, and, we have wondered what happened to
Easy Ways [...] ‘cause they used to fill me [...] and then obviously then that sort of went and we heard they were doing a deal with The Deacon’.

Furthermore, Disconnected OMs appear to interact sparsely with other local businesses. As Francis expressed:

“ [...] I would say [...] we’re using [...] local taxis, so I suppose that’s a local thing. I probably, not really I don’t think. I mean [...] I probably should, but I don’t buy local produce [...] my husband has this problem as well [in the Hotel he runs in a nearby town] that there are certain food and wine things that you can enter, but [...] you’re supposed to use all your local [...] but, at the end of the day. It’s the cost of it [...] He reckons, that, and I agree with him, you can get so much [...] just as good produce from a larger company, than you can from the local people [...] I go to [...] do you know Costco?”

Her account indicates that she feels that she should support local shops, but justifies her decision not to with the higher price of local produce. While Gemma initially suggests that she uses local shops, she then explains that she buys most of her produce from supermarkets, which similar to Francis, she attributes to cost:

“ [...] [W]ell, you’re using all their products [...] but I mean, you’ve got to admit you do go to ASDA and Tesco for products more, because you’re [...] working on fine [...] pricing. So your local stuff is dearer, there’s no getting away from it [...] but [...] you’re still using your post office [...] so, you don’t go away down the road to find a post office, or even a butcher, you could use the local butcher. But [...] basically, cash and carry or, super markets, is better for your bulk stuff [...] And if you can get it delivered, which, didn’t use to happen, but nowadays, you can actually get it delivered to the door. Which is really good [...]” (Gemma, Disconnected OM, 50s, owner-manages a B&B in Dearham, LLTNP).
This observation is broadly congruent with Bosworth and Farrell (2011), who found that in-migrant tourism business owners were less likely to buy local produce. These observations imply that Disconnected OMs may interact sparingly with local businesses and that their relationship with other tourism businesses may be problematic.

**Ties with the non-business community**

While Disconnected OMs generally described the community’s role for their business as generating income, their responses suggest that they typically did not feel that they benefit commercially or personally from their interaction with it. This indicates that there may be a conflict between Disconnected OMs’ expectations of the LC, and the economic benefit they feel they receive from it. Indeed, this is highlighted in Jeffrey’s account. While he initially criticised the lack of community activity, his frustration seemed to be related largely to what he felt to be a lack of support from the LC for his business:

“[...] [A] lot of places have got [...] gala committees or village committees, but Abbeytown don’t care about that. They don’t [...] see that they have any kind of obligation, duty, to support their local pub or, restaurant or whatever. So they’ll come here, and meet once a month for free. Mostly not even buying a drink. Be slightly upset if the place is busy and they can’t find somewhere to settle themselves. And then plan how they’re gonna do fundraising things in the village hall, on a Saturday night. Which drags all my customers that might be coming here, down to there. At cheap prices.”

Jeffrey’s references to “duty” and “obligation” suggest that he expects the LC to use his business’ facilities. This contrasts especially with responses by Independent OMs, who emphasised their financial dependence on the LC, but expressed appreciation for the support they receive from it. Moreover, an interview with another OM in
Abbeytown, Nicole, who, like Jeffrey, owner-manages a business with a pub, revealed a very different understanding of the same LC. Apart from Jeffrey, most Disconnected OMs suggested that their business has few or no ties with the local non-business community, which seems to reflect the negative attitudes and the seemingly lack of personal interest they largely displayed towards the LC (see 5.2.2).

In contrast to Disconnected OMs, Independent and Community-Oriented OMs generally described positive ties with the local non-business community. Typically, ties with the non-business community related to their links with individuals in the LC, their involvement in local organisations and associations, and participation in charitable events and activities. Community-Oriented and Independent OMs largely indicated that the ties with the local non-business community were reciprocal. Anna explained:

“[...] [P]eople do [...] spread the word if you like. You know, so people in Talkin will talk to people in Kirkfield, and they kind of promote your business for you in a way [...] good rapport. And we do quite a lot of charity, fund raising, stuff as well [...] so that kind of helps. And we get involved in kind of the village kind of events and stuff like that [...]”

Anna’s comment implies that ties with the non-business community generate income for them, and also benefit the LC. Holly describes the business’ ties with the local non-business community and indicates that she depends on them financially:

“[...] [I]f I didn’t have [the local community], we wouldn’t be here. Simple as that.”

“[...] [I]f you didn’t have a local community using your bar every day and using your kitchen every day. Or put people in your bedrooms at the weekends, ‘cause there’s fortieth birthday party on, or there’s a, a wedding. You wouldn’t survive.”
Likewise, Peter showed an awareness of the community’s role for his business:

“[…] We have a good rapport overall […] all our neighbours and all their customer base, and anybody […] travelling by, visitors coming in, we don’t have a problem with any of that, they don’t have a problem with us, we have a great rapport with them. There is not, there is nothing I can say, negative, I can’t put a negative thing on it […] because […] a lot of […] local support you get. Particularly in the winter, in the off-season. You get the local support. You got to give and take though, so […] You got to come and match […] give them what they want […] Money is scarce […] and of course with the drinking culture as well, drinking, that’s gone, that’s finished […] so we’re trying to reintroduce some of that, back into the [local community]. Like, the taxi and things like that, you know. People […] not binge drinking, but sensible drinking […] maybe we’ll have quizzes, we’ll have a little kind of Karaoke, we’ll have card games, we’ll have, things like that […] we’ll put some activities on. Want that people come and join, that’s it, you don’t have to. On the whole it’s good […] we have a good rapport with [the local community]” (Peter, Independent OM, 50s, owner-manages an Inn in Barbon, DG. He moved to the location less than 10 years ago with his family).

Holly indicated that her behaviour towards the LC is informed by her awareness of her financial dependence on it:

“[…] Because people appreciate that you’ve remembered or […] you make a point in knowing what it is that people want. And as long as you continue to give that, then you’ll continue to get them using you. If you start turning round and you ’pffff’ […] then you’re not going to get it.”

It was noted that Independent OMs typically referred to the commercial benefit of these ties. In contrast, Community-Oriented OMs in particular felt that they benefit
personally from their ties with the local non-business community. Carla explained that she “needs” the community for friendship. She highlighted the closeness of the relationship with the local non-business community, and indicated a dependency on it:

“[The local community] need you and you need, well you need them more than, they need you actually. As far as I’m concerned [...] I need them because they recommend me, I need them because they provide me with services, I need them for friendship.”

Likewise, Dan described close ties within the local non-business community, and mentions the emotional support available: “[...] [I]f somebody's got a problem, everybody will, you know, offer their help [...] people will [...] just ring and ask if they need any help [...]”. Evident from Dan and Carla’s accounts are as well a sense of trust that Community-Oriented OMs typically displayed towards their local community.

**Extra-local ties**

Disconnected and Independent OMs seemed to lack awareness of extra-local ties. While some suggested that their business has ties with actors outside the LC, typically OMs in both groups appeared less aware of these ties, which mirrors previous research findings (Farrell *et al.*, 2011; Mottiar, 2007; Mottiar and Ryan, 2007; Young, 2010). For instance, Sally explained that the only relationship her business has outside the LC is with the Golf Courses. Her response suggests that this relationship may be one-sided, initiated by the Golf Course, who send her marketing material:

“[...] [N]o, apart from the golf courses, of course we keep in touch with them. They send us their literature, eh, their new programs for the year, whatever is happening. We keep in touch that way, they will call us, they will call us if they need something [...] but other businesses [...] no [...] apart from the golf courses
that keep in touch with us, no I would probably say that's the only contact we have [outside the local community].”

Likewise, Tracy in Allerby said:

“[…] No, I don’t think so […] obviously I’m a member of VisitScotland […] I will get phone calls from other communities if they have got a visitor […] and they want to stay […] in Allerby for instance and […] they'll say, 'I've seen you on the VisitScotland website and [...] my guests want to come [...] to Allerby, are you available?’ So that sort of thing” (Tracy, Independent OM, 50s, owner-manages a B&B in Allerby, LLTNP. Moved to the location more than 10 years ago with her husband).

Similarly, Tom explained that the ties with actors outside the LC are mainly with his suppliers, and indicated that he uses the supermarket for a lot of his shopping:

“I can't really think of any great numbers. Obviously from here [...] our supplier, most of our suppliers are either in Cartbay or in Dumfries. We use the Cash and Carry for a lot of things [laughing] or Tesco, the infamous Tesco that everybody hates, but are actually very, very good [...] so, that tends to be the sort of further away [...] there's very few as I say other than our gardener in Dregby.”

In addition to their limited awareness of extra-local ties, Independent and Disconnected OMs tended not to comment on working together with other tourism businesses to attract tourists, or to keep tourists in the area, which contrasts with Community-Oriented OMs' responses.

The latter generally felt that their business has some ties that reach beyond the LC, which were largely with other businesses or organisations. For instance, Karl describes
“With the VisitScotland links we’re now establishing [...] that’s the marketing thing [...] but being a small business, we don’t really need to worry about such distance things, other than talking to those guys now and again [...] because the nature of our business [...] we’re not international, the website of course is. It can be found from anywhere. Consequently, we do get visitors from all over the world [...] but we don’t have to be out there, waving a flag. Because the website’s doing that for us. And thank god for the Internet. That’s why we’re in VisitScotland, really...we’re advertising in various different [...] Bed and Breakfast come hotel searching kind of places. Even locally [...] well there’s the Association of Dumfries and Galloway Accommodation providers [...] there’s obviously accommodation systems around. And [...] nationally as well as internationally. I know some people around here [...] advertise on say American websites [...] but I don’t see the point. If you’ve got TripAdvisor [...] global number one searching engine I believe for accommodation. You don’t really need to go any further. And [...] when that penny’s dropped, you then start thinking, well what’s the other number one? Well it’s gonna be VisitScotland for Scotland, and stop worrying and maintaining all the peripheral, satellite kind of search places. Just go with the main one.”

Reflecting their views of the LC and emphasis on contributing to it (see 5.2.2), Community-Oriented OMs tended to emphasise a need to collaborate with tourism businesses in the wider area and pointed out that this would benefit their business in the long-term. As Laura explained:

“[...] [W]e kind of try and help each other in the bigger area as well, ‘cause at least it keeps people in Dumfries and Galloway! [...] but if people come to the
Community-Oriented OMs’ awareness of as well as interest in ties with extra-local businesses contradicts research by Young (2010), who found that while tourism businesses tend to have a strong presence within their LC, their presence outside the community is less prominent. At the same time, these observations lend support to Jóhannesson et al. (2003) who found that tourism businesses actually interact with businesses outside their LC.

The observations presented here indicate that STB OMs differ in their interaction with the LC and actors outside it, which may explain the conflicting findings in the literature. Specifically, contrary to findings from Curran et al. (2001) and Mottiar (2007), Community-Oriented and Independent OMs appear to interact with their local non-business community. Moreover, even though OMs in all three groups tended to feel that their business interacts with the local business community, which is in line with much previous research (see, for example: Chell and Baines, 2000; Costa et al., 2008; Halme and Fadeeva, 2000; Keen, 2004; Kokkranikal and Morrison, 2011; Komppula, 2004; Mottiar and Ryan, 2007; Pavlovich, 2001, 2003, 2004; Tinsley and Lynch, 2008), Disconnected OMs largely described difficult or competitive relations with other tourism businesses, and a lack of interaction with the local business community in general. Interestingly, only Community-Oriented OMs showed an awareness of actors outside the LC and any interest to engage with them, which seems to be driven by their desire to contribute to the LC.
5.3. Discussion

The literature reviewed in Chapter Three revealed a need to explore STB OMs’ views of their business’ LC and its relationship with it, i.e. their stance on SS, to develop an understanding of STBs’ potential to contribute to SS through their relationship with the LC. This chapter addressed the first research objective, which was to devise a new STB typology for exploring STB OMs’ understandings of SS, i.e. their views of their business’ LC and its relationship with it. More specifically, it examined differences in OMs’ understandings, and how they relate to their initial motivations to run the business. Participants’ responses were analysed deductively and inductively to achieve this research objective. The results from the deductive data analysis suggest that STB OMs’ views of their business’ LC and its relationship with it are unrelated to their initial motivations to run the business. The inductive analysis revealed three groups of OMs who differ in their attitude towards SS: Community-Oriented, Independent and Disconnected OMs. While the OMs in these three groups show some commonalities, key differences in their understandings of their business’ relationship with the LC were revealed, which appear to relate to their views of the LC and the meaning they attach to it. Most importantly, the variations in Community-Oriented, Independent and Disconnected OMs’ stance on their business’ LC and its relationship with it were not captured by the lifestyle/profit typology. Indeed, the groups of lifestyle and profit oriented OMs each contained examples of all three inductive OM types. Table 5.2. shows where the deductive and inductive typologies revealed differences between OM types, and demonstrates that the new, inductive typology reveals additional variations between OMs. Differences between the inductive types are detailed in Table 5.3. Following a brief summary of the key differences that emerged between the inductive OM types, this section draws out the key observations from this chapter and relates them to the literature. The possible implications of the research findings for STBs’ contribution to SS are discussed in Chapter Six.
Table 5.2. Summary of the differences revealed by the inductive and deductive typologies. 
*Source: Author.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Themes in the data</th>
<th>Differences identified between <em>inductive</em> OM types: Community-Oriented, Independent, and Disconnected</th>
<th>Differences identified between <em>deductive</em> OM types: lifestyle-oriented and profit-oriented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>The role of the LC in their choice of business location</em></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Attitude towards the LC</em></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Relationship with the LC</em></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ties with the local business and non-business community</em></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ties with extra-local businesses</em></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most OMs had migrated to their current location and lived on the business premises, as a result of which their business’ and personal LC overlapped. The findings revealed differences in STB OMs’ understandings of SS. For Community-Oriented OMs, the relationship between their business and the local business and non-business community, as well as ties with extra-local businesses, seem to be driven by a desire to be part of, interact with and contribute to it (see Table 5.3). This appears to relate to the particularly affectionate attitude these OMs largely showed towards the LC, the sense of trust and belonging they tended to highlight, and that their choice of location was influenced by the appeal of it. Additionally, the results suggest that, while for these OMs the income from the business is important, they may engage in activities that benefit the LC, even if it does not benefit their own business, as long as it gives them a sense of being part of the LC or at least allows them to ‘give back’ and are recognised by the LC for doing so. Community-Oriented OMs appear to share what Besser and Miller (2004) refer to as ‘the belief of a shared destiny’, i.e. the shared fate.
rationale. Specifically, this refers to a belief that the prosperity of businesses is closely entwined with that of their LC: the business will benefit from a prosperous community and vice versa. The findings also indicate that these OMs feel a moral obligation to contribute to their LC and interact with it (Besser and Miller, 2004).

Evident from Table 5.3, this contrasts with Independent OMs, whose interest in interacting with the LC and business community seemed to be predominantly commercial. Similarly, the LC typically played no role in their choice of location, and their affectionate attitude towards the LC appeared to relate to an awareness of how their personal behaviour towards the LC can benefit their business. It seems that for these OMs the economic return and economic benefit from their interaction with the LC presents a key driver in the relationship with it. Indeed, their view of the LC seems to be informed by a strong awareness of how it influences the business financially, and the economic benefits they receive from it. These OMs appear to adhere to the public relations rationale that Besser and Miller (2004) describe, which assumes that business owners’ support for the LC is linked to a belief that it will contribute to their business’ success. While Besser and Miller (2004) observe that small business owners who expressed this belief did not show increased support for the LC, the current research suggests that it influences the nature of the relationship with the LC.

Different still, for Disconnected OMs the LC generally played no role in their choice of location, and they largely expressed a negative attitude towards it, which seemed to relate to the lack of interaction with the local non-business community and the problematic ties with the local business community that these OMs generally described (see Table 5.3). These OMs seem to lack trust in the local business community, feel that the LC does not benefit them financially, and do not desire to be part of it, which indicates that they see no commercial or personal benefit from interacting with it.
Table 5.3. Key differences in Community-Oriented, Independent, and Disconnected owner-managers' understandings of social sustainability.

Source: Author.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key themes in the data</th>
<th>Community-Oriented OM</th>
<th>Independent OM</th>
<th>Disconnected OM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The role of the LC in their choice of business location</td>
<td>The LC influenced their choice of business location.</td>
<td>The LC played no role in their choice of business location.</td>
<td>The LC played no role in their choice of business location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude towards the LC</td>
<td>Particularly affectionate attitude towards the LC.</td>
<td>Positive attitude towards the LC.</td>
<td>Negative attitude towards the LC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with the LC</td>
<td>Express a sense of trust, and a desire to belong, and contribute, to the LC.</td>
<td>Relationship with the LC seems largely commercially driven.</td>
<td>Lack of, or problematic interaction with, the LC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ties with the local business and non-business community</td>
<td>Feel embedded in the local business and non-business community, and emphasise the reciprocity of ties.</td>
<td>Feel embedded in the local business and non-business community, and emphasise the reciprocity of ties.</td>
<td>Feel embedded only in the local business community, and display distrust towards it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ties with extra-local businesses</td>
<td>Emphasise the importance of ties with businesses and organisations outside the LC.</td>
<td>Limited awareness of ties with actors outside the LC.</td>
<td>Limited awareness of ties with actors outside the LC.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

That small business owners differ in their motivations to engage with the LC reflects findings from Besser and Miller (2004), Besser (2012) and Fuller and Tian (2006). Nevertheless, the current research revealed a further group of OMs, the Disconnected ones, who appeared unlikely to interact with the LC, and have a limited personal and commercial interest in it. This indicates that there may be STB OMs who do not interact with their LC.
It is possible that STB OMs’ views are related to their personal characteristics. For instance, Community-Oriented OMs tended to have lived in their location for less than 10 years, and Disconnected and Independent OMs for more than 10. Phillipson et al. (2006) and Bosworth and Willett (2011) suggest that more recent in-migrants, driven by their desire to be accepted, are more inclined to engage with the community. At the same time, this may imply a temporal dimension in STB OMs’ views, which future studies could clarify (see 7.2). Additionally, Community-Oriented OMs’ previous ties to the location or a similar environment may imply an increased awareness among these OMs of the challenges related to running a business in a rural location, which Bosworth and Farrell (2011) find related to the OMs’ integration in the LC. Moreover, Community-Oriented OMs tended to be younger than Independent and Disconnected OMs, which suggests that they may be more active and willing to engage with the LC. In contrast, it was less clear if OMs’ gender or whether they had children in the household influenced their understandings and may present an interesting avenue for future research (see 7.2).

It is also possible that STB OMs’ views relate to local tourism development and rural accessibility, providing further support for Morrison and Teixeira (2004), Morrison et al. (2010) and Thomas et al. (2011), who emphasise the need to consider mediating factors in conceptualisations of STB OMs. The responses indicate that the remoteness of locations may encourage a desire to interact with and be part of the LC, as displayed by Community-Oriented OMs. This reflects research by Atterton (2007), who observes that businesses in remote locations have stronger ties with their LC than businesses in accessible rural locations. Similarly, tourism emerged as a possible mediating force on STBs OMs’ views of the relationship. In particular, the findings lend support to the work by Allen et al. (1993), who observe that in areas where residents’ expectations of tourism-related income are met, or where tourism is viewed as a promising source of income, residents may have a more positive attitude towards the industry than in areas where residents’ expectations of tourism are unfulfilled. It seems that OMs’ views of the relationship were more positive in areas where tourism-related income
was high (DG and EL), than in LLTP where income from tourism is comparatively low (see chapter 4.3). Indeed, this may be exacerbated considering the high influx of tourists to the Park, which results in significant pressures on the natural environment, for comparatively little economic return for local residents. It is possible, therefore, that the cost of tourism, as viewed by local residents, outweigh its benefits, and may lead to unmet expectations in terms of tourism’s economic benefits, and therefore result in negative attitudes towards tourism businesses. This also concurs with Saxena (2006), who notes that high numbers of tourists can impede on the local social fabric. These observations highlight the need to consider local tourism development and the geographic accessibility of STBs’ locations to understand their relationship with their LC.

Additionally, OMs’ views may relate to the diversity of local tourism businesses. Tinsley and Lynch (2008) observe that differentiation between tourism businesses, in terms of their products and services, is conducive to the relationship with the LC, whereas a high occurrence of businesses with a similar offering may be detrimental to it. Community-Oriented and Independent OMs commented on the lack of competition among accommodation providers, and expressed their pleasure of being positioned within a local market niche. In contrast, some Disconnected OMs described competitive ties with local tourism businesses, and expressed their distrust towards them, which may indicate a lack of service or product differentiation among local tourism businesses.

The results of this study indicate that Community-Oriented, Independent and Disconnected OMs differ in their relationship with their business’ LC, which is consistent with the observations in earlier studies pertaining to variations in STB OMs’ interaction with their LC – or lack thereof. Specifically, research has found differences in the density of networks that STB OMs participate in (Lynch, 2000), the quantity and nature of their ties (Chell and Baines, 2000; King et al., 2012; Sweeney and Lynch, 2009), and who they interact with (Curran et al. 2001; King et al., 2012; Mottiar, 2007).
Another important finding was that STB OMs’ views of the relationship between their business and the LC seem to relate to their understanding of the LC and the meaning they attach to it. Indeed, this is in line with findings from Tzschentke et al. (2008), Hallak et al. (2012) and Bosworth and Willett (2011), who observe that STB OMs’ views of their business’ LC relate to their behaviour towards it. Similarly, the results are in agreement with work in the field of lifestyle migration, which has found that migrants’ views and ideas about their destination influence their behaviour in it (Benson and O’Reilly, 2009; Bijker et al., 2013). The results also indicate the intentionality of OMs’ interaction with the LC, beginning with their choice of location, which supports Bosworth and Farrell (2011), who identify a purposive dimension to STB OMs’ integration in the LC. Although Hallak et al. (2012) and Bosworth and Farrell (2011) point out that the local social environment attracts migrant tourism owners to their destination, few, if any, studies have examined the role that the LC plays in STB OMs’ motivations to run the business. However, the observations here suggest that whether or not the LC influences STB OMs’ reasons for choosing their location enhances knowledge of their business’ relationship with its LC, emphasising the need for researchers to distinguish analytically between OMs’ decision to move and their motivations to run the business.

Another finding from this study is that OMs’ attitudes towards the LC appear to relate to who they interact with. Specifically, Community-Oriented and Independent OMs appear to interact with the local business and non-business community, whereas Disconnected OMs seem to interact only with the local business community, the relationship which seemed problematic. The differences in OMs’ views of local ties with the business and non-business community reflect the conflicting findings within the literature pertaining to STBs’ interaction with their LC: while some studies have found that STBs interact with their local non-business community (Bosworth and Farrell, 2011; Keen, 2004; Lynch, 2000; Mottiar and Ryan, 2007; Paniagua, 2002 Pavlovich, 2001; Pavlovich and Kearins, 2004; Saxena et al., 2007), others found a lack of interaction with their local non-business environment (Curran et al., 2001; Mottiar,
2007). Additionally, Community-Oriented OMs appear to interact with the LC as well as with extra-local businesses, which contradicts work by Young (2010), who finds that local and extra-local networks of small businesses usually do not overlap.

Moreover, the findings are in line with research that observes differing motives among small business owners for engaging with the LC. A Study by Fuller and Tian (2006) suggests that STB OMs may be motivated to engage with the LC due to a sense of social responsibility or commercial motives. Studies by Besser and Miller (2004) and Besser (2012) suggest that small business owners may be driven to support the LC by the anticipation of benefits for their business or them personally, or by a sense of moral obligation. The current research findings add to this literature, revealing that differences in STBs’ relationship with the LC appear to relate to their OMs’ views of the LC, and the meaning they ascribe to it. In other words, while previous studies suggest that the relationship is influenced by OMs expectations from the LC, the current research finds that the relationship also relates to the meaning that OMs ascribe to who or what the relationship is with.

This chapter has contributed to filling a gap in knowledge by exploring STB OMs’ views of their business’ LC and its relationship with it. The findings indicate that differences observed in previous studies in STBs’ interaction with their LC relate to their OMs’ views of the LC, and the meaning they attach to it, but not their OMs’ initial motivations to run the business. Notably, this suggests that current conceptualisations of lifestyle and profit oriented STB OMs are unable to reveal nuanced differences in STBs’ relationship with their LC. The observations in this chapter indicate that the threefold typology presented allows for a deeper understanding of STB OMs’ understandings of SS, and captures more nuanced differences between OM types, which may have implications for their relation with their LC. The findings imply that STBs vary in their contribution to local SS and emphasise the need to consider STBs’ relationship with their LC to understand their role in SS. The possible implications that
the findings might have for STBs’ contribution to local SS are discussed in the following chapter.
Chapter Six: Possible implications for small tourism businesses’ potential role in social sustainability

The intention of this research is to explore how small tourism business (STB) owner-managers’ (OM) views of their business’ local community (LC) and its relationship with it contribute to a better understanding of STBs’ potential role in social sustainability (SS). The SS literature suggests that STBs can contribute to SS through their relationship with the LC. Specifically, the potential in STBs’ relationships with their LC, i.e. social capital (SC), can have socioeconomic effects. While many studies have examined STBs’ ties with their LC – some of which indicate that STBs differ in their relationship with it – discussion about STBs’ contribution to SS has been limited. To better understand STBs’ relationship with their LC, and their potential to contribute to SS, the previous chapter addressed a gap in current knowledge relating to STB OMs’ views of their business’ LC, and of its relationship with it, i.e. their understandings of SS. The findings indicate that the nature of STBs’ relationship with the LC relates to their OMs’ understandings of the community, and the meaning they attach to it. A new, inductive typology of STB OMs emerged from the results, which captures nuanced differences in STB OMs’ views and understandings that may have implications for STBs’ contribution to SS. Drawing on these results, this chapter seeks to examine possible implications of STB OMs’ understandings of SS for their role in it. Specifically, the current chapter seeks to answer these research questions: How can STB OMs’ understandings of their business’ LC and its relationship with it enhance knowledge of the potential within STBs’ relationship with the local community?, and, What implications do the research findings have for STBs’ potential to contribute to SS? It considers the main research findings in relation to bonding and bridging SC to discuss possible implications for local social cohesion and local economic development (6.1), and reflects on how the new inductive typology of STB OMs enhances knowledge of
6.1. The potential in small tourism businesses’ relationship with the local community

The results of this research indicate that Community-Oriented, Independent, and Disconnected OMs differ in their access and contribution to local SC, which has consequences for local social cohesion and economic development. Community-Oriented and Independent OMs tended to feel embedded within their local business and non-business community and emphasised the reciprocity of their ties with it. Explicitly, these OMs seemed to be involved in local social institutions and organisations, such as the local school, scout’s groups, and the church, where they participate in and contribute to local cultural and charity events, fundraisers, and community gala days and interact with local businesses, to purchase supplies, recommend activities for visitors, and – through reciprocal referrals – with other accommodation providers (see chapter 5.2). Their ties with the local business and non-business community suggest that Community-Oriented and Independent OMs might be able to access and contribute to local SC. Specifically, it appears that, through their mutual ties with the local business and non-business community, Community-Oriented and Independent OMs have access to resources including information, knowledge and equipment, which are essential for the operation of the firm (Levitte, 2004), and echoes previous studies concerned with tourism networks (Hall, 2004; Kokrannikal and Morrison, 2011; Komppula, 2004; Pavlovich, 2001). Consequently, the access to these social resources is the very embodiment of the SC these two groups have at their disposal, as was defined in chapter 2.3. Indeed, OMs in these two groups suggested that their ties with the LC are conducive to the promotion of their firm, support their day-to-day operations, facilitate acquiring new skills, and generate income through the
referral of tourists (see chapter 5.2). Additionally, Community-Oriented OMs indicated that the relationships with the LC are characterised by trust, which may reduce the costs of doing business (Fukuyama, 1995), and benefit the economic success of their businesses (Svendsen and Sørensen, 2007), hence contributing to the well-being of the business and non-business community.

Community-Oriented and Independent OMs’ reciprocal links with the LC may also promote the development of local cooperation among tourism businesses (Moscardo, 2014) and help local innovation (Saxena, 2006), which are crucial for tourism growth (Komppula, 2004; Komppula, 2014; Kokkranikal and Morrison, 2011). In particular, they can facilitate the flow of information and knowledge about business practices, local suppliers and offerings for tourists (see chapter 5.2). This can improve the tourism product and the visitor experience, and is critical for the competitiveness of tourism destinations (Hall, 2004; Kokkranikal and Morrison, 2011; Mottiar and Ryan, 2007; Pavlovich, 2001). Indeed, this group of OMs suggested that their ties with other local businesses enhance the visitor experience through the provision of gastronomic facilities, for instance, or activities during their stay (see chapter 5.2). As a result, these OMs, in particular, might play a role in supporting and maintaining other local businesses, and even encourage new start-ups. Additionally, Community-Oriented OMs indicated that they engage in local marketing (see chapter 5.2), which may encourage joined-up marketing initiatives and can contribute to the competitive advantage of a tourist destination (Mottiar and Ryan, 2007), as well as regional competitiveness (Hall, 2004).

Independent OMs’ predominantly commercial interest in their LC suggests that their contribution to local economic development may be limited to activities that benefit their business (see chapter 5.2). It follows that, in line with the ‘catalysts’ described by Moscardo (2014), this group of OMs may contribute to tourism development, but their engagement in the LC is restricted to their commercial activities. In contrast, Community-Oriented OMs, in particular, seemed to be driven by a desire to contribute
to and be part of the LC, suggesting that they may have motivations that go beyond the profitability of their business, and which Moscardo (2014) relates to a positive contribution to tourism development in the LC.

In contrast to Community-Oriented and Independent OMs, Disconnected OMs indicated a lack of trust towards the business community, and seem to interact sparsely with the local non-business community (see chapter 5.2), implying that they are unable to benefit from the resources available in the LC, which may impede on their business’ success. Disconnected OMs may also hamper the flow of information in the LC, and therefore, may negatively influence the development of a successful tourism product. In addition, it is possible that their problematic relationship with the LC and the indifferent attitude this OM type tended to show toward their LC (see chapter 5.2) reduces the number of referrals they receive from it, which may further hamper their business’ success. Indeed, previous studies have observed that a symbiotic relationship between tourism businesses and their LC and the OMs’ integration in it are key to their business’ success (Besser and Miller, 2004; Hallak et al., 2012). Disconnected OMs’ negative attitude toward the LC may also impede on tourists’ impressions of the destination, and may discourage visitors to spend in and much less to return to the LC. Equally, their limited access to ‘insider knowledge’ hampers their ability to recommend activities to tourists and their role as ‘ambassadors’ of the destination (Szilvia, 2000), which may negatively influence the visitor experience. Moreover, it implies that the multiplier effect that tourism is often associated with is reduced, as Disconnected OMs are less likely to refer tourists to local businesses. In comparison, Community-Oriented, and Independent OMs may enhance the visitor experience, and attract visitors and new residents to the area who contribute to the survival of local infrastructure, shops, and businesses, which is arguably especially important in rural areas where local facilities have seen a decline (DETR, 2000).
The results also indicate that Community-Oriented and Independent OMs present a positive influence on local social cohesion by fostering norms of generalised reciprocity, and facilitating cooperation and social interaction in their local business and non-business community (Putnam, 1995; Woolcock and Narayan, 2000). Relationships characterised by norms of reciprocity discourage opportunistic behaviour (Putnam, 1995), suggesting that, in order to avoid social sanctions, these OMs are likely to demonstrate behaviour that is in the interest of the LC, or at least not detrimental to it. Furthermore, participating in or hosting events for the LC encourages interactions between OMs and the LC and the development of intra-community relationships (Arcodia and Whitford, 2006) – possibly across different social groups within the LC, therefore promoting local bonding and bridging SC, as well as social cohesion.

Moreover, Community-Oriented OMs showed awareness of and a desire to adhere to local social norms of trust, familiarity and safety. These OMs seem to draw on personal relationships in the LC for friendship, emotional support, help with childcare or shopping for groceries. These ties and interactions are manifestations of social cohesion, and about “getting on at the more mundane level of everyday life” (Forrest and Kearns, 2001:2127; Kearns and Forrest, 2000). This is further evidence that Community-Oriented and Independent OMs facilitate social interaction, contribute to a sense of community, and foster local social norms which is conducive to local social cohesion (Forrest and Kearns, 2001; Putnam, 1995). In particular, while common social norms reduce social conflict (Forrest and Kearns, 2001), a sense of community encourages social interaction and participation, positively influences individual’s satisfaction with their location, and is fundamental to social cohesion (Chavis and Wandersman, 1990; Forrest and Kearns, 2001). By contrast, Disconnected OMs might contribute to the erosion of trust and familiarity, and reduction of social interaction through their lack of interest in the local non-business community, and their problematic relationship with the local business community (Besser, 2009; Forrest and Kearns, 2001). Moreover, their lack of integration in the LC implies that they are less
aware of, and hence less likely to adhere to, local social norms, which may result in behaviour that further impedes on the OMs’ relationship with it. These observations suggest that Disconnected STB OMs might hamper local bonding SC and, therefore, social cohesion.

However, the results also hint at the contradictory nature of SC, and the potentially negative implications it may have. Notably it seems that Community-Oriented OMs might contribute to social exclusion in the LC by promoting values and norms particular to a specific social grouping within it, thereby encouraging ‘exclusive identities’ and homogeneity (Putnam, 2000). Reflecting their desire to be part of the LC, these OMs – themselves in-migrants – emphasised their efforts to ‘give back’, and highlighted their distinctiveness from in-migrants who “sit on their butts and do nothing but moan” (Carla). This indicates that Community-Oriented OMs might increase the barriers that new in-migrants face to integrate into the LC (Crow and Allan, 1994), which may hamper interactions or even cause conflict between different social groups, and be detrimental to local social cohesion (Forrest and Kearns, 2001; Kawachi and Berkman, 2000). Indeed, too much bonding SC can contribute to the pursuit of “narrow sectarian interests” and may impact the individual personal liberties of people within the group (Woolcock and Narayan, 2000:230). This observation highlights the potential dangers of the “unmitigated celebration of community, trust, and group cohesion in the social capital literature” recently criticised by Portes (2014:18408). In comparison, Independent OMs’ limited personal involvement in the LC might encourage inclusiveness. As Holly pointed out, “we’re completely neutral [...] you don't get involved in people's [issues]”, which implies that these OMs play a role in overcoming social divides within the LC, thereby contributing to local bridging SC, and promoting social cohesion. As a result, Independent and Community-Oriented OMs may present complementary forces: while the latter seem to add to cohesion particularly among residents who share their values regarding their engagement with the LC, the former may counter divides between social groups in the LC.
It is worth mentioning that Community-Oriented and Independent OMs’ integration in the LC allows them to participate and contribute to local stocks of SC (Bosworth and Willet, 2011). Furthermore, local levels of bonding SC influence how knowledge and information gained through bridging SC are absorbed and acted upon within a tourism destination (Haugland et al. 2011; Putnam, 2000), stressing the importance of Community-Oriented and Independent OMs’ contribution to local bonding SC. Bridging ties provide access to new economic opportunities (Atterton, 2007), and facilitate the exchange of knowledge and information with actors located in another destination. Additionally, they can contribute to innovation within the destination as well as the dissemination of good practice (Haugland et al. 2011; see also: Granovetter, 1985; Moscardo, 2014).

Interestingly, it emerged in this research that Community-Oriented OMs, who appeared to be most likely to contribute to a ‘lock-in’ effect through their strong ties with the LC (Uzzi, 1997), also seemed most aware of and motivated to engage with, actors outside the LC. This suggests that Community-Oriented OMs might contribute to tourism growth through their ties with the non-local business community, thereby encouraging innovation and the dissemination of good practice. Moreover, considering their integration in the local business and non-business community, Community-Oriented OMs may serve as important connectors between local and extra-local networks. This finding also suggests that Community-Oriented OMs may counteract the potential over-embeddedness that high stocks of bonding SC may cause – which indeed they may contribute to – and which may hamper economic development (Atterton, 2007; Uzzi, 1997). Indeed, as Portes (2014) points out, there is the possibility of ‘excessive in-group trust’, which results in uncritical and overly confident behaviour with potentially negative social and economic consequences. It follows that Community-Oriented OMs may present a conduit for new information and knowledge through their external ties, which may challenge conventional knowledge and assumptions within the group. This suggests that Community-Oriented OMs may contribute to the necessary balance of bonding and bridging SC that Woolcock (1998)
emphasises. The author (Woolcock, 1998) suggests that close ties with high levels of in-group trust might result in social norms that discourage members within the group to pursue external economic opportunities, which may be detrimental to business success. Specifically, bonding SC can prevent access to communities and social or professional groups, and too much of it might result in economic or non-economic claims from community members that inhibit economic development (Atterton, 2007; Woolcock, 1998).

The findings discussed here indicate that the differences in Community-Oriented, Independent, and Disconnected OMs’ understandings of SS revealed in the previous chapter relate to variations in their contribution to local SS. Specifically, while Community-Oriented and Independent OMs may be conducive to social cohesion and economic development by adding to local bonding and bridging SC, they differ in their influence on it. Disconnected OMs, on the other hand, may present a threat to local social cohesion and economic development by negatively influencing bonding SC. Drawing on the discussion in this chapter so far, as well as the findings regarding lifestyle and profit oriented OMs’ understandings of SS (see chapter 5.2), the next section will reflect on how the results from this study enhance understanding of STBs’ contribution to local SS.

### 6.2. Enhancing understanding of small tourism business’ contribution to local social sustainability

The results discussed in this chapter imply that differences in STB OMs’ understandings of their business’ LC and the meaning they attach to it relate to variations in their business’ contribution to local bonding and bridging SC and hence their influence on social cohesion and economic development. This emphasises the need for conceptualising STBs in relation to their LC to understand the potential economic
impact they might have on local SS. This indeed echoes observations by Bosworth and Farrell (2011:1491), who emphasise the role that tourism business owners’ relationships play for economic development, arguing that “[m]oving away from a single-minded view of profit-driven entrepreneurship brings the important features of networks, community and embeddedness more centrally into our understanding of a tourism entrepreneur.”

Additionally, the findings highlight the need for a more nuanced approach to OMs’ motivations to move to a particular location, and to consider the influence of the LC on their choice of location, to understand their influence on local SC. Previous work by Bosworth and Farrell (2011) finds that tourism owners who moved to their location with the intention of supporting the LC played a role in optimising bonding and bridging SC. In turn, those who were attracted by an area’s image as a lifestyle destination and were motivated by “notions of the rural idyll, but not necessarily the needs, expertise and requirements of the local economy”, were less likely to integrate and thus also less likely to contribute to SC (Bosworth and Farrell, 2011:205). The results from the current study suggest that among OMs who were motivated to move to a particular area by the desire for a particular lifestyle, those OMs who considered the LC in their choice of location, i.e. Community-Oriented OMs, may play a key role in the development of SC; whereas OMs for whom the LC played no part, i.e. Disconnected OMs, may hamper local SC. This highlights the need for approaches that consider OMs’ views of their LC to understand their potential role in local SC development.

It was noted that the potential within STBs’ relationship with the LC and its benefit to it seem unrelated to the length of time that the OM has lived in the LC: Community-Oriented OMs recorded the shortest lengths of residency (see chapter 5.3), yet appear to have the closest relationship with the LC. This is broadly similar to findings by Hallak et al. (2012), who discovered that tourism business owners’ support toward the LC is unrelated to the length of time they have spent in the LC. Similarly, Moscardo (2014)
finds that the effect tourism entrepreneurs have on tourism development is unrelated to their length of residency, or whether they are incomers or locals, but instead relates the entrepreneurs’ place attachment. The findings also reveal the possibility of a temporal dimension to OMs’ views and understandings, and that, as a result, OMs may fall into any of the three OM categories at different points in time. In particular, Community-Oriented OMs’ marked personal interest in the LC may diminish over time, potentially resulting in attitudes observed among Disconnected OMs. This finding highlights the need to also consider OMs’ personal relationship with the LC to understand their business’ potential to contribute to local SC.

The observations indicate that current conceptualisations of STBs based on their OMs’ motivations to run the business are unsuited for examining their relationship with their LC and their impact on local SS. In particular, it emerged from the previous chapter that the inductive typology of Community-Oriented, Independent, and Disconnected STB OMs reveals nuances in STB OMs’ understandings of SS, which the dichotomous typology of lifestyle and profit oriented STB OMs is unable to capture. The discussion in this chapter suggests that the variations in Community-Oriented, Independent, and Disconnected STB OMs’ understandings of SS have implications for their contribution to local SS. Notably, the nuance in STBs’ possible influence on local social cohesion and economic development is concealed by the typology of lifestyle and profit oriented STB OMs. The key implications for local social cohesion and economic development that emerged from the discussion in this chapter, and the related research results concealed by the lifestyle/profit typology, are summarised in Table 6.1. In particular, Community-Oriented OMs may – due to their marked personal interest in the LC and their desire to be part of and contribute to it – on the one hand, contribute to social cohesion in the LC, and, on the other, promote social divisions within it. The personal interest in LC that this group of OMs showed, and their desire to be an active part of it were obscured by the twofold typology. Similarly, Table 6.1 reveals that the twofold typology fails to demonstrate the emphasis that Community-Oriented and Independent STB OMs placed on the reciprocity of their ties with the local business.
and non-business community, which can encourage economic development and foster intra-community cohesion.

Table 6.1. Differences concealed by the lifestyle/profit typology regarding small tourism businesses’ potential contribution to local social cohesion and economic development.

*Source:* Author.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible implications for local social cohesion and economic development revealed by the inductive typology of STB OMs</th>
<th>Relevant results concealed by the typology of lifestyle and profit oriented OMs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community-Oriented and Independent STB OMs may contribute to local economic development through their reciprocal ties with the local business and non-business community</td>
<td>Reciprocity of ties concealed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-Oriented STB OMs may contribute to local economic development and intra-community cohesion, as they maintain extra-local ties with businesses, and are integrated into the local business and non-business community</td>
<td>Extra-local ties found only among lifestyle oriented OMs who are not embedded in the local non-business community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-Oriented STB OMs’ personal interest in the LC, and their desire to be part of and contribute to it, may simultaneously hamper and encourage local social cohesion.</td>
<td>Personal interest in LC, and desire to be part of and contribute to it were obscured.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disconnected STB OMs’ negative attitude toward their LC, lack of integration in the local non-business community, and their problematic relationship with the local business community may be detrimental to local economic development and social cohesion.</td>
<td>Negative attitude toward the LC and problematic relationship with the local business community were concealed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Equally, the twofold typology conceals Community-Oriented OMs’ possible contribution to local bonding and bridging SC. Specifically, the results (see chapter 5.1) showed that, while lifestyle oriented OMs describe ties with businesses outside the LC, they seem integrated only into the local business community (see Table 6.1.). However, unless the OM establishes a relationship with the local non-business community, any resources that may lie within their extra-local tie are unreachable to the non-commercial part of the community (Bosworth and Willet, 2011; Haugland et al. 2011). This implies that lifestyle-oriented OMs are unlikely to contribute to local bridging SC through their ties with extra-local actors. Profit-oriented OMs, on the other hand, showed limited awareness of extra-local ties. As a result, the twofold typology fails to capture Community-Oriented OMs’ potential role as ‘connectors’ between the LC – where they seem to be embedded within the local business and non-business community – and extra-local business networks. This suggests that, due to their local integration, Community-Oriented OMs enable the LC to access extra-local economic opportunities. The SC literature indicates that bridging SC, in particular, is key for economic development, implying that Community-Oriented OMs may play a major role in local economic development – a role which is obfuscated by the dual typology of lifestyle and profit oriented OMs. It is also evident from Table 6.1. that this typology conceals the potentially damaging influence that Disconnected OMs’ limited interest in the LC, their problematic relationship with the local business community, and the lack of interaction with the local non-business community might have on local social cohesion and economic development. Specifically, the negative attitude and the problematic relationship with the local business community were hidden in lifestyle and profit oriented STB OMs’ accounts.

These observations show that the lifestyle/profit typology hides a group of STBs that may play an especially important role in local SS for rural communities, Community-Oriented OMs and another group, which may be detrimental to local SS: Disconnected OMs. Significantly, OMs in these two groups were typically motivated to run their business by a desire to pursue a particular lifestyle (see chapter 5.2), further
emphasising the unsuitability of the lifestyle/profit typology as an analytical tool to explore STBs’ contribution to local SS. This observation confirms findings from previous research, which suggest that STB owners motivated by lifestyle reasons to run their business hamper local economic development (Bosworth and Willet, 2011), are skewed by the authors’ conceptualisations of STBs.

The lifestyle/profit typology also appears to conceal variations in the geographical preferences among OMs, which may have further implications for local SS. In particular, it was observed that Community-Oriented OMs seemed to be located mainly in DG, while Independent OMs were found largely in EL, and Disconnected OMs in LLTNP. Indeed, this finding concurs with previous studies that observed differences in STB OMs’ preferences for particular locations (Getz and Carlsen, 2000; King et al., 2012; Shaw and Williams, 2004). While the current research was exploratory in nature and, hence, no claims are made about the generalisability of the findings or the representativeness of the population frame, the possibility of geographical variations among STB types seems important. It implies that STBs may present a negative or positive self-perpetuating force on local SS. In locations where Community-Oriented and Independent OMs prevail, STBs may play an important role in developing local bonding SC by encouraging the flow of knowledge and information, social interaction, cooperation, and a sense of community. Additionally, as a result of their ability to access local SC, STBs in these locations may be particularly successful economically (albeit not necessarily being growth-oriented) and therefore sustainable. Moreover, locations that attract Community-Oriented STBs could notice strong interactions with extra-local actors, which may enhance economic development. At the same time, however, the potential of Community-Oriented OMs to foster exclusive identities, which encourage social divisions, must be considered. On the other hand, locations that attract predominantly Disconnected OMs, may find that STBs hamper local bonding SC by obstructing the flow of information and knowledge and the development of tourism business networks, and fostering social conflict. STBs in these locations may also impede on the tourist experience, and be less successful financially,
thus presenting a negative influence on local economic development and social cohesion.

The findings discussed in this section suggest that the inductive typology of Community-Oriented, Independent and Disconnected OMs reveals key differences in STB OMs’ potential contribution to local SS. Moreover, they imply that the new typology presents a more useful analytical tool for exploring STBs’ relationship with their LC and their contribution to local SS than the lifestyle/profit typology or, for that matter, any other typology that conceptualises STBs based exclusively on their OMs’ motivations to run the business and in isolation from their business’ LC. The next section concludes this chapter by drawing out the key points emerging from it.

6.3. Chapter Summary and Conclusion

The current chapter sought to address a research gap revealed in Chapter Three regarding STBs’ contribution to SS. It examined particularly the possible implications of STB OMs’ different understandings of SS for local social cohesion, and economic development. Additionally, it reflected on how the new inductive typology introduced in Chapter Five enhances knowledge of STBs’ contribution to local SS. In doing so, this chapter has demonstrated the value of the inductive typology presented in Chapter Five, as an analytical tool to examine STBs’ relationships with their LC and contribution to local SS.

The findings suggest that STBs differ in their influence on local social cohesion and economic development, which relates to their OMs’ ability to tap into as well as generate local SC. The observations also imply that STBs play different roles in local SS. Community-Oriented OMs’ marked personal interest in the LC, drive to participate in it and desire to ‘give back’, may be particularly conducive to social cohesion, but at the
same time promote social divisions within the LC. The simultaneously negative and positive influence that their strong ties with the LC, i.e. bonding SC, might have for local social cohesion mirror the seminal works on SC by Putnam, Woolcock, Portes and others. Additionally, Community-Oriented OMs’ strong ties with the LC may play a key role in local economic development. Specifically, the findings suggest that this group of OMs may add to social bridging capital by facilitating intra-community ties and relationships with extra-local businesses, which, due to these OMs’ local integration, allow the LC to access external economic opportunities. Notably, Community-Oriented OMs emerged as the only group with the potential to encourage interaction with extra-local actors.

Independent OMs’ may also foster social cohesion and economic development by promoting social interaction, contributing to a sense of community, and promoting reciprocal ties within the LC. However, their predominantly commercial interest in the LC suggests that their contribution may be restricted to activities that they understand as being beneficial for their business. Nevertheless, their commercial orientation implies that they may be particularly aware of opportunities for enhancing the local tourism product, indicating that these OMs may, in particular, contribute to the competitiveness of tourism destinations.

In contrast to Community-Oriented and Independent OMs, Disconnected OMs seem to present a negative force on local social cohesion and economic development. It notably appears that their lack of interaction with the local non-business community, and their problematic relationship with the local business community, might erode familiarity, trust, and reciprocity, and obstruct social interaction and the flow of information and knowledge, which may be detrimental to primarily local bonding SC.

This chapter also revealed that the prominent lifestyle/profit typology of STB OMs conceals key differences in STBs’ potential influence on local social cohesion and economic development, as it fails to reveal the nuance in OMs’ access and contribution
to local SC. Moreover, the observations indicate that the twofold typology might obfuscate spatial differences between STBs, and hence in their roles in SS. Since small businesses tend to dominate in the tourism industry (Middleton and Clarke, 2001), this observation may have more far-reaching implications for tourism’s role in SS (see 7.2).

This chapter has highlighted the importance of STB OMs’ relationship with their business’ LC for the understanding of STBs’ role in SS, and more specifically, their impact on local social cohesion and economic development. This echoes work from Morrison et al. (2010), Skokic and Morrison (2011) and Tzschentke et al. (2008), who observe that STB OMs’ views and beliefs influence their business’ behaviour (see chapter 2.1). The chapter has also revealed that current conceptualisations of lifestyle and profit oriented STB OMs are unable to capture the different roles that STBs might play in local SS. Moreover, the discussion suggests that other STB typologies based on their OMs’ motivations to run the business are unable to reveal nuances in STBs’ relationship with their LC and their potential impact on it. In contrast, the findings indicate that STBs’ relationship with their LC may help to explain contradictory findings regarding STBs’ role in RS observed in previous studies. The Author will reflect on this further in the concluding chapter of this thesis.

By revealing that STBs differ in their utilisation of as well as potential to generate SC in their LC, this chapter has contributed to the nascent literature on tourism and SC (McGehee et al., 2009; Moscardo, 2012; Shaky, 2016). In particular, the findings discussed here emphasise the need to consider differences in STB OMs’ views of their business’ LC and the meaning they attach to it, to understand their role in SC development. Previous research has argued that, while in-migrants in rural areas present valuable sources of SC due to their extensive networks as well as their higher levels of education and professional experience, their contribution to it is related to their OMs’ level of local integration (Bosworth and Farrell, 2011). The findings from this research imply that STB OMs’ integration in their business’ LC, and hence their
contribution to local SC, is related to their views of and the meaning they attach to the LC.

While this research characterises the potential impact of STBs on SS as mainly positive, it has also revealed that differences between STB OMs’ personal relationship with the LC and the business’ locations must be acknowledged. Additionally, the results of this study highlight the need to distinguish between different types of in-migrants. While some may introduce “dynamism, broad networks and experience” (Atterton, 2007:242), others might inhibit local economic development and social cohesion due to a lack of local integration and overall interest in the LC. The observations further indicate that, while networks in rural – especially remote – areas may be stronger and possibly more insular than in urban areas (Atterton, 2007), actors within those networks are likely to differ in their roles in it, and their relationship with the LC. In other words, not all actors in rural areas necessarily participate in and much less contribute to a dense social network.

In arguing that differences in STBs’ relationship with their LC relate to their OMs’ views of the LC and the meaning they attach to it, this chapter implies that a new way of understanding STBs is required. Rather than conceptualising them in relation to their OMs’ motivations to run the business, OMs’ personal relationship with the LC becomes central to understanding their business’ relationship with the community as well as its impact on it. In turn, continuing to conceptualise STBs in isolation from their LC may lead to false assumptions about their role in SS. This would further contribute to the ‘myths’ surrounding STBs (Morrison et al., 2010), instead of exposing them. To examine how the current research and the findings discussed here enhance understanding of STBs’ role in RS, the next chapter reflects on the research objectives and questions that this thesis set out to address.
Chapter Seven: Conclusions

The aim of this research was to explore small tourism business (STB) owner-managers’ (OM) views of their business’ local community (LC) and its relationship with it to develop a better understanding of STBs’ potential role in social sustainability (SS). Reflecting the explorative nature of this research, it was guided by an interpretive-constructionist methodology with the aim to give voice to the STB OM, allowing the researcher to view them in a new angle, and to reveal possible shortcomings of current conceptualisations of them. The researcher conducted semi-structured interviews with 26 OMs of small accommodation businesses located across 19 rural villages and towns in three areas in Scotland: Dumfries and Galloway (DG), East Lothian (EL), and Loch Lomond and the Trossachs National Park (LLTNP). Participants’ responses were analysed deductively and inductively, presenting a novel approach in the field of STB research.

The purpose of this chapter is to reflect on the extent to which the research aim and objectives were achieved. In particular, it presents the key research findings (7.1), identifies research limitations and outlines recommendations for future research (7.2). The chapter concludes with possible implications for policy (7.3).
7.1. Research findings and contributions to knowledge

The current research sought to develop an understanding of STBs’ potential to contribute to SS through their relationship with the LC, by exploring OMs’ views of their business’ LC and its relationship with it, i.e. their understandings of SS. STBs play an increasingly critical role in rural economies (see chapter 1.1). To date, however, there has been little agreement on how these firms might contribute to sustainable rural development. Research findings regarding STBs’ influence on environmental sustainability, in particular, are conflicting (see chapter 1.1), and their role in social sustainability has hitherto received scant attention (see chapter 3.4). SS, however, plays a central role in sustainable rural development. Specifically, relationships between actors are fundamental to achieving sustainable rural development (see chapter 3.1), and were identified as a key theme in the SS literature (see chapter 3.2). The literature suggests that STBs can contribute to SS through their relationship with their LC. While previous research indicates that OMs’ understandings of SS are critical for understanding the STB-community relationship (see chapters 2.1 and 3.4), they have attracted very little attention from the scholarly community. To address this research gap, the following two research objectives and questions were identified. The first research objective was to examine possible implications of STB OMs’ views of their business’ local community and its relationship with it for their role in SS. From this objective, two corresponding research questions emerged: How can STB OMs’ understandings of their business’ local community and its relationship with it enhance knowledge of the potential within STBs’ relationship with the local community?, and, What implications do the research findings have for STBs’ potential to contribute to SS?

To achieve this objective, an analytical device was required for examining STBs’ potential to contribute to SS through their relationship with the LC. Typically, STBs are conceptualised based on their OMs’ motivations to run the business (see chapter 2.2), and usually categorised into lifestyle and profit oriented OMs (see chapter 2.3). While several studies have found an association between OMs’ motivations to run the
business and STB behaviour, there is a notable paucity of empirical research focussing specifically on how OMs’ motivations relate to their views of their business’ LC and its relationship with it. It follows that current conceptualisations of STBs may be unsuited for examining STBs’ relationship with the LC, and possible differences between them. From these observations, a further research objective and two research questions emerged. The second research objective was to devise a typology for examining STBs’ relationship with their LC. This revealed two research questions, which were: How do STB OMs differ in their understandings of their business’ LC and its relationship with it?, and, How do STB OMs’ views of their business’ local community relate to their initial motivations for running the business?

To achieve these research objectives, semi-structured interviews were conducted with 26 OMs of small serviced accommodation businesses located in 19 rural villages and towns across DG, EL, and LLTP. The research was underpinned by an interpretive-constructionist research paradigm to reveal assumptions about OMs, and challenge current conceptualisations of them. The qualitative data were analysed inductively and deductively, which presents an innovative approach in STB studies. Whereas Chapter Five explored the results of the analyses of OMs’ understandings of their business’ LC and its relationship with it, the possible implications of the research findings for STBs’ potential role in SS were discussed in Chapter Six.

This section considers how the main research findings may contribute to knowledge, and reflects on the extent to which the research aim was achieved.
7.1.1. Reflecting on the research aim

The aim of this research was to explore how STB OMs’ views of their business’ LC and its relationship with it, i.e. their understanding of SS, can contribute to developing an understanding of STBs’ potential role in SS. This research has offered a framework for the exploration of STB OMs’ understandings of SS, and for examining the STB-community relationship. The findings presented in this section contribute in several ways to developing an understanding of STBs’ role in SS. Specifically, the research revealed possible differences in STBs’ potential to contribute to SS. It emerged that differences in STBs’ relationship with the LC and the potential within it seem to relate to their OMs’ views of their business’ LC and their personal relationship with it. It was also revealed that STBs’ contribution might vary spatially. An inductive typology emerged from this research, which provides a suitable tool for examining STBs’ relationship with their LC as it reveals further nuances in STB OMs’ views and understandings, which current conceptualisations of lifestyle and profit oriented STB OMs are unable to capture. Moreover, the typology is useful for examining STBs’ potential role in SS as it reveals qualitative and geographical differences between them.

7.1.2. An alternative inductive typology of small tourism business owner-managers

While much research has examined STBs’ ties with their LC, there has been limited discussion about STB OMs’ views of the LC, and how they might relate to differences in STBs’ relationship with the LC (see chapter 3.4). The findings from the current research address this gap in understanding.

The research revealed three inductive STB OM types who differed in their views of their business’ LC, and their business’ relationship with it: Community-Oriented, Independent and Disconnected STB OMs (see chapter 5.2). For Community-Oriented
OMs, the LC generally influenced their choice of business location. This seemed reflected in the affectionate attitude and sense of trust these OMs tended to show towards their LC, as well as their emphasis on being part of the LC, and somehow ‘giving back’ to it. Similarly, their interaction with the local business and non-business community, and extra-local actors seemed driven largely by personal – as opposed to commercial – interest, in particular their desire to contribute to the LC. Additionally, these OMs emphasised the reciprocity of their ties with the local business and non-business community.

In comparison, the LC generally played no role in Independent OMs’ choice of location. In line with this, although these OMs generally showed a positive attitude towards their business’ LC and appeared to view it as important for their business, they tended not to express that it played a role for them personally. Likewise, their interaction with the local business and non-business community seemed to largely serve a commercial, as opposed to personal, purpose. While this group also highlighted the reciprocal nature of their ties with the local business and non-business community, they showed limited awareness of ties with actors outside the LC.

The LC also played no role in Disconnected OMs’ choice of location. In contrast to Independent OMs, however, this group largely showed a negative attitude towards the LC, and no personal or commercial interest in it. Indeed, they tended to describe a problematic relationship with the LC, generally indicated a lack of trust towards the local business community and seemed to lack ties with the local non-business community. Similar to Independent OMs, these OMs seemed to interact sparsely with the local non-business community and extra-local actors.

This new inductive threefold typology addresses a need for typologies that conceptualise STBs in relation to their LC (see chapter 2.3). Notably, differences between each OM type regarding their views of the LC and their personal relationship with it appeared to relate to their understanding of their business’ relationship with
the LC. In other words, how STB OMs think about their business’ LC seemed to relate to how they behave towards it. This coherence in OMs’ views reflects theories in economic sociology that consider economic behaviour as closely interrelated with social relations (see, for example, Granovetter, 1985, 2005; Krippner, 2001; Krippner et al., 2004; Polanyi, 1944). It also echoes previous work by STB researchers who observe that OMs’ views and beliefs influence their business’ behaviour (Morrison et al., 2010; Skokic and Morrison, 2011; Tzschentke et al., 2008).

The findings lend further support to the argument developed in Chapter Two that the binary categorisation of lifestyle and profit oriented STB OMs – popular among STB scholars – may be unsuited for examining STBs’ relationship with their LC (see chapter 2.3). In particular, the results have shown that the inductive typology revealed additional, critical differences in OMs’ understandings of SS to those that emerged from the deductive analysis of lifestyle and profit oriented OMs’ views. This finding indicates that STB OMs’ views of their business’ LC and its relationship with it are unrelated to their initial motivations to run the business (see chapter 5.1).

Moreover, it was observed that, while OMs’ motivations to run their business and their desire to move to a particular location are often interrelated, they are nevertheless distinct dimensions of OMs’ motivations to run an STB. For researchers seeking to understand STBs’ interaction with their LC, this emphasises the need to differentiate analytically between OMs’ initial reasons for running their business and choosing their business’ location, to be able to explore OMs’ views of their business’ LC, and to understand the STB-community relationship.

The finding that STB OMs’ views of their business’ LC relate to their understanding of their business’ relationship with it highlights the fact that OMs’ views and understandings are critical for understanding STBs’ relationship with their LC. In contrast to previous studies, which indicate that OMs’ motivations to run the business may relate to STB behaviour (Dewhurst and Thomas, 2003; Goulding, 2006; Goulding
et al., 2005; King et al., 2012; Lynch, 1998; Morrison and Teixeira, 2004; Paniagua, 2002; Shaw and Williams, 2004), this research suggests that OMs’ motivations to run the business are unrelated to the business’ relationship with the LC. Similarly, the finding that the inductive typology revealed more differences in OMs’ understandings of SS than the lifestyle/profit typology highlights the need for STB scholars to consider the suitability of different typologies for their particular research, and to critically examine how conceptualisations of STBs might influence their research findings.

The relation between STB OMs’ views and differences in their business’ relationship with their LC revealed in this research emphasises the need for STB researchers to acknowledge the multiplicity of STB OMs’ realities and to explore the meaning that STB OMs attach to their business’ LC, in order to enhance knowledge of their business’ interaction with it. Additionally, the findings highlight the value of qualitative small business research (Shaw, 1999) and of the combination of inductive and deductive analyses to reveal taken-for-granted assumptions, and to challenge potential ‘myths’ about STBs (Morrison et al., 2010).

7.1.3. Small tourism businesses’ potential role in social sustainability

STB scholars have typically focussed on STBs’ contribution to environmental sustainability, resulting in calls for more research into their contribution to the social dimension of sustainability (Thomas et al., 2011). As Chapter Three argued, SS is considered a pre-requisite for economic and environmental sustainability (see chapter 3.2). Although the literature suggests that STBs can contribute to SS through their relationship with the LC, few, if any studies have considered their ties with the LC in relation to SS (see chapter 3.4). This research contributes to developing an understanding of STBs’ role in SS. In particular, the research findings suggest that there are qualitative and geographical differences in STBs’ potential to contribute to social capital (SC), and hence, SS. While Community-oriented OMs may contribute to SS in their LC and the wider area by generating local bonding social capital (SC) and extra-
local bridging SC, Independent OMs may contribute to SS in their LC by generating local bonding and local bridging SC (see chapter 6.1). Disconnected OMs, on the other hand, may be associated with low levels of SS.

The findings suggest that STB types and hence their potential impact on SS may vary spatially (see chapter 6.1). Each OM type seemed to be predominantly located in a particular area: Community-Oriented OMs where more likely to settle in DG, Independent OMs seemed to prefer EL, while Disconnected OMs where mainly to be found in LLTNP. As STBs tend to dominate numerically in tourism destinations (Battisti et al., 2013; Irvine and Anderson, 2004; Middleton and Clarke, 2001), these findings suggest that tourism’s impact on SS might vary spatially, which has implications for tourism’s role in SS. More specifically, it is possible that tourism presents a positive force on SS in areas where Community-oriented and Independent OMs predominate, whereas in locations that attract Disconnected OMs tourism may negatively influence SS. This emphasises the need for STB scholars to understand STBs’ relationship with their LC and their role in SS within their particular geographic contexts.

Notably, the inductive typology revealed variations in addition to those that emerged from the deductive analysis of lifestyle and profit oriented OMs’ views, regarding STBs’ potential access and contribution to SC, the nature and scope of their potential contribution to SS (local or wider area), and the possible spatial variation of it. Specifically, the dichotomous categorisation of lifestyle and profit oriented STB OMs was unable to capture OMs’ potential to contribute to local bonding SC through their reciprocal relationships with the LC, their strong personal interest in the LC, affectionate attitude towards it, and desire to actively participate in it. It was likewise unable to show OMs’ potential role in generating extra-local social bridging capital through their relationships with extra-local businesses and their LC, and local bridging SC through their relationships with actors in different social groups in their LC. Furthermore, the twofold typology could not capture OMs’ potentially damaging influence on SS through a problematic relationship with and even a negative attitude...
towards it. This indicates that the inductive threefold typology presented in this thesis constitutes a more suitable tool for examining STBs’ potential to contribute to SS through their relationship with their LC, as it reveals nuances in the STB-community relationship that the lifestyle/profit typology was unable to capture.

The possible qualitative and geographical differences in STBs’ potential to contribute to SS outlined here emphasise the need for researchers to examine OMs’ understandings of their business’ LC to enhance knowledge of their role in SS. Moreover, these differences stress the need for STB scholars to be aware of potential differences between STBs regarding their contribution to social bonding and bridging capital in the LC and the wider area. While Morrison et al. (2010:739) call on STB scholars to mitigate “context myopia”, the current research findings highlight the need for STB researchers to be aware of ‘owner-manager myopia’ to understand STBs’ role in SS.

As most participants had migrated to their location, these observations also add to current understanding of in-migrants’ and lifestyle migrants’ potential contribution to rural development. In particular, they highlight the need to distinguish carefully between different groups of migrants, and to consider their views of the LC to understand their potential to contribute to local development.

7.2. Research limitations and recommendations for future research

Limitations emerge from this research regarding its scope, population frame, generalisability of the research findings and method, which shall be outlined here. The notion of social sustainability informed the theoretical framework of this research to explore STB OMs’ understandings of their business’ local community and its relationship with it. While several possible implications emerge from the research
findings for STBs’ contribution to SS (see chapter 6.3), it was beyond the scope of this research to examine how STB OMs contribute directly to SS in the study areas. A valuable avenue for future research would, therefore, be to examine how each OM type influences SS in the LC and the wider area. The current study discussed the possible implications that the differences in STB OMs’ understandings of SS might have for STBs’ potential to contribute to SC. Future research could examine the consequences of the research findings for other SS dimensions.

The typology presented in this thesis could inform the design of comparative STB research with national and international dimensions, in urban and rural contexts, and across different sub-sectors in tourism. This would allow researchers to examine how STB OM types vary across different sectoral and geographical contexts, and whether STB OM types predominate in specific geographical locations, as the results presented here suggest. If the geographic variation of STB OM types can be confirmed, this may have significant implications for SS, as the research findings indicate that STBs’ role in SS might differ (see chapter 6.3). In this case, OMs’ reasons for choosing their location and their decision-making process merit further attention to understand why specific OM types might be attracted to particular areas, so as to be able to manage tourism’s influence on SS.

Regarding the generalisability of the research findings, a limitation of the research lies in the fact that research participants were recruited from 19 rural villages and towns in three regions of Scotland. It follows that the results of research are not representative of STB OMs in different rural locations in Scotland, or even other countries. Likewise, the researcher makes no claim about the applicability of the findings to urban areas. Additionally, the research participants were recruited from the accommodation sector. It follows that the research findings may not apply to STBs in other tourism sub-sectors, such as visitor attractions, or tour operators. Similarly, as the population frame included only small tourism businesses (see chapter 4.5), no claims can be made about the applicability of the research findings to larger businesses, i.e. those that employ
more than 49 staff. Conversely, many participants employ less than 10 staff for their STB, as a result of which the findings may be applicable to micro tourism firms. Following on from this, it is recommended that further research be carried out to compare STBs and micro sized tourism businesses.

None of the OMs who participated in this study was born and raised in their business’ LC, which reflects the findings of other studies (Shaw and Williams, 2004; Williams and Hall, 2000; Williams et al., 1989). Indeed, it is possible that OMs who run an STB in the community that they were born in, have different understandings of SS. It might very well be that – unlike OMs interviewed for the current research – their motivations to run the business are related to the LC. Further work needs to be done to explore the views of this group of STB OMs.

Due to these limitations, participants’ views explored in this research regarding their business’ LC cannot be taken to be representative of STB OMs across Scotland. It is indeed possible that further research reveals additional groups or a different subcategorisation of OMs based on their views of their business’ LC and its relationship with it. However, this research did not set out to survey all STB OMs in Scotland, but rather to explore in detail the views and beliefs of a small number of OMs to reveal the complexity of their views and differences between them.

The researcher conducted only one interview with each participant. It follows that the data gathered presented a snapshot of STB OMs’ views and beliefs. Therefore, it would be interesting to examine how OMs’ views change over time. Moreover, employing the OM as the unit of analysis presented difficulties and is a limitation of this research. While in most cases the OM comprised one individual, in a couple of occasions both spouses considered themselves as the OM, a phenomenon which Getz and Carlsen (2005) referred to as ‘copreneur’. In these cases, both participated in the interview, as a result of which OMs’ views were presented by multiple individuals. This reveals another limitation of the research, as it is possible that other members of the
household and individuals involved in the running of the STB influence the views of the participants, and hence the business’ relationship with the LC. Future research could consider the STB as the unit of analysis to explore the views of additional household members and individuals involved in running the business, and how they relate to the STBs’ relationship with the LC.

On reflection, a further limitation of this research lies in the limited collection of demographic data for this study. While gender and household situation did not emerge as possible influences on OMs’ views and understandings, future research may want to explore how other demographic characteristics – for example OMs’ level of education, or their financial resources – relate to differences in STB OMs’ views of their business’ LC and the meaning they attach to it.

It would furthermore be interesting to explore how differences in STB OMs’ views and understandings relate to individually different sets of values. Personal values can influence STB OMs’ behaviour, attitudes and views (see e.g. Aertsens et al., 2009; Fukukawa et al., 2007; Rokeach, 1973; Schultz, 2005; Schwartz, 2008), implying that the study of values may be able to provide further insight into the differences between Community-Oriented, Independent and Disconnected STB OMs. It would be particularly interesting to examine where STB OM types are located along value continuums, such as that by Schwartz (Schwartz et al. 2012) or Rokeach (1973). For instance, it is possible that Community-Oriented STB OMs emphasise values that have a social focus, while a personal focus might drive Independent and Disconnected OMs. Examining the values of these OM types may further enhance understanding of their relationship with their LC.

Semi-structured interviews were used in this research as the method for data collection. While they allowed the researcher to access STB OMs’ perceived realities by exploring their views and understandings, they may not reflect their day-to-day activities. As a result, it is impossible to assume that OMs’ views of their business’
relationship with the LC reflect their interaction with it. Nevertheless, as revealed by previous research, STB OMs’ views and beliefs influence their behaviour (Morrison et al., 2010; Skokic and Morrison, 2011; Tzschentke et al., 2008), and interpreting the meaning that individuals attach to objects, subjects and actions can help explain social phenomena (King and Horrocks, 2010). It follows that the current research regarding STB OMs’ attitudes towards their business’ local community contributes to understanding the STB-community relationship.

It is expected that the new inductive typology of STB OMs provides a useful analytical tool for researchers to examine STBs’ relationship with their LC. Research into tourism networks, clusters and destination branding would, therefore, benefit from considering OMs’ views of their business’ LC and examining differences between STBs, to understand the different roles that STBs might play. Likewise, research concerned with STBs’ support towards the LC would benefit from exploring differences between OMs’ understandings to reveal the complexity of STBs’ ties and relationships. In turn, a lack of attention to the differences between OMs (see e.g. Mottiar, 2015), or disregarding OMs’ views and understandings of their business’ relationship with the LC (see e.g. Hallak et al. 2013), may lead to false assumptions about STBs and their interaction with the LC.

7.3. Policy implications

The Scottish Government identified collaboration between rural tourism businesses as a sub-measure for increasing collaboration in rural areas (The Scottish Government, 2014). Similarly, Scotland’s current tourism strategy has “collaboration at its heart”, to achieve “long-term, economic sustainability” (The Scottish Tourism Alliance, 2012:18). Applying SS to the study of STBs has revealed that STBs may differ in their collaboration with other tourism businesses, which has several ramifications for policy.
In particular, it emphasises the need to consider the differences in STB OMs’ views and understandings in the design of policy instruments. For instance, Community-Oriented OMs may respond particularly well to initiatives that are framed in terms of benefits for the LC, as these OMs seemed to be driven to engage with the LC mainly by a personal interest in it, and a desire to contribute to it. Independent OMs, on the other hand, may be receptive to initiatives that are framed in terms of the benefits for their business. In contrast, Disconnected OMs may not respond to initiatives aimed at increasing collaboration, due to their apparent lack of commercial and personal interest in the LC. Instead, it may be valuable to target this particular group with initiatives aimed at enhancing their understanding of how the success of their business relates to and depends on other actors in the LC, and how the wellbeing of the LC may be conducive to their business’ economic success. Increased awareness of their business’ and LC’s interdependence may increase their interest in collaborating with other businesses, and hence their responsiveness to relevant policy initiatives.

The findings may also have ramifications for efforts to engage STBs in tourism partnerships between the public and private sector, which Thomas (2007) observes as being problematic. In particular, he argues that the dominant orientation towards competitiveness within policy has thwarted efforts to involve STBs in tourism partnerships, as OMs of these businesses are generally not driven by profit-maximising motives to run their business. Indeed, this research suggests that only Independent STB OMs were driven by the anticipation of commercial benefits for their business to engage with the LC. The research findings show that STBs differ in their relationship with their LC and their interest to engage with it, and suggest that the success of policy initiatives seeking to encourage STB participation in partnerships can be enhanced by considering differences in STB OMs’ views and understandings.

The findings imply further that initiatives aimed at increasing collaboration between STBs may vary geographically in their success. If the spatial variation of STB OM types is confirmed through future research (see 7.2), this would highlight the usefulness of
regional policies that are tailored according to the dominant STB type in an area. At the same time, this reveals possible implications for the sustainability of tourism destinations and reveals a need for policymakers to understand which type of STB OM is attracted to what location. Disconnected STB OM s, for instance, were largely located in LLTN P. The research findings suggest that these OM s may present a self-perpetuating negative force on local SC, with implications for local social cohesion and economic development (see chapter 6.1), which may hamper local SS in LLTN P.

The research findings may have implications for policy’s orientation towards competitiveness, which is also criticised by Thomas (2007). The focus on competitiveness is evident in the new tourism strategy for DG, for example, which explicitly prioritises growth-orientated tourism businesses (Dumfries and Galloway Council, 2016:4). However, this research has shown that Community-Oriented STB OM s, who tended to predominate in DG and were generally not motivated to grow their business, may play a vital role in DG’s rural economy through their relationship with the LC and ties with actors outside it (see chapter 6.1). As a result of the focus on growth-related tourism businesses in DG’s tourism strategy, however, Community-Oriented OM s’ potential to contribute to economic development in DG may remain untapped, and highlights the dangers of conceptualising STBs exclusively based on their OM s’ profit orientation. Instead, the current research indicates that recognising the differences between STBs’ relationship with their LC, and the potential within it reveals further opportunities for STBs to contribute to the growth of their local economies. Rather than funding initiatives to support OM s to grow their business regarding turnover, employees and service offering, policy that aims to encourage positive interaction between STB OM s and their local communities and OM s’ integration in it might be more effective at increasing STBs’ contribution to tourism growth.

It is anticipated that employing the inductive typology of Community-Oriented, Independent and Disconnected STB OM s to identify what types of STB OM s prevail in
which locations can increase the success of policy initiatives aimed at encouraging collaboration between STBs in rural Scotland outlined in the Scottish Rural Development Programme (The Scottish Government, 2014), promote their participation in tourism partnerships, and support holistic tourism strategies that acknowledge and utilise STBs’ potential to contribute to a more sustainable form of tourism.
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Appendix
### A1. Nvivo coding frame

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corresponding IV question</th>
<th>1st level theme (main node)</th>
<th>2nd level theme (child node)</th>
<th>3rd level theme (child node)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motivations to run the business</td>
<td>About the business</td>
<td>OMs' feelings towards the business</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Business features</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Day-to-day running of the business</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Business as a solution to personal circumstances</td>
<td>Business as a solution to personal circumstances following a life event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lifestyle requirements</td>
<td>Work-related lifestyle requirements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The business location</td>
<td></td>
<td>A purposive choice of business location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>For personal reasons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Based on commercial considerations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corresponding IV question</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; level theme (main node)</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; level theme (child node)</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; level theme (child node)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The business location as a result of personal circumstances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The attractiveness of the local environment played a role in the choice of business location.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The local community played a role in the choice of business location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The local natural environment influenced the choice of business location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously lived in or had personal ties to a similar, rural environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The business’ local community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The people in the community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The local infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services and facilities available in the community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An affectionate attitude toward the community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohesion in the community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corresponding IV question</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; level theme (main node)</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; level theme (child node)</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; level theme (child node)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of cohesion</td>
<td>Interaction between the OM and community</td>
<td>Knowing people in the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Engaging with the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supporting each other in the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Feeling part of the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interaction in the community</td>
<td>Events and activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How the local community makes the OM feel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The relationship between the business and the community</td>
<td>Characterised by cohesion</td>
<td>Feeling part of the community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supporting each other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Engaging with the community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The community generates income for the business</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corresponding IV question</td>
<td>1st level theme (main node)</td>
<td>2nd level theme (child node)</td>
<td>3rd level theme (child node)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The community’s role for the business</td>
<td>The community plays a role for the business</td>
<td>The community generates income for the business</td>
<td>The community uses the business’ facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The community plays no role for the business</td>
<td>The community influences the tourist experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ties between the business and the local community</td>
<td>Ties with the business community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>With other tourism businesses</td>
<td>Ties are reciprocal</td>
<td>Ties generate income for other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corresponding IV question</th>
<th>1st level theme (main node)</th>
<th>2nd level theme (child node)</th>
<th>3rd level theme (child node)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>businesses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ties with the non-business community</td>
<td>The OM engages with the community</td>
<td>The OM contributes to the community</td>
<td>The community uses the business' facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There are no ties between the business and the community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra-local ties</td>
<td>Extra-local ties with businesses</td>
<td>Generate income for their business</td>
<td>Generate income for other businesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extra-local ties with tourists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No ties with actors outside the local community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social sustainability</td>
<td>Is about sustaining a community</td>
<td>Is about continuity</td>
<td>Economic factors influence social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Corresponding IV question</strong></td>
<td><strong>1st level theme (main node)</strong></td>
<td><strong>2nd level theme (child node)</strong></td>
<td><strong>3rd level theme (child node)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sustainability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure is key for social sustainability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People are key for social sustainability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The business’ contribution to social sustainability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The interaction between people is important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It brings people in to the local community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It provides services and facilities to the community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A2. Interview excerpt Karl

Karl, Community-Oriented OM, 50s, owner-manages a B&B with his wife in Waitby, DG. They moved to their location less than 10 years ago.

A: And the, how would you describe your local community Q7 #00:14:41-8#

K: well obviously it's the people of the town. I mean, thankfully again, and another reason why we chose it, [town], IS a county town. It isn't a sort of administrative seat anymore. But its' a small place. And everyone, knows everybody else. And eh, we take comfort from that. Because, we can take a walk up to the local coop, and it's only a 2, 3, minute walk, and eh, you probably stop 6 times. You know, and once you get into the Coop, or the Postoffice, everyone knows you, and has a quick chat, it takes ages, you know. Just go and get a loaf and some milk, and and hour later you're back thinking 'I met so and so, so and so, so and so'! And that's what community brings. It's that closeness and familiarity. I think you lose that in the bigger cities, don't you? Where everyone shuts down in their own little space, and ehm, tries to ignore the outside world. Cause they're busy getting on with their bit. And, and they appreciate other folks that are busy getting on with their bit. whereas here it's more relaxed and folks have got time to stop, and pass the time of day with you. Even if it's only commenting on the rain and the clouds and the, the lack of sunshine the wind keeps blowing, how cold it is, the weather is number 1 of course! #00:15:48-2#

A: but that's everywhere!! (laughing) #00:15:51-5#

K: yeah, but here it's slightly different. As we said before your turned the little device on that, ehm, it's a micro climate here, that's another reason why we chose the place. Between the coast and sea, and mountains, the sea brings in moist air, takes it away again, you know we've, we're open to the east coast here, but the west coast isn't that far away. So we get, sandwiched in the middle. And it, somehow creates different temperature and air here. and of course the gulf-stream comes into there. Hence all the botanical gardens are around this region. We did have palm trees in the front, you won't have seen them cause they're not there anymore. Thanks to the, not this last
winter, but the 2 before being so cold. It took out 1000s of palm trees around the whole region. There're hardly any left.

A: aww, yes

K: which is unusual, they were old, really old palm trees, but, they have now succumbed to, the changes, but they were there because, it's generally mild here. Even when you see the satellite photographs of Britain buried under snow. You see the little point sticking out green! (laughing) Just a, it's unusual!

A: yes

K: and wonderful for it. And community adds another layer to that. If you know everybody. And if they a-, not appreciate what you do, but respect what you do, they see you work hard. And we've transformed this place from a run down, ignored, unloved place, into what it is. So many folk just pass by and say the same thing. I don't think they would do that in a big city, or a big town. They wouldn't, they'd perhaps notice, maybe, but to then go one step further and comment, that you done well, you've transformed, you know wish you luck, that doesn't happen I don't think outside the rural community. So that's answered 2 questions, hasn't it!?

A: (laughing) and ehm how would you describe the relationship between the business and the local community? Q8

K:well we work for the community in that we bring people here. Who then go out to the community and spend money. And help, will therefore help in the local economy, helping them to keep jobs. Ehm, which perhaps wouldn't be served if weren't here providing our 4 rooms. That's 4 rooms less, that's 8 people less, to go out and about and see their visitor attractions, to spend money in the giftshops, or the art shops. And that's therefore, a little bit less. It's only a fraction, but it all adds up, doesn't it? All these little fractions! So that helps the community we obviously contribute to the community by getting involved in charity things or supporting various community projects, and ehm, we ourselves shop in the community. AND, the community use us by putting people here. we're here for the business and we do get taken over by a local
company that eh, use us for a week for business meetings and staff training.

A: right

P: ehm, they couldn't do that anywhere else in the town, so we're providing that facility. And of course we do get neighbours, and people from just the farms and houses around. Because they're very small, the traditional old, if you like, Gaelic kind of crofters' cottages, when the relatives do come, they can't, they haven't got a spare room, so..we're providing them a spare room. For their relatives or friends that come to see them. So that's a way of helping the community to..I mean obviously it's a, to our benefit, but it's a 2 way benefit. And I think that's the best way in the community. You give and you take.
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## A5. Owner-manager characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OM</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Initial motivation to run the business</th>
<th>Reasons for choosing their business' location</th>
<th>Live on business premises</th>
<th>Length of time residing at location</th>
<th>Household situation</th>
<th>Member of local organisation(s)/associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>Lifestyle</td>
<td>Moved to the location to run the business. The attractiveness of the local community and the local natural environment influenced their choice of location. Had personal ties to the location before moving.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0-10 years</td>
<td>Lives on the business premises with her husband and daughter, who goes to the school in the village</td>
<td>Helps out with the local scouts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>Lifestyle</td>
<td>Moved to the location to run the business. The attractiveness of the local community and the local natural environment influenced their choice of location. Had previous ties to the area as he ran a Hotel in a nearby town.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0-10 years</td>
<td>Lives with partner on the business premises. Has no children</td>
<td>Yes, member of a local tourism group, whose members exchange information and pass on customers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OM</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Age group</td>
<td>Initial motivation s to run the business</td>
<td>Reasons for choosing their business’ location</td>
<td>Live on business premises</td>
<td>Length of time residing at location</td>
<td>Household situation</td>
<td>Member of local organisation s/associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abigail</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>Lifestyle</td>
<td>Moved to the location to run the business. The attractiveness of the local community and the local natural environment influenced their choice of location. Had personal ties to the location before moving.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0-10 years</td>
<td>Lives with husband and children, who go to the local primary school, and to the secondary school in a neighbouring town</td>
<td>Yes, member of a local tourism group, whose members exchange information and pass on customers;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carla</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>Lifestyle</td>
<td>Moved to the location to run the business. The attractiveness of the local environment as a reason for choosing the location, in particular the local community and the local natural environment. Grew up in a rural environment.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0-10 years</td>
<td>Lives with husband on the business premises. Children are grown-up and do not live locally</td>
<td>Husband is a first responder, she sits on the local community association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Age Group</td>
<td>Initial motivations to run the business</td>
<td>Reasons for choosing their business' location</td>
<td>Live on business premises</td>
<td>Length of time residing at location</td>
<td>Household situation</td>
<td>Member of local organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karl</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>Lifestyle</td>
<td>Moved to the location to run the business. The attractiveness of the local environment as a reason for choosing the location, in particular the local community. Had holidayed in the area with her children.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0-10 years</td>
<td>Lives with wife on business premises. Children are grown-up and do not live locally</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam &amp; Greta</td>
<td>Husband and Wife</td>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>Lifestyle</td>
<td>Moved to the location without any intention of running a small tourism business. The attractiveness of the local community and the local natural environment influenced their choice of location. Had no previous ties to the area.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>&gt;30 years</td>
<td>Lives with wife, children are grown-up and do not live locally</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>Lifestyle</td>
<td>The local natural environment and the local community did not influence their choice of location. Had no previous ties to the area.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21-30 years</td>
<td>Lives with partner, children grown up and do not live locally</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OM</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Age group</td>
<td>Initial motivation s to run the business</td>
<td>Reasons for choosing their business' location</td>
<td>Live on business premises</td>
<td>Length of time residing at location</td>
<td>Household situation</td>
<td>Member of local organisation s/associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>Profit</td>
<td>The local natural environment and the local community did not influence their choice of location. Moved to the location without any intention of running a small tourism business. Had personal ties to the location.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21-30 years</td>
<td>Lives with wife on business premises. Children are grown-up and do not live locally</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franci s</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>Profit</td>
<td>The attractiveness of the local natural environment and the local community as a reason for choosing the location. Moved to the location to run the business. Lived in a nearby town before.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0-10 years</td>
<td>Lives with husband on business premises. Children live locally</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emm a</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>Lifestyle</td>
<td>Moved to the location without any intention of running a small tourism business. The local natural environment and the local community did not influence their choice of location. Had personal ties to the location.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21-30 years</td>
<td>Lives with husband on business premises. Son does not live in the area.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OM</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Age group</td>
<td>Initial motivation s to run the business</td>
<td>Reasons for choosing their business’ location</td>
<td>Live on business premises</td>
<td>Length of time residing at location</td>
<td>Household situation</td>
<td>Member of local organisation s/associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James &amp; Donn a</td>
<td>Husband and Wife</td>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>Lifestyle</td>
<td>Moved to the location to run the business. The local natural environment and the local community did not influence their choice of location. Had no previous ties to the area.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0-10 years</td>
<td>Lives with husband on business premises. Children are grown-up and do not live in the area.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>Lifestyle</td>
<td>Moved to the location without any intention of running a small tourism business. The attractiveness of the local community and the local natural environment influenced their choice of location. Used to holiday in the area.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11-20 years</td>
<td>Lives with husband on business premises. Children are grown-up and do not live in the area.</td>
<td>Member of the community council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OM</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Age group</td>
<td>Initial motivation to run the business</td>
<td>Reasons for choosing their business’ location</td>
<td>Live on business premises</td>
<td>Length of time residing at location</td>
<td>Household situation</td>
<td>Member of local organisations/associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>Lifestyle</td>
<td>Moved to the location to run the business. The attractiveness of the local community and the local natural environment influenced their choice of location. Had no previous ties to the area.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0-10 years</td>
<td>Lives with wife on business premises. Has no children.</td>
<td>Part of the fire service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leigh</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>75-84</td>
<td>Lifestyle</td>
<td>Moved to the location without any intention of running a small tourism business. The local natural environment and the local community did not influence their choice of location. Had no previous ties to the area.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>&gt;30 years</td>
<td>Lives with husband on business premises. Children grown up and do not live in the area.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawn</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>Profit</td>
<td>Moved to the location to run the business. The attractiveness of the local community and the local natural environment influenced their choice of location. Had no previous ties to the area.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11-20 years</td>
<td>Lives with husband on business premises. Had no children.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OM</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Age group</td>
<td>Initial motivation(s) to run the business</td>
<td>Reasons for choosing their business' location</td>
<td>Live on business premises</td>
<td>Length of time residing at location</td>
<td>Household situation</td>
<td>Member of local organisation(s)/associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>Profit</td>
<td>Moved to the location without any intention of running a small tourism business. The local natural environment and the local community did not influence their choice of location. Had personal ties to the location.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>11-20 years</td>
<td>Lives with husband and children in a house in the same village, and children go to the school in the village.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick &amp; Helen</td>
<td>Husband and Wife</td>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>Lifestyle</td>
<td>Moved to the location without any intention of running a small tourism business. The attractiveness of the local community and the local natural environment influenced their choice of location. Used to live in a rural environment.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>&gt;30 years</td>
<td>Lives with husband on business premises Children are grown-up and do not live in the area.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OM</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Age group</td>
<td>Initial motivation to run the business</td>
<td>Reasons for choosing their business’ location</td>
<td>Live on business premises</td>
<td>Length of time residing at location</td>
<td>Household situation</td>
<td>Member of local organisations/associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gemma</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>Lifestyle</td>
<td>Moved to the location to run the business. The local natural environment and the local community did not influence their choice of location. Had personal ties to the location.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11-20 years</td>
<td>Lives alone on the business premises. Children are grown up and do not live in the area.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>Lifestyle</td>
<td>Moved to the location to run the business. The attractiveness of the local community influenced their choice of location. Had no previous ties to the area.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0-10 years</td>
<td>Lives with parents and son on the business premises, and son goes to school in the village</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>Profit</td>
<td>Moved to the location to run the business. The local natural environment and the local community did not influence their choice of location. Had no previous ties to the area.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0-10 years</td>
<td>Lives with wife and children in a house in the village, and children go to the local school.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OM</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Age group</td>
<td>Initial motivation to run the business</td>
<td>Reasons for choosing their business’ location</td>
<td>Live on business premises</td>
<td>Length of time residing at location</td>
<td>Household situation</td>
<td>Member of local organisation/s/associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>Profit</td>
<td>Moved to the location without any intention of running a small tourism business. The local natural environment and the local community did not influence their choice of location. Had no previous ties to the area.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>does not live there</td>
<td>Lives with husband and children in a nearby city</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holly</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>Profit</td>
<td>Moved to the location without any intention of running a small tourism business. The local natural environment and the local community did not influence their choice of location. Had no previous ties to the area.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>does not live there</td>
<td>Lives with husband and children in a nearby city</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>Profit</td>
<td>Moved to the location to run the business. The attractiveness of the local community and the local natural environment influenced their choice of location. Had no previous ties to the area.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0-10 years</td>
<td>Lives with wife and children on the business premises.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OM</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Age group</td>
<td>Initial motivation(s) to run the business</td>
<td>Reasons for choosing their business' location</td>
<td>Live on business premises</td>
<td>Length of time residing at location</td>
<td>Household situation</td>
<td>Member of local organisation(s)/associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>Lifestyle</td>
<td>Moved to the location without any intention of running a small tourism business. The attractiveness of the local community and the local natural environment influenced their choice of location. Had no previous ties to the area.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21-30 years</td>
<td>Lives with partner, ex-wife and children live in the village.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katie</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>Profit</td>
<td>Moved to the location without any intention of running a small tourism business. The local natural environment and the local community did not influence their choice of location. Had no previous ties to the area.</td>
<td>No, live in a village nearby</td>
<td>21-30 years</td>
<td>Lives with partner and son in a nearby village, and one of her sons goes to the school in the village</td>
<td>Yes, part of local traders association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan &amp; Laurenn</td>
<td>Husband and wife</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>Lifestyle</td>
<td>Moved to the location to run the business. The attractiveness of the local community influenced their choice of location. Had personal ties to the area.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0-10 years</td>
<td>Lives with wife on the business premises. Has no children.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## A6. Business characteristics and locations

Legend: ↓=low; ↑= high; ↓↑ = mixed. Sources: See Table 4.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OM pseudonym</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Village Pseudonym</th>
<th>Economic circumstances</th>
<th>Tourism development: tourist influx</th>
<th>Tourism development: visitor spend</th>
<th>Rural accessibility</th>
<th>Business type</th>
<th>Provide public facilities as part of their business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>DG</td>
<td>Garrigill</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>Remote rural</td>
<td>Guest House</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>DG</td>
<td>Catterlen</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>Remote rural</td>
<td>B&amp;B</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abigail</td>
<td>DG</td>
<td>Rampside</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>Remote rural</td>
<td>Guest House</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carla</td>
<td>DG</td>
<td>Patterdale</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>Remote rural</td>
<td>B&amp;B</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karl</td>
<td>DG</td>
<td>Waitby</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>Remote rural</td>
<td>B&amp;B</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam &amp; Greta</td>
<td>EL</td>
<td>Grasmere</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>Accessible rural</td>
<td>B&amp;B</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally</td>
<td>EL</td>
<td>Abbeytown</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>Accessible rural</td>
<td>B&amp;B</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim</td>
<td>EL</td>
<td>Briery</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>Accessible rural</td>
<td>B&amp;B</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Legend: ↓=low; ↑= high; ↓↑ = mixed. Sources: See Table 4.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OM pseudonym</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Village Pseudonym</th>
<th>Economic circumstances</th>
<th>Tourism development: tourist influx</th>
<th>Tourism development: visitor spend</th>
<th>Rural accessibility</th>
<th>Business type</th>
<th>Provide public facilities as part of their business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Francis</td>
<td>EL</td>
<td>Murton</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>Accessible rural</td>
<td>B&amp;B</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emma</td>
<td>EL</td>
<td>Cartmel</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>Accessible rural</td>
<td>B&amp;B</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James &amp; Donna</td>
<td>LLTNP</td>
<td>Allerby</td>
<td>↓↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>Accessible rural</td>
<td>B&amp;B</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy</td>
<td>LLTNP</td>
<td>Allerby</td>
<td>↓↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>Accessible rural</td>
<td>B&amp;B</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>LLTNP</td>
<td>Allerby</td>
<td>↓↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>Accessible rural</td>
<td>B&amp;B</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leigh</td>
<td>LLTNP</td>
<td>Tebay</td>
<td>↓↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>Accessible rural</td>
<td>B&amp;B</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawn</td>
<td>LLTNP</td>
<td>Tebay</td>
<td>↓↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>Accessible rural</td>
<td>B&amp;B</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Legend: ↓=low; ↑= high; ↓↑ = mixed. Sources: See Table 4.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OM pseudonym</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Village Pseudonym</th>
<th>Economic circumstances</th>
<th>Tourism development: tourist influx</th>
<th>Tourism development: visitor spend</th>
<th>Rural accessibility</th>
<th>Business type</th>
<th>Provide public facilities as part of their business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alice</td>
<td>LLTNP</td>
<td>Dearham</td>
<td>↓↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>Accessible rural</td>
<td>Bunkhouse</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick &amp; Helen</td>
<td>LLTNP</td>
<td>Dearham</td>
<td>↓↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>Accessible rural</td>
<td>B&amp;B</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gemma</td>
<td>LLTNP</td>
<td>Dearham</td>
<td>↓↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>Accessible rural</td>
<td>B&amp;B</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna</td>
<td>DG</td>
<td>Talkin</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>Remote rural</td>
<td>Hotel with pub</td>
<td>Yes, a pub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>DG</td>
<td>Barbon</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>Remote rural</td>
<td>Inn</td>
<td>Yes, a pub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole</td>
<td>EL</td>
<td>Abbeytown</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>Accessible rural</td>
<td>Inn</td>
<td>Yes, a pub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holly</td>
<td>EL</td>
<td>Edenhall</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>Accessible rural</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>Yes, a pub and a restaurant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Legend: ↓=low; ↑= high; ↓↑ = mixed. Sources: See Table 4.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OM pseudonym</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Village Pseudonym</th>
<th>Economic circumstances</th>
<th>Tourism development: tourist influx</th>
<th>Tourism development: visitor spend</th>
<th>Rural accessibility</th>
<th>Business type</th>
<th>Provide public facilities as part of their business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jefferey</td>
<td>EL</td>
<td>Abbeytown</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>Accessible rural</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>Yes, a pub and a restaurant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>LLTNP</td>
<td>Aikton</td>
<td>↓↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>Accessible rural</td>
<td>Inn</td>
<td>Yes, a pub and a restaurant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katie</td>
<td>LLTNP</td>
<td>Grizedale</td>
<td>↓↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>Accessible rural</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>Yes, a pub and a restaurant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan &amp; Lauren</td>
<td>DG</td>
<td>Greenrow</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>Remote rural</td>
<td>B&amp;B with astronomy centre</td>
<td>Yes, an astronomy centre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>