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Abstract

Ethical entrepreneurship and by extension wider best practice are noble goals for the future of tourism. However, questions arise which concepts, such as values motivations, actions and challenges underpin these goals. This thesis seeks to answer these questions and in so doing develop an applied ethics analysis for best practice entrepreneurs in tourism. The research is situated in sustainable tourism, which is ethically very complex and has thus far been dominated by the economic, social and environmental triple bottom line thinking. This research takes a different approach by applying a value-behavioural lens to best practice entrepreneurship. In so doing, the focus shifts from impacts and consequences towards those values and actions that determine best practice entrepreneurship.

The originality of the research is grounded in a two-pronged research strategy, combining archival research and methods from Personal Construct Theory through the process of iteration. Both strategies are currently underused in tourism research. This constitutes an important methodological contribution. Furthermore, a unique set of archival data in the form of Tourism for Tomorrow Awards applications and judges' reports enhances the originality of the findings. Archival data was complemented by semi-structured interviews with so-called ethical tourism entrepreneurs. A mix of source and method triangulation has added significant rigour to this research.

The key findings are that best practice in tourism is ethically very complex, which suggests a form of ethical pragmatism. Second, a dissonance exists between
motivations for best practice, which are value-pluralistic, and ethical judgement making, which is more principle-based. Third, a further dissonance was identified between admittance/awareness and action for issues of misrepresentation, whereas no dissonance was found for relationship or distribution dilemmas. This thesis has combined three strands of research: business ethics, entrepreneurship and sustainable tourism. This original approach lays ground for change towards a more ethically-bound entrepreneurial practice in tourism.
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1 INTRODUCTION

The winners of this year’s Tourism for Tomorrow Awards come from hundreds of unique applicants. This year’s winners show that embracing sustainable tourism principles and practices is a full time responsibility to both current and future generations of this finite and fragile planet that we all share.

(Christ 2014, online)

1.1 BACKGROUND AND AIMS OF THE RESEARCH

Each year the Tourism for Tomorrow Awards recognise outstanding businesses and individuals for being high achievers in sustainable tourism and awarded them for their ethical and responsible business conduct. After years of working in the sphere of sustainable tourism awards, I now embark on the theoretical and empirical work of understanding what it is that makes some people aspire to do ‘good’ in business over and above pursuing a healthy bottom line. By analysing examples of best practice in sustainable tourism and by talking to supposedly ethical tourism entrepreneurs (i.e. those recognised by their peers for ethical business conduct), this thesis aims to discover what actually constitutes ‘good’ in business. More specifically, values and types of behaviour for sustainable in tourism are investigated; the nature of ethical entrepreneurship in sustainable tourism is unpacked; and best practice in sustainable tourism is conceptualised from an ethical perspective. In this thesis, sustainable tourism acts as a proxy for studying ethics as will be further explained in Section 1.2.2 of this introductory chapter.
The actors in this research context are tourism entrepreneurs. As tourism is a largely fragmented industry driven by small and medium-sized enterprises (Miller 2001), entrepreneurs take on a crucial role in shaping the tourism system and in setting benchmarks for what constitutes ‘good’ or ethical business conduct. Establishing the nature of ‘good’ or best practice is thus a fundamental objective of this research. The theoretical foundation of this thesis is informed by literature on business ethics, sustainable tourism and entrepreneurship – specifically entrepreneurial role behaviour. In so doing, this thesis interweaves these three strands of research and contributes to filling the gap at this juncture of academic literature (Figure 1.1).

FIGURE 1.1: Position of this research in academic literature

Source: present author
Sustainability is seen as the key goal for business ethics (Crane and Matten 2010). However, as will be shown in due course, sustainability and sustainable tourism are ethically complex phenomena. As such, the significance of this research lies in unravelling the ethical complexity of sustainability in tourism by means of studying best practice cases. Gaining an understanding of the different ethical dimensions of best practice and ethical entrepreneurship has the potential to improve sustainability and business ethics management. Furthermore, this research significantly advances best practice research by supplying a definition for best practice and thus improving the basis for future best practice research. Finally, the timeliness for developing an entrepreneurial practice framework that is better and more conducive to societal and environmental wellbeing also strengthens the significance of this research. Whilst the susceptibility of tourism to ethical dilemmas has been widely acknowledged and researched, the focus of much literature is on impacts and consequences. This research aims to shift this focus away from ends by looking at means – values and patterns of behaviour – for sustainable tourism.

The rigour within this qualitative study is established by employing methods that strengthen the five key dimensions for rigour in qualitative research, namely accountability, confirmability, credibility, dependability and transferability (see Lincoln and Guba 1985 and Phillimore and Goodson 2004 for further analysis of these five dimensions). The range of methods includes an iterative coding process, an audit trail, source and method triangulations and applying a data usefulness test for secondary data among others. These add rigour and root the findings deep within the thesis’s research framework and existing literature. The next section will outline this thesis’s research aims and objectives in more detail.
1.2 **RESEARCH AIMS AND OBJECTIVES**

This thesis is built on an iterative approach towards theory building and pursues two key aims for research. These are outlined as follows:

**Research aim 1:**

*The first aim of this research is to develop an ethical framework for best practice in tourism.*

From this overarching aim three key objectives are derived: first, a definition for the term ‘best practice’ in sustainable tourism is sought by utilising method and source triangulation. This definition constitutes the nature of best practice from a meta-ethical perspective. Second, a value-behavioural lens is put upon values, motivations and types of behaviour for best practice in tourism. Normative and descriptive ethics are analysed here for the purpose of the overall ethical framework. Third, ethics theory is applied to gain a better understanding of the ethical grounding of best practices in sustainable tourism. In order to achieve research aim one a number of research questions need to be addressed. These are:

- What is the nature of best practice?
- How is best practice in tourism challenged?
- Which behavioural responses to these challenges exist?
- Which values underpin best practice?
- What is the ethical foundation of best practice?
Research aim 2:

The second aim of this research is to gain a deeper understanding of the role behaviour and judgement making of ethical tourism entrepreneurs.

This second aim shifts its focus away from an ethic for best practice to the individual entrepreneur who stands at the centre of this research. Entrepreneurial role behaviour and an entrepreneurial ethic are the key focal points for research aim two. It becomes an idiographic study by looking at the personality and ethical foundation of individual entrepreneurs. As such, a Weberian Ideal-Type construct for an ethical tourism entrepreneur is developed. This is linked to Personal Construct Theory (PCT), which assumes that people’s behaviour in unique circumstances is psychologically conditioned by the “way they anticipate events” (Kelly 2003, p. 7). In other words, by the way they make judgements in an uncertain situation. This leads to four further objectives:

First, the research has to uncover the judgement approaches of entrepreneurs in light of ethical dilemmas. Hypothetical ethical dilemmas, stemming from the literature review and the ethical framework (research aim one) will serve as substitutes, or smaller, broken-down piece of ethics as a whole. The rationale for this method is that one’s ethical foundation as a whole is too complex a construct in itself. This ties in with the second objective of this research, which is to use ‘laddering’ as an interview technique. This will guide the interviewee from describing simple constructs and then deriving superordinate constructs from these (Fransella 2005). In research on ethics, this is of particular importance as moral values relate to a higher sphere of values than others (legal, practical, religious) and
can often not be explicitly expressed (Graafland, Kaptain and Mazareew-van Dujin Schouten 2006). The third objective is to explore how these constructs and values can be linked to existing ethics theory in order to develop an ethical foundation for tourism entrepreneurs. It is not the aim of an idiographic study to develop general laws that are applicable to every individual, but to be able to compose meaningful descriptions of unique events (Rychlak 1981). In PCT, the individual person is seen as the event (Kelly 2003). The fourth objective is to uncover the relationship between an individual entrepreneur’s ethical foundation and his or her entrepreneurial role behaviour. Entrepreneurial role behaviour in this context relates to the need for achievement, entrepreneurial risk-taking and an entrepreneurial ethic (Cunningham and Lischeron 1991). In order to achieve research aim two a number of research questions need to be addressed. These are:

- What is the nature of ethical entrepreneurship?
- Which motives drive actions for ethical entrepreneurship?
- Which risks are associated with ethical entrepreneurship?
- What mission and priorities exist for ethical entrepreneurship?
- How are ethical judgements in this context made?

1.3 INTENDED CONTRIBUTIONS

The contributions of this research are threefold: (1) the thesis interweaves three areas of research, namely tourism, entrepreneurship and ethics and in so doing contributes to the scant literature at this juncture; (2) the thesis advocates and demonstrates the currently under-used methodology of archival research in qualitative tourism studies;
The thesis has applied management learning opportunities in as such as it provides tangible advice for managers, entrepreneurs and students of tourism and/or entrepreneurship. The points below outline the contributions in more detail.

**Theoretical Contributions**

- To contribute to filling the gap in research at the juncture of tourism ethics and tourism entrepreneurship
- To develop an ethical framework for best practice in tourism and to provide a definition of best practice for advancing future best practice research
- To unpack the notion of ethical entrepreneurship in tourism by applying ethics theory to entrepreneurial role behaviour and judgement approaches

**Methodological Contributions**

- To prove the usefulness of archival research as a research strategy in qualitative tourism research by employing the method of template analysis
- To prove the usefulness of Personal Construct Theory as a research strategy in qualitative tourism research by using the 'laddering-technique'

**Applied Management Contributions**

- To increase awareness among practitioners about the plethora of ethical dilemmas in the tourism and educate them about behavioural responses
- To educate practitioners about the nature of best practice in tourism and to provide guidance about its values
- To improve awareness about ethical entrepreneurship in tourism and stimulate actions for change
1.4 SETTING THE SCENE

1.4.1 APPLIED ETHICS AND BUSINESS DILEMMAS

Ethics theories are traditionally divided into three strands of moral philosophy: teleology (or consequentialist theories), deontology (or non-consequentialist theories), and virtue ethics (Thiroux and Krasemann 2011). The latter is often described as traditional teleology (Macdonald and Beck-Dudley 1994). Each enjoys a long tradition of philosophical debate, dating back to Ancient Greece. But equally, each has also been adapted and altered throughout time to reflect more modern principles.

Teleology is concerned with ends (consequences) rather than means. It is divided in ethical egoism and utilitarianism (Thiroux and Krasemann 2011). Whilst ethical egoism includes the notion of hedonism, utilitarianism is once more sub-categorised into act- and rule-utilitarianism (Fennell 2006). Teleologists judge and then act upon the basis of achieving the greatest positive outcome either for self-interest or for group-interest (Thiroux and Krasemann 2011). Problematic with this view is that it is subject to high moral relativism (Yaman and Gurel 2006) and requires the measurability of pleasure versus pain (Macdonald and Beck-Dudley 1994). The notion of a cost-benefit-analysis is typically associated to utilitarian principles.

Deontological theories on the other hand are premised on the belief that actions of right and wrong are based on moral standards that are universally applicable (Thiroux and Krasemann 2011). They are divided into intuitionism, religious ethics
theories and most notable, Kantianism (or Kant’s Duty ethic). Critics argue that these are irrational and based on principlism (Thiroux and Krasemann 2011). Furthermore, they fall short for the purpose of practical applications and can pave the way for fundamentalist views of right and wrong (Macdonald and Beck-Dudley 1994).

Virtue ethics, lastly, defines actions for right and wrong based on the notion of good character (Thiroux and Krasemann 2011) and the idea of the good life for a flourishing society (Jamal 2004). These ideals are elusive as it is unclear how to define and judge good character. Yet, virtue ethics has seen revival in academic interest in the field of tourism and business alike (see Brenkert 2009, Colonomos 2005, Drake and Schlachter 2008, Jamal 2004, Wijesinghe 2014). Fennell (2006) argues that none of these theories take individual, personal responsibility into account and calls for a more nuanced outlook to tourism and business ethics. In addition, Lurie and Alban (2007) criticise these approaches as backward-looking and searching for a justification in hindsight.

The thesis adopts an applied ethics perspective, which includes meta-ethics (the nature of ‘good’ in business), normative ethics (what should be ‘good’ in business) and descriptive ethics (what values underpin ‘good’ in business). Applied ethics uses cases and narratives of individuals to derive a wider ethical foundation under certain circumstances (Werhane 1996). In this thesis, the cases are best practice examples in sustainable tourism and the narratives come from tourism entrepreneurs who have been commended for their ethical conduct. Applied ethics is also the examination of a moral judgement of individuals in particular situations.
These situations here are business dilemmas that are categorised based on the existing literature on the subject. The individuals are entrepreneurs. Hannafey (2003) speaks about applied ethics from the perspective of the individual entrepreneur – a perspective that suits the personal constructivist research paradigm in this thesis. He contends that “…, the ways in which personal characteristics of individual entrepreneurs affect their ethical perspectives and business decision-making remains a major topic in the literature.” (Hannafey 2003, p. 103) This view complements the Psychological Characteristics School of Entrepreneurship as a second theoretical framework.

Moreover, Hannafey (2003) distinguishes several categories of business dilemmas – or situations to which moral judgement needs to be applied. Largely speaking, these are presented in the literature as misrepresentation dilemmas, distribution dilemmas and relationship dilemmas. By applying this framework to the analysis of best practice in tourism, it is possible to examine the kind of dilemmas that tourism entrepreneurs face, how they respond to these and which values underpin their behavioural responses.

1.4.2 SUSTAINABLE TOURISM: AN ETHICALLY COMPLEX ISSUE

If sustainability is the key goal for business ethics as advocated by Crane and Matten (2010), it is crucial to understand its ethical foundation. However, sustainability by itself is already ethically complex and incorporates different moral dimensions. This study is therefore born out of the belief that sustainability can be used as a proxy for studying ethics (for a corroborating approach see García-Rosell and Mäkinen 2013).
In principle, sustainable tourism includes: (1) achieving maximum positive benefits for people with minimum negative impacts on the environment; (2) respect for all host communities and their socio-cultural heritage; (3) and the long-term viability of tourism with the aim of enjoyment for future generations (UNEP-WTO 2005, p. 11).

These principles reflect three key ethics theories: utilitarianism, Kantian deontology and virtue ethics. The utilitarian dimension manifests itself through an instrumental weighing up of alternatives for their positive and negative consequences, which in essence denotes a cost-benefit-analysis for sustainable practices (Fennell 2006). In his seminal work *Utilitarianism* John Stuart Mills postulates “Actions are right in proportion as they tend to promote happiness.” (Mills, J.S., in Hartmann 2002, p. 30) For sustainable tourism this means striving towards maximising positive impacts, whilst negotiating and minimising negative tourism impacts. This can be found in the first of the three UNEP-WTO (2005) principles for sustainable tourism.

The second of the UNEWP-WTO principles is anchored in Kantian deontology. In *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals*, Kant (I. Kant, in Hartman 2002, p. 20, verse 4:430) sees the "principle of humanity, and in general of every rational nature, as an end in itself". This calls for human beings and their authenticity to be treated as ends in themselves, as they possess an intrinsic value. According to Jamal and Camargo (2014), the notion of respect has indeed bridged some of the gaps of the instrumentalist, utilitarian approach to sustainable tourism. It can be argued that sustainable tourism aims to extend this principle of humanity to nature as a whole. Although critics would counter this argument to say that we are yet to develop a
more suitable conservation ethic amidst a strongly anthropocentric approach to sustainable tourism (Holden 2003).

The third UNEP-WTO principle for sustainable tourism advocates an orientation into the future or intergenerational equity (Crane and Matten 2010), the notion of stewardship and the inclusion of all stakeholders. The third principle promotes the idea of the ‘good life’, which is reflected in Aristotelian virtue ethics. For Aristotle, people lived together as social and political beings striving towards happiness in oneself (eudemonia) and others (human flourishing). These values are conducive to the ‘good’ or ethical life (Hartman 2002, Jamal 2004). Sustainable tourism, by focusing on future and on enjoyment, consequently incorporates Aristotelian virtue ethics.

1.4.3 Psychological Characteristics School of Entrepreneurship

As previously stated, the actors in this study are tourism entrepreneurs. These are individual entrepreneurs and not corporate entrepreneurs within larger organisations. The focus on the individual is aligned to an interpretivist and personal-constructivist research paradigm, which emphasises the study of the individual behaviour and values. In so doing, this research follows the notion that entrepreneurship is to be understood as a form of behaviour (Drucker 1985). This results in a value-behavioural lens of entrepreneurship. Cunningham and Lischeron (1991) have formulated the Psychological Characteristics School of Entrepreneurship among four other schools of thought. It builds the theoretical
framework for the understanding of entrepreneurship in this research and directly informs the data analysis.

In this school of thought, entrepreneurs are defined by being the founders of their own businesses who have control over the means of production. This constituted an important sampling criterion for the latter part of the research. Cunningham and Lischeron (1991) focus this lens on special values, attitudes and needs that distinguish entrepreneurs from non-entrepreneurs, i.e. managers, small business owners or corporate entrepreneurs; and assume that their behaviour is driven by these psychological criteria. They emphasise the attitude to risk and the need for achievement as distinguishing entrepreneurial characteristics and contend that entrepreneurs have a special moral compass upon which they base their actions. Although Cunningham and Lischeron (1991) recommend this value-behavioural research approach to be conducted among start-up entrepreneurial ventures, this view has not been taken in this thesis. The interviewed entrepreneurs range from young individuals who have started their businesses only recently to more mature ones with 36-year-old businesses. This variety allows a better understanding of the entrepreneurial journey and learning curve that shapes an ontology for ethical entrepreneurship. Moreover, it has to be noted that the Psychological Characteristics School of Entrepreneurship does not focus on extraordinary achievers, such as the research participants. Whilst this may be seen as a limitation and at odds to best practice research, the school’s focus on values and ethics aligns it again to the research objectives.
To summarise, the theoretical underpinnings of this research revolve around three key literature areas: tourism and ethics, ethics and entrepreneurship, and entrepreneurship and tourism. Within this context, the ethical analysis is based on an applied ethics approach. The theoretical framing is grounded in a categorisation of business dilemmas derived from the literature (see Hannafey 2003) and the individual entrepreneurial ethics as well as Cunningham and Lischeron's (1991) psychological-behavioural school of entrepreneurship. Sustainable tourism, here acts as a proxy for studying ethics.

Figure 1.2 visualises the relationship between these central tenets that surround the thesis title – *An applied ethics analysis of best practice tourism entrepreneurs*.

**FIGURE 1.2: Central tenets for this thesis**

Source: present author
1.5 INTRODUCING THE ACTORS

The previous sections have introduced the position of this thesis in existing academic literature, as well as the conceptual underpinnings, which guide the research. It is prudent now to introduce the practical context of this research in order to clarify the rationale for the research strategy. The research was undertaken in two chronological phases. First, an archival research strategy with the use of secondary data was conducted. Second, semi-structured interviews with individual entrepreneurs followed. Findings and conclusions were then derived through an inductive, iterative analysis of both research phases. The following paragraphs briefly introduce the origins of the data before being explained in greater depth in Chapter 6: methods and processes.

1.5.1 THE TOURISM FOR TOMORROW AWARDS

The *Tourism for Tomorrow Awards* build the source of data for the first phase of the research, namely the archival research. The Awards are an annual, sustainable tourism award aimed at promoting and recognising best practice in sustainable tourism (WTTC 2014a). The Awards enjoy a long history and have first been inaugurated in 1989 by the Federation of Tour Operators with the aim of encouraging sustainable practices. In 1992, British Airways took over the Awards and subsequently, in 2003 the Awards came under the auspices of the World Travel & Tourism Council (WTTC). As a non-partial, non-sectorial and non-governmental entity, WTTC seemed the most appropriate host for the Awards. With the introduction of new criteria and revised categories, they are now considered to be
among the leading award programmes for sustainable tourism (Buckley 2012). This is largely due to the rigour of the awards judging process, which includes an independent judging panel comprising of experts in sustainable tourism from around the world. Furthermore, all shortlisted entrants undergo an on-site evaluation to corroborate any claims made in their original applications.

It is important to emphasise here that the *Tourism for Tomorrow Awards* material – applications and judges’ reports – are all unpublished documents and not available to the public. They are owned by WTTC and kept under strict data protection regulations. Naturally, promotional materials about winners and shortlisted entrants are available online. However, this is not the material used in this research. Thankfully, due to my close relationship with the organising body WTTC originating from my previous employment; it was possible to gain exclusive access to the unpublished, original award applications and all corresponding judges’ reports. This access had to be negotiated carefully and was built on the concepts of mutual trust and full anonymity. Henceforth, no name or geographical references will be made in this thesis. It has further received a favourable ethical opinion from the University of Surrey’s Ethics Committee. The *Tourism for Tomorrow Awards* material enables this research to investigate the ethical dimensions for best practice in tourism. This is due to the fact that the overall awards criteria encompass various elements of ethics theory, much aligned to the approximation of sustainable tourism and ethics. More detail is given in Chapter 6: methods and processes.
1.5.2 Ethical Tourism Entrepreneurs

During the second phase of the research, semi-structured interviews were carried out with 14 best practice entrepreneurs. In line with Cunningham and Lischeron’s (1991) Psychological Characteristics School of Entrepreneurship, these individuals were selected on the basis of having founded their own business. Further selection criteria were that this business was in the field of sustainable tourism and that these entrepreneurs have been awarded for ethical and responsible business conduct. The recognition for ethical conduct may stem from the previous Tourism for Tomorrow Awards, although not exclusively, and some entrepreneurs in the list of research participants have received different distinctions, for example the Condé Nast World Savers Award or Responsible Tourism Award. The crucial criterion for selection is that each entrepreneur has contributed in some form to the betterment of society as determined by his or her peers. According to Wempe (2005) an ethical entrepreneur is one who exploits opportunities not just for their own benefit, but also with the aim to contribute to societal and environmental wellbeing. As such, the chosen research participants could be considered as ethical entrepreneurs. In a Weberian sense, they constitute what is objectively possible, rather than representative (Rogers 1969). Once more, my previous employment and professional network has been beneficial for recruiting research participants and establishing a good rapport in interview situations that delve into deeper, ethical dilemmas and probe respondents on their moral judgement. The following section gives a brief methodological overview.
1.6 THE RESEARCH JOURNEY: A METHODOLOGICAL OVERVIEW

1.6.1 BEST PRACTICE RESEARCH

This research seeks to conceptualise the ethical underpinning of best practice in tourism with the aims for advancing best practice research and improving business ethics management. Best practice research is based on a practice to principle approach (Overman and Boyd 1994). It is argued that best practice research is “bold and creative, visionary and potentially transformational.” (Overman and Boyd 1994, p. 81) However, the uptake of the concept for academic research has been very slow focusing mainly on knowledge transfer (Kulkarni and Ramamoorthy 2014) and policy shaping (Olfert and Partridge 2010). Yet there is a lack of an understanding of the nature of best practice. This is largely due to two reasons.

First, the concept for best practices in tourism is very vague. Robin Tauck, CEO of Tauck and Partners LLP, a captain of industry and advocate for sustainable tourism states, “I don’t think that we as an industry have defined what best practice actually means.” (Tauck 2014, personal communication) In addition, the vagueness of the concept is mirrored in the few existing studies of best practices in tourism. The focus is largely on policy shaping for destination development (see Ibery and Saxena 2009, Stoian and Stoieca 2011, and Wight 2013). An exception is the work of Hwang and Lockwood (2006) whose focus is on implementation strategies for best practices for small and medium sized enterprises in the hospitality industry. Nonetheless, research into the underlying phenomena of best practices has yet to be conducted.
The second hindrance to best practice research lies in the difficulty of obtaining access to data that captures genuine best practices. As Overman and Boyd (1994, p. 79) emphasise, data for best practice research largely relies on reputational samples, word of mouth or commercial and promotional case studies. It is therefore of crucial importance to negotiate access to the most promising data available and then to rigorously test the chosen data set for the usefulness of this research. The uniqueness of the data set in this research adds significantly to the originality of this thesis.

1.6.2 RESEARCH METHODS AND METHODOLOGIES

The thesis is situated in a subjective, ontological paradigm based on the belief that human behaviour is guided by subjective meaning (Slote Morris 2009) and that the individual is responsible for the conclusions derived from facts by their own interpretations (Kelly 2003). It follows an iterative process, whereby each parts of the thesis inform each other. Figure 1.3 visualises this process.

FIGURE 1.3: The research process

Source: present author
The chosen research strategies are archival research and Personal Construct Theory. Archival research is best understood as a collection of methods rather than a set methodology (Timothy 2012), while Personal Construct Theory and methods from its spectrum have the potential to elicit higher-order constructs, such as ethical standards from individuals (Fransella 2005). For this purpose, semi-structured interviews are conducted with tourism entrepreneurs. The sampling strategy for these entrepreneurs has been informed by the findings from the literature review. Further, template analysis has been selected as the appropriate data analysis method for the archival research stage, based on its suitability for handling large quantities of qualitative data (King 2012). Thematic and narrative analyses are utilised for the second phase of the research as they are in keeping with an applied ethics approach. To conclude this introductory chapter, an outline of the thesis is now presented with brief chapter summaries.

1.7 THESIS OUTLINE AND CHAPTER SUMMARIES

CHAPTER 1: Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to introduce the topic and to outline the aims and objectives for the research and asks questions that will build the basis for further investigation. Besides establishing the significance, originality and rigour of the research, the intended contributions are presented as well. The chapter then positions the thesis within existing academic literature, and highlights the significance of this position by pointing towards a research gap. Moreover, key concepts that underpin the research are introduced and their relationship is visualised. The chapter continues by introducing the actors in this research and
confirms why these actors have been chosen. Finally, by outlining the thesis and providing brief chapter summaries, the scene is set for the remainder of the work.

CHAPTER 2: Key Concepts: business ethics and tourism ethics

The aim of this chapter is to review existing literature of business ethics and tourism ethics that are relevant for this thesis and to seek ways of using this literature for the empirical part of this research. The chapter is divided into two parts. First, business ethics is the focus of the review. More specifically, the notions of business responsibilities, business dilemmas and the profit versus principle debates are investigated. This is followed by a closer review of tourism ethics, with an emphasis of the ethical sensitivity of the tourism industry and an applied business ethics for tourism. The chapter concludes by providing a rationale for a value-behavioural lens and by setting out objectives for the use of the literature for the remainder of the thesis.

CHAPTER 3: Key Concepts: entrepreneurial role behaviour and ethic

The purpose of this chapter is to investigate the current state of knowledge of entrepreneurial role behaviour and an entrepreneurial ethic. The Psychological Characteristics School of Entrepreneurship builds the basis for this investigation. It includes the attitude towards risk, the need for achievement and ethical considerations for entrepreneurship. As such, this chapter informs the empirical part of the research, particularly the second research aim of unpacking the notion of ethical entrepreneurship. The literature on risk-taking and the need for achievement support the discussion about an ontology, mission and motivation for ethical entrepreneurship. In addition, the review of the literature in this chapter
influences the research philosophy and situates this thesis in a personal-constructivist epistemology. Finally, the review of the literature informs the sampling strategy for the second phase of the empirical research.

CHAPTER 4: Key Concept: the tourism entrepreneur

This final chapter of literature review looks at the overlap of tourism and entrepreneurship research. Entrepreneurial role characteristics that are distinguishing to entrepreneurial role behaviour are examined. Following this, an analysis of tourism entrepreneurship takes place emphasising the current focus on lifestyle entrepreneurship. Furthermore, the chapter analyses the special characteristics and barriers for tourism entrepreneurship, which demand ethical consideration. Entrepreneurial role behaviour and an entrepreneurial ethic are placed against the backdrop of tourism entrepreneurship. The chapter develops a purposeful definition of a tourism entrepreneur. It concludes, however, with a detailed look at the research framework that has been derived from the literature review. The learning outcomes from the literature review are presented and *a priori* and primary coding themes for research phase one are derived.

CHAPTER 5: Research philosophy, methodology and ethics

The purpose of this chapter is to unravel the underlying philosophical foundation of this research, which are grounded in the review of the literature. The chapter also presents the methodology chosen for investigating the research aims and objectives, all of which are reiterated here. The chapter continues with presenting a rationale for the two research strategies, which have been selected to complete research phase one and two respectively. The process of iteration is continuously
emphasised. The chapter highlights the potential for both within tourism research. It includes notes on research ethics, researcher positioning and reflexivity. The importance of having a separate chapter dedicated to philosophy and methodology lies in the originality of the research strategy.

CHAPTER 6: Methods and processes

The aim of this chapter is to explain in detail the methods and processes that took place during the empirical phase of this research. This detailed analysis contributes to the transparency of the overall research and highlights the rigour that has been established. Throughout accountability, confirmability, credibility, dependability and transferability play an important role for choosing the appropriate research methods. These are presented in a chronological fashion, including the sampling rationale, data collection, data preparation, and data analysis for both phases of the research. The chapter highlights the advantages of triangulation in qualitative tourism research and demonstrates an array of methods that have been utilised for establishing rigour. The chapter concludes by stressing the nature of the iterative process of interpretation.

CHAPTER 7: Findings

The purpose of this chapter is to present the findings from both phases of the research in a thematic and succinct manner. All findings and points of discussion are cross-referenced in Appendix L of this thesis. The findings in this chapter relate to both overarching research aims and are presented chronologically. Verbatim quotes from the primary and secondary data are used to substantiate the findings. It should be noted that an expansive and more illustrative list of quotations has been reserved.
for Appendix K for reasons of coherence and brevity. The chapter begins by presenting a definition for best practice in tourism, followed by an analysis of the dilemmas, types of behaviour and values that together underpin best practice in tourism. Subsequently, the chapter moves towards an ideographic study and presents the findings for role behaviour and judgement approaches for an ethical entrepreneurship in tourism. The chapter then concludes with a visualisation of best practice in tourism and by outlining the implications of these findings for the subsequent two discussion chapters.

CHAPTER 8: An ethic for best practice in tourism

This chapter is a discussion chapter dedicated to establishing an ethical framework for best practice in tourism and thus, fulfilling research aim one of this thesis. The chapter discusses the findings for a definition for best practice, dilemmas and behavioural responses as well as values for best practice in tourism. In so doing, it unravels the underlying concepts of best practice and contributes to the ambiguous state of research of best practice in tourism to date. The chapter draws on the literature that has been presented earlier as well as the ethical dimensions as laid out in the Tourism for Tomorrow Awards criteria. The chapter then concludes with developing an ethic for best practice in tourism that is based on ethical pragmatism and advocates the use of an ethical prism for business ethics. It also situates best practice in tourism within current schools of thought on business ethics. Finally, the chapter lays the foundations for practical and managerial implications of this research that are presented later.
CHAPTER 9: Understanding ethical entrepreneurship in tourism

The purpose of this chapter is to analyse those elements that together combined manifest what can be called ethical entrepreneurship in tourism. These include an ontology for ethical entrepreneurship, the mission and motivations behind it and priorities for ethical entrepreneurship. The chapter also includes a section on ethical judgement making, which allows to draw conclusion for the individual entrepreneurial ethic. The discussion in chapter 9 is based on the findings of these interviews that are presented in Section 7.6 and 7.7 of this thesis. The analysis of the findings is rooted in the Psychological Characteristics School of Entrepreneurship, which highlights risk, need for achievement and the individual ethic as key elements for understanding entrepreneurship. Furthermore, an applied ethics analysis has taken place in line with the overall title of this thesis. This chapter aims to address the second overarching research aim, and in so doing paves the way for further managerial implications that are presented in the final chapter of this thesis.

CHAPTER 10: Conclusion

The purpose of this chapter is to answer the research questions and thus to tie together the problem of investigation, the methods and rigour that was employed and the findings that have resulted from this research. In addition, this chapter seeks to highlight the significance and originality of this research. This includes the actual theoretical and methodological contributions that have been achieved. It also includes any implications for management that result from the findings of this research. Finally, the chapter concludes with presenting final, reflexive thoughts on the subject at hand and makes recommendations for any future research.
2 KEY CONCEPTS: BUSINESS ETHICS AND TOURISM ETHICS

Part of that force would

Do evil evermore, and yet creates the good.

(Goethe 1961, Mephistopheles to Faust, Part I, Scene III, p. 159)

2.1 INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this chapter is to review the principles of business ethics in current academic literature and to draw conclusions relating to pertinent concepts in business ethics, such as business responsibilities, ethical dilemmas in business and specifically the profit versus principle debate. The chapter further reviews ethics in tourism literature, focusing predominately on the application of business ethics. It highlights the sensitive nature of tourism with regards to ethical dilemmas. The chapter concludes with a call for the adoption of a value and behaviour lens for applied ethics studies and the reorientation from a consumer-focus to that of other actors in the tourism system. This chapter thus builds the basis for an analysis of an entrepreneurial ethic, which is the subject of Chapter 3. It also synthesises these concepts for the purpose of tourism studies in Chapter 4.

Moral thinking in relation to economic activity has a long philosophical and cultural heritage. The ancient Greeks discussed actions of right and wrong in connection to product shortages. Epicureans argued to increase supply, whereas Stoics called for constraining demand (Sedlacek 2011). The Old Testament introduced the notion of a linear timescale with a worldly beginning and end. This presented the idea of
progress. Christianity then offered the concept of gift-giving and advocated a more merciful approach to economic activity (Sedlacek 2011). With this in mind, it is remarkable that the first academic journal dedicated to ethics in business and economics was not published until 1982 – *The Journal of Business Ethics*.

The chapter now continues with a review of business ethics with a particular focus on business responsibilities, the profit versus principle debate, and business dilemmas. Subsequently, attention is turned towards tourism ethics. A brief overview of the literature is provided, followed by a more focused review of tourism as an essentially ethically sensitive industry and the importance of applied business ethics in tourism. The chapter concludes with a summary of the learning outcomes of this literature review, an identification of gaps in the literature as well as a proposal for the direction of this thesis.

### 2.2 Business ethics

#### 2.2.1 An overview

Over the last 50 years, two schools of thought have emerged, which could hardly be more different. They concern the responsibilities of a business. First, there is the *Separation Thesis* proposed by Milton Friedman that states that business must make profit first and foremost and has no wider obligations to society-at-large. In other words, business is separate from society. Friedman (1970) purports that corporate social responsibility is a fraud or a way of green washing. According to him the only responsibilities of a corporation are economic and legal. This means, the business
has to make profit and stay in operation. Anything over and above that would be detrimental to the organisation and not in accordance to its core responsibilities. A contrasting view is that of Keith Davis (1975), who contends that a business’s responsibility goes beyond those core principles to include society and the environment. He highlights the symbiotic relationship between business and society by stating that “Since business interacts extensively with all of society, perhaps more of these demands [for social responsibility] were made on business than any other institution.” (Davis 1975, p. 19)

Much of this debate is anchored in the distinction between individualised and socialised societies. In socialised societies, the stronger are encouraged to support the weaker and by that eventually society as a whole becomes stronger (Minnaert, Maitland and Miller 2011). This relates to Marxist and Christian philosophies. Davis’s view of business responsibilities links into these philosophies. He goes as far as saying that “…business should fulfil a citizenship role.” (Davis 1975, p. 23) In individualised societies, on the other hand, each member is treated equally and must work towards his or her own welfare without limiting the opportunities for other members (Minnaert et al. 2011). The Friedmanian interpretation of business responsibilities on the other hand epitomises that of the individualised society’s philosophy. Brenkert (2009) argues that neither is the case. He advocates a differentiating view, whereby responsibilities vary between business and non-business situations. The dividing views on business ethics – separatist, symbiotic, and differentiating – will benefit from an interpretation of entrepreneurial motivation in the discussion of this thesis. First, though, it is important to understand what business responsibility here means.
A company's responsibilities are usually expressed in terms of its fiduciary responsibilities. Such responsibilities are often monetary in nature and are rooted in long-term, mutual trust. Trust is the premise on which each company operates (Colonomos 2005). Trust is essential to an organisation. The breakdown of trust is the greatest threat to business success and trust can only be established through ethical behaviour (Connelly 2006).

In keeping with the tradition of Milton Friedman (1970), a company's sole fiduciary responsibility is towards its shareholders. His view remains that should a company engage in fiduciary responsibilities outside of those towards its shareholders, it is willingly spending the money of the owners and the company is not at liberty to do so. He contends “The stockholders or customers or the employees could separately spend their own money on a particular action if they wish to do so.” (Friedman 1970, p. 2) Friedman is primarily concerned with philanthropic or charitable activities that involve distributing profits outside of the company's sphere. He believes strongly that it is government legislation that has to protect society from any wrongdoing, not voluntary business actions. In addition, he has an optimistic opinion about humankind as he concludes, “In a free society, it is hard for ‘evil’ people to do ‘evil’, especially since one man’s good is another’s evil.” (Friedman 1970, p. 4) What resonates through Friedman's thinking is the controversial *Fable of the Bees* by Bernard Mandeville, who famously wrote that individual vices will eventually turn into public benefits and thus contribute to the general wellbeing of society. He writes:
Thus every Part was full of Vice,
Yet the whole Mass a Paradise;
(Mandeville and Kaye 1924, p. 9)

In addition to corporate social responsibility, there is of course economic responsibility. Economic responsibility, traditionally, is seen as contribution to Gross Domestic Product (GDP) and creating jobs. In fact, job creation is a major argument for or against investment into businesses and industries, particularly when investment comes from public sources. For tourism, the economic responsibility of firms is substantial. In 2013, the total contribution to GDP worldwide of tourism was 9.5% and the industry employed over 266 million people in total (WTTC 2014b). Globally, the economic responsibility of (tourism) businesses is vital to the wellbeing of society.

Cadbury (2002), however, adds a controversial argument to this. He suggests that businesses’ economic responsibility does not include creating employment. He states, “The business's task is to serve its customers efficiently and profitably; jobs are a consequence of businesses carrying out that task.” (Cadbury 2002, p. 20) It is noteworthy that Cadbury seems to rank responsibility towards customers over and above a firm’s employees. Both, Friedman’s and Cadbury’s views neglect that there are in fact stakeholders that are neither employees nor customers. For tourism, this is particularly pertinent as the people living in tourist destinations are very much affected by the commercial activity that is taking place around them, even if they are not directly participating in them.
This leads on to more advanced thinking about business responsibilities. Raiborn and Payne (1990) contend that a company’s fiduciary responsibilities extend beyond that of its shareholders. A company possesses three groups of fiduciary beneficiaries: society-at-large, the equity interest holder and the customer. Raiborn and Payne (1990) explain persuasively their beneficiary status as follows. First, society-at-large allows the firm to exist, while benefitting from the company’s productivity and added value. This corroborates Davis’s (1975) intention that businesses are even more morally obliged than other institutions because of their intensive interaction with society. It's a symbiotic relationship built on mutual benefit. Second, equity interest holders, such as owners, shareholders and creditors, engage in a synergetic relationship with the company and it is the company’s responsibility to accrue a return on their investment. Lastly, the company has responsibilities towards its customers. This largely pertains to a discrepancy between the scientific truth of a product and its advertised marketing truth. Many ethical dilemmas can arise out of this last fiduciary responsibility.

From a value perspective, transparency is regarded as an important responsibility towards society-at-large (Colonomos 2005, Davis 1975). Transparency is not only concerned with financial matters, but includes the notion of social auditing. Companies ought to develop balance sheets for their social costs and externalities as well as their financial books (Davis 1975). In contrast to Friedman’s omission of externalities, Davis (1975) advances him by recognising them. His idea is to commoditise them and put a price on them. In so doing, business responsibility becomes commoditised and subject to a cost-benefit analysis. More recently, this utilitarian stance on business responsibilities has been opposed (Brenkert 2009,
Colonomos 2005, Hartman 2011). Most prominently, Macdonald and Beck-Dudley warn:

*Something morally essential is lost in all varieties of utilitarianism, including even the most recent. For utilitarians, anything goes, nothing is entirely forbidden, and everything can be rationalised by shifting the sands of expected good and evil consequences.*

(Macdonald and Beck-Dudley 1994, p. 619)

The preceding paragraphs have shown that business responsibility is an elusive concept and this thesis seeks to generate an entrepreneur’s view on the subject.

2.2.3 **Profit and Principles**

The focus on business responsibilities based on money-trusts has led to the emergence of its own economics school of thought – monetarism (Sedlacek 2011). However, contrary to the belief in monetarism, focus on profit is not necessarily mutually exclusive from a focus on ethical principles.

Colonomos (2005, p. 460) describes the “new ethical wave” as a result of a paradigm shift towards sustainable development and the re-discovery of the principles of trust and transparency. Yet, it is important to note that the notion of profit as a secondary motive is not new or based on a revival of business ethics in the last two decades. Rather, it is deeply rooted in Aristotelian virtue ethics. According to Aristotle, pleasure (profit) complements activity (or development) (Hardie 1968).
The two concepts are entirely interlinked. What he means to say is that one cannot exist without the other. Centuries later, Schumpeter (1934) built on this idea by explaining that neither profit nor development can exist separately. More recently, this interplay between profit and principle was formalised in the so called Brundtland Report, which explains that development – specifically sustainable development – is a constant process of change aimed at achieving a balance between profit and principle (WECD 1987). Thus, plainly speaking, profit cannot be regarded as a primary business responsibility.

In addition to ancient Greek philosophy, the Old Testament also bears evidence that profit maximisation is not the ultimate goal of economic activity. In the Old Testament, God asks Man to rest on the 7th day. This rest is not a sign of recovery from exhaustion, instead resting time is allocated to enjoy the benefits of one’s work. This translates to the principle of profit optimisation rather than maximisation or “in economic language: The meaning of utility is not to increase it permanently but to rest among its grains.” (Sedlacek 2011, p. 89)

If we follow the ancient scripts and more recent literature on economic development, then the only possible conclusion is that profit is not a primary business objective, but rather a necessary condition for on-going development on the one hand and a result of economic activity on the other. In this sense, it is possible to argue that both Friedman (1970) and Cadbury (2002) were mistaken in identifying profit making as the foremost business responsibility.
However, profit does carry a fundamental role in a business’s survival. This also concerns non-profit organisations, as necessary funds to continue one’s activity also need to be accrued. When profit (or financial viability) becomes a necessity, then it is inevitably linked to ethical principles pertaining to the generation and distribution of these profits. Graafland’s (2002) work on profit and principles outlines four profit scenarios. First, in an ideal and steady situation, there is a good chance that there is no apparent clash between making profit and ethical principles. Graafland (2002) calls this the Win-Win-Scenario. The problem with this scenario is that it relates to short-term thinking and relies on a status quo to be upheld. In an entrepreneurial environment, this is almost impossible as change is at the heart of entrepreneurship and with change come ethical challenges (Brenkert 2009).

Graafland's (2002) second scenario is called Licence to Operate. In this case, minimum standards are set by society for social and environmental sustainability and the company may operate as long as these minimum standards are met. This scenario corresponds to Friedman's view (1970) of government regulation for the protection of society and the environment, whilst businesses remain solely responsible for economic welfare. The downside of this approach is that ethical principles of businesses are dependent on the strength of external parties. If external parties fail in their task to safeguard social and ecological sustainability, then businesses have no incentive to take on a responsible citizen-role (Davis 1975).

The third perspective is called Acceptable Profit Perspective (Graafland 2002). Here, the adherence to ethical principles guides the level of necessary or acceptable profit a business must make. Economic welfare, thus, becomes the second concern. A
danger with this perspective is the question of determining what constitutes ‘acceptable profit’. In tourism research, it has been shown that particularly lifestyle entrepreneurs find it difficult to estimate what constitute ‘appropriate’ or ‘acceptable’ profit levels (Hall, Rusher and Thomas 2004). The Acceptable Profit Perspective is often adopted by non-profit organisations, whose founding principles often concern societal wellbeing rather than profit maximisation. A danger of this perspective is that businesses are susceptible to limiting their financial long-term viability. Lastly, Graafland concludes:

A more realistic option is that a company attaches an intrinsic value to both profits and principles. In that case, an optimal balance must be found between profits and principles.

(Graafland 2002, p. 301)

He calls this the Integrated Perspective and it relates to the notions of transparency and trust as well as an integrated sustainable auditing process (Graafland 2002). However, it is unclear how this perspective can be achieved. The notion of achieving an optimal balance suggests a willingness to trade principles. Yet, if an intrinsic value were attached, they would become untradeable by default. The integrated profit perspective remains elusive. Yet, these four perspectives will help analyse the profit motive for best practice tourism entrepreneurs and their subsequent actions.

What this review has shown is that moral philosophy in connection to economic activity has existed almost as long as humankind. Yet as a field of academic study, it is relatively new. There are opposing views as to whether business and ethics are
separate or symbiotic concepts. Some scholars suggest that a more differentiating approach might be more prudent (Brenkert 2009).

The two underlying premises of business ethics are the debate over business responsibilities and the profit motive. Both premises are highly elusive and opposing schools of thoughts have emerged over time. Some argue that business responsibilities may be purely economic (Friedman 1970). Others contend that they include responsibilities for societal wellbeing (Davis 1975). Raiborn and Payne (1990) support the responsibility of job creation, whilst Cadbury (2002) dismisses this as a non-essential business responsibility. Lastly, a debate surrounding profit maximisation versus profit optimisation has led to the emergence of more nuanced profit and principle perspectives (Graafland 2002).

Following this, this thesis seeks to investigate whether tourism entrepreneurs take a separatist, symbiotic or differentiating view on business ethics, how their own profit motivation translates into different profit and principle perspectives and what their view on business responsibilities is. This will aid the research aim of gaining a deeper understanding of role behaviour for best practice tourism entrepreneurs.

2.2.4 BUSINESS DILEMMAS

A business dilemma occurs when two or more standards clash or when there is uncertainty over responsibilities (Cadbury 2002, Graafland et al. 2006). These standards are internalised by individuals and can relate to different spheres of life,
such as questions of morality, practical business considerations, idealistic or religious beliefs and legal matters (Graafland et al. 2006, Raiborn and Payne 1990). The focus of this research is on business dilemmas with an ethical dimension. These tend to relate to higher ideals, at least theoretically (Graafland et al. 2006). Lurie and Albin (2007) have developed a fitting definition of a moral or ethical business dilemma, which lends itself to the psychological perspective on entrepreneurship as adopted in this thesis. They state:

_In epistemological terms, a moral or ethical dilemma is a situation in which a person does not know how to act because of conflicting beliefs about what is axiologically required._

_(Lurie and Albin 2007, p. 196)_

This definition encompasses some core concepts that are useful for this research. First, a dilemma is something experienced by an individual. In the case of this thesis, these individuals are tourism entrepreneurs. Second, dilemmas are situational, albeit they may be recurring situations, but never permanent conditions. As such, they can be overcome. This is reflected in the notion of change in an entrepreneurial environment. Third, dilemmas require value judgement and demand action to be taken. This supports the value and behaviour focus of this thesis. Wempe (2005) acknowledges that these behavioural values are subject to change when circumstances change. Lastly, action requires knowledge and Lurie and Albin (2007) specify that in business situations, business knowledge is required when dealing with ethical dilemmas. The individual’s perspective is important and actors and their role behaviour are placed at the centre of this definition.
The literature on business dilemmas with an ethical dimension has shown that these can be loosely grouped into three categories: misrepresentation, relationships and distribution dilemmas. The next sections will look at these three types of business dilemmas in more detail. This review of the literature builds the basis of analysis for the empirical phase of this research.

2.2.4.1 Misrepresentation dilemmas

The issue of misrepresentation relates to the truth about one’s product or the risk involved in one’s company that an entrepreneur is willing to reveal. Brenkert (2009) sets this dilemma into a Competitive Context based on the earlier mentioned Differentiation Thesis, which states that the choices of behaviour that are deemed acceptable are often greater in a competitive environment. As an example, such a situation would lead the entrepreneur to diverge from the scientific truth of a product through positive misrepresentation in order to gain a competitive advantage. Lying is seen as the most common form of rule breaking in a competitive context. A clash of standards occurs between the normative virtue of honesty and a motivational value of gaining a competitive advantage. The competing ethics theories here are Kant’s Categorical Imperative and the utilitarian calculus. Sometimes, however, a positive misrepresentation even ends up becoming true. Brenkert (2009) calls this the Pygmalion Effect – a self-fulfilling prophecy. In these incidences the positive misrepresentation acts as a catalyst for a positive action or result. Once more, the dilemma arises due to a clash between the normative duty of honesty and the teleological value of utility. Misrepresentation in a competitive context also relates to Cadbury’s (2002) idea of opportunism or conflicting orders.
for example that a sale has to be made at any cost even if it means jeopardising the customer's benefit.

Hannafey (2003) on the other hand is more concerned with the misrepresentation of risks involved for potential investors and calls this the Promoter Dilemma. He states, “The most common promoter dilemmas involve uncertainty over how much detailed information to convey about the risk of a venture.” (Hannafey 2003, p. 105) The clash occurs between two motivational values. On the one hand is the motivation to gain support for one's venture. But on the other hand, there is fear of experiencing a disadvantage by disclosing too much information. Both relate to issues of transparency and openness, which are considered key values for ethical entrepreneurship (Colonomos 2005).

Information sharing, however, need not necessarily be directed towards individuals or groups outside the organisation, as it is the case with the Promoter Dilemma. Piercy and Lane (2007) describe a form of inward-looking misrepresentation as Implementing the Executive Role. By this, they mean that it is the duty of an executive, or entrepreneur, to establish partnerships and trust within their organisation through information sharing (Piercy and Lane 2007). If this inward transparency is neglected, then trust relationships within the organisation may break down. The misrepresentation dilemma concerns the fiduciary responsibilities of an entrepreneur and internal stakeholders, such as employees or equity interest holders.
2.2.4.2 Relationship dilemmas

A second category of dilemmas – relationship dilemmas – relate to a company's fiduciary responsibilities towards society-at-large. Hannafey (2003) speaks of the Relationship Dilemma that occurs when there is a multitude of stakeholders with differing interests. If misrepresentation dilemmas are seen as the most common form, then relationship dilemmas are regarded as the most challenging and complex ones. This is true because of critical junctures in relationships (Hannafey 2003, Piercy and Lane 2007).

Both Brenkert (2009) and Wempe (2005) point to the Dirty Hands Dilemma that leads to rule bending in order to meet one's fiduciary responsibilities even if this is in conflict with the interests of the wider society. Brenkert (2009, p. 465) concludes that in such situations, an entrepreneur “cannot operate innocently.” These dilemmas result out of a complexity in decision-making and often distort a company's original responsibilities. One must revisit Cadbury's (2002) view on business responsibilities to shed light on this dilemma:

*Businesses cannot be responsible for creating employment. Their task is to serve their customers efficiently and profitably; jobs are a consequence of businesses carrying out a task.*

(Cadbury 2002, p. 20)

Here, a company's decision to lay off its employees in order to ensure profitability is likely to be in conflict with the interests of wider society and yet, it may be necessary.
In this instance, the conflicting standards relate to the virtue of altruism, and in particular to whom an organisation or entrepreneur should extend this altruism. In the case of the customer it is seen as reciprocal. By serving the customer efficiently, the customer will ensure profitability. According to Cadbury (2002), reciprocal altruism does not exist between the company and its employees. He regards employment as a positive consequence out of the reciprocal, altruistic relationship between the company and its customers, yet not as a central business responsibility.

An extreme variation of the *Dirty Hands Dilemma* is called *Tricksterism*, which relates to the same situation of a conflict of interest between the business and society-at-large, but removes any possible guilt from the entrepreneur or business (Brenkert 2009). *Tricksterism* dilemmas connote an extreme form of moral relativism. Judgements are made before the evaluation of rules. They are often based on intuition and lack any sense of objectivity (Chonko, Wotruba and Loe 2003). These competing values are reflected in cases of bribery and corruption (Cadbury 2002). Although, ethical dilemmas should not be substituted for legal ones and vice versa (Piercy and Lane 2007).

Another relationship dilemma relates to role conflicts, such when one person has different roles – *Entangled Hands Dilemma* – or that too many people are involved in one decision with competing values – *Many Hands Dilemma* (Wempe 2005). Role conflicts play an important part of tourism entrepreneurship. They revolve around issues of procedural justice (Jamal and Camargo 2014) and issues of stakeholder complexity and lifestyle entrepreneurship. In synthesising these concepts, Chapter 4 will review these dilemmas in more detail within the tourism context.
Business dilemmas can also relate to distribution. Most commonly, this means conflicts over the fair and just distribution of profits and bonuses (Hannafey 2003). Hannafey (2003) also contends that such dilemmas are more common among new venture start-ups as they often lack an established system of income distribution. The dilemma tends to occur when there is uncertainty over how profits should be split. It involves the firm and its employees as well as equity shareholders. The clash often involves the debate over profit versus principles. Following a Friedmanian view on the responsibility of a firm, it becomes clear that shareholders should always gain their share of the profit first before any funds are spent otherwise. His argument is that if we were to follow that principle, then the distribution dilemma becomes void (Friedman 1970).

An issue arises when profits are connected to principles, such as fairness or equality. For example, Piercy and Lane (2007), in analysing power relationships between corporate sellers and buyers have discovered that unbalanced power relationships between larger, preferred suppliers, and the vast majority of smaller suppliers lead to “a form of cross-subsidiary which raises the moral question of whether it is right or fair to treat smaller customers this way.” (Piercy and Lane 2007) They call this the Benefits of the Few Dilemma, which is concerned with distributive injustice between strategic partners (the few), and all other suppliers or customers (the many). In the context of tourism, as will be shown in Chapter 4, this dilemma is quite pertinent. In many instances complicated supply chain management with a plethora of suppliers and buyers can lead to power imbalances and distributive injustice,
particularly within the realm of ‘greening’ the supply chain, under the guise of principles of sustainability and trust.

The notion of fairness coupled with forgiveness can also create another form of ethical business dilemma. An entrepreneur might knowingly circumvent an authoritative rule because he or she believes the benefits outweigh the rule breaking, and that distributive justice will be achieved. Then the entrepreneur will ask for forgiveness for the rule breaking later. Brenkert (2009) calls this *Permission and Forgiveness*. Forgiveness and positive unfairness of the forgiver has been a recurring phenomenon in the recent economic crisis. Rules have been circumvented in order to maximise profits and achieve greater distribution – general wealth. Yet, the consequence was one of distributive injustice between a few versus the many. As Sedlacek (2011) persuasively analyses, the recent bailouts of banks and insurance companies are a clear example of positive unfairness, or as Brenkert (2009) would call it – *Permission and Forgiveness*. However, they are not phenomena of recent times but have been deeply rooted in Christian tradition (Sedlacek 2011) and have shaped economic thinking and judgement approaches throughout the centuries. Following this review of business ethics, the remainder of the chapter is dedicated to ethics in tourism specifically.
2.3 TOURISM ETHICS

2.3.1 AN OVERVIEW

Tourism ethics has only recently emerged as a field of academic interest, whereas business ethics has seen a longer tradition. Early research into ethics and hospitality has been conducted by Hall (1993) and into ethics and marketing by Wheeler (1995); likewise Lea (1993) drew attention to ethical issues surrounding tourism development in the global South. It was not until the rise of the new sustainable development paradigm of the early 1990s that the tourism ethics discourse has gradually emerged and received attention as a field separate from general business ethics. The rationale behind this development is that general business ethics was seen as insufficient for tourism as it is an industry with special needs and therefore requires its own theoretical concept of ethics (Walle 1995). Section 2.3.2 will provide more detail on the rationale for a tourism ethic.

While ethics is widely recognised in tourism academia as the study of what is right and wrong within moral philosophy (Hudson and Miller 2005), Hultsman (1995) argues that ethics is not just as a philosophical framework, but also as a study of practical application. This interpretation is more aligned to its Greek origin, which translates *ethikos* into a habitual mode of conduct (Fennell 2006) and sits more comfortably with the applied ethics stance taken in this thesis. Considering ethics as a habitual mode of conduct related of actions of right and wrong also supports the aim of this thesis of studying values and types of behaviour for best practice in tourism.
Some attempts have been undertaken to categorise ethics in the tourism literature. For example, Gibson (2010) suggests looking at the ethical enterprise on the one hand and ethical tourist behaviour on the other. Fennell (2006) sees ethics in tourism broadly divided into three areas: business ethics, environment ethics, and development ethics. Whereas others, like Yaman and Gurel (2006), have much more detailed categorisations of ethics in tourism, namely industry operations, development and planning, types of tourism and marketing, codes of ethics, education, and decision-making. More recently, tourism ethics has also seen research into applying different ethical lenses for the purpose of creating a tourism value platform (see García-Rosell and Mäkinen 2013, Wijesinghe 2014). Combining those approaches towards ethics in the tourism literature, four broad areas have emerged: ethics theory in tourism, applied business ethics, environment and development ethics, and an ethic for tourists. The following paragraphs review these briefly.

2.3.1.1 Ethics theory in tourism

The writings on ethics theory focus largely on objective ethics theories, including deontology, teleology and Aristotelian virtue ethics (Fennell 2006, Hudson and Miller 2005, Jamal 2004, Malloy and Fennell 1998, Wijesinghe 2014). Deontology is often synonymous with Kantian ethics; however, Christian ethics also contain deontological elements. The two basic premises are: (1) the categorical imperative, which requires actions to be carried out only if they are universally applicable; and (2) the practical imperative, which attaches an intrinsic value to each human being, thus protecting them from being instrumentalised for other people's benefits.
Teleology, also often referred to as ‘consequentialism’ (Hudson and Miller 2005), on the other hand is based on cost-benefit considerations. In other words, actions are ethical relative to their ability to promote happiness. In teleological thinking, the end is more important than the means. Teleology can be further divided into egoism (greatest pleasure for oneself without regard for others), hedonism (greatest pleasure for one-self with minimum pain for others) and utilitarianism (greatest pleasure for the greatest group of people). Whilst, adventure tourism and beach holidays have mostly been seen as hedonistic experiences (Fennell and Malloy 1999) it is conceived that other types of travel, such as ecotourism, follow more deontological patterns (Minnaert, Maitland and Miller 2006). Virtue ethicists in tourism advocate the good life as the basic premise for an ethical modus operandi (Jamal 2004). This includes the formation of good character through daily practice and the contribution to the flourishing of society within reasonable means (Fennell 2006).

2.3.1.2 Business ethics in tourism

The second area of research can largely be summarised as applied business ethics in tourism. Strategic and operational perspectives form the basis of applied business ethics in tourism. Strategy in ethics often concerns codes of conduct that organisations either create or adopt (Coughlan 2001, D’Amore 1993, Guttman 1999, Marchoo, Butcher and Watkins 2014, Malloy and Fennell 1998, Payne and Dimanche 1996). Operational perspectives address business functions such as marketing, human resources or procurement (Butcher 2003, Dunfee and Black 1996, Fennell and Malloy 1999, Hall 1993, Lovelock 2004, Lovelock 2008, Minnaert et al. 2006,

2.3.1.3 Environment and Development Ethics in Tourism

Environment and development ethics form the third area of tourism ethics research. Both Fennell (2006, 2008) and Holden (2003, 2009) have written extensively about environmental ethics; whilst Lea (1993) and Smith and Duffy (2003) have contributed much to the tourism development ethics debate. Most research into environment ethics relates to the debate between anthropocentrism versus biocentrism or ecocentrism (Fennell 2006, Holden 2003, Holden 2009, Hudson and Miller 2005, Mowforth and Munt 2009). "Environmental ethics is subsequently concerned with redefining the human position towards nature." (Holden 2003, p. 97) In an anthropocentric view, nature serves humans and is instrumentalised for the benefit of human welfare. In other words, it has an extrinsic value to humankind. Biocentrists, however, would argue that nature has intrinsic value and cannot be viewed as a means to an end for humankind. Biocentrism is an interpretation of Kant's Practical Imperative. The anthropocentric view of nature domination has recently been infused with the notion of stewardship and as a result a conservation ethic has arisen parallel to the global sustainability movement (Holden 2003). The divide between an anthropocentric and a biocentric view has potential to create
further ethical dilemmas in tourism and needs to be subject of the investigation on challenges for best practice in tourism.

Environment ethics and development ethics are closely linked. The rapid growth of the tourism industry has sparked the debate on tourism ethics (Lea 1993). This is of particular importance to the developing world. “Tourism occupies an ambiguous position in its development effects, possessing both conservation and destructive characteristics.” (Lea 1993, p. 705) Advancements in the debate on development ethics in the global South should trigger more attention from aid organisations, funders and development NGOs (Lea 1993). This is crucial for fostering positive effects from tourism development. Development ethics also revolve around issues of stakeholder collaboration (Jamal and Stronza 2009). As such, they play a vital role in developing values for best practices in tourism.

2.3.1.4 A TOURIST ETHIC

The final field of tourism ethics research relates to the tourists themselves and their behaviour. Breakey and Breakey (2013), Butcher (2003, 2009, 2012), Gibson (2010), Malone, McCabe and Smith (2014), and Moufakkir and Burns (2012) amongst others have contributed to this field of knowledge. However, this thesis aims to look at the supply side, i.e. the tourism providers or entrepreneurs and their role behaviour and value judgement. Therefore, a more detailed investigation of literature about tourist behaviour and travel choices will be omitted from this review as it does not contribute to the research aims. It serves the purpose to be aware that this field of literature exists, but closer elaboration is not necessary in
this context. The following two sections will highlight the importance of applied ethics research in tourism from an industry perspective.

2.3.2 Tourism: an ethically sensitive industry

At the heart of the tourism industry's characteristics that render the necessity for a renewed focus of study for ethics in tourism, lays the notion that tourism is not merely an economic activity; instead it is both political and moral in its nature (Lovelock 2008). In fact, it is the encounter with the unknown, the unfamiliar, that makes tourism so prone to a plethora of ethical dilemmas (Gibson 2010). As an activity that is mainly concerned with human behaviour, tourism opens itself to ethical scrutiny. This behaviour stems primarily from the pursuit of hedonistic ends (Fennell 2006), and as such warrants the analysis of values and types of behaviour in tourism through an applied ethics lens.

Tourism practitioners have responded to this with the development of different types of tourism to hone in on unethical behaviour. These types range from alternative tourism to pro-poor tourism, responsible tourism, new moral tourism and the overarching panacea for ethical tourism – ecotourism. Yet, Fennell (2012, p. 189) solemnly voices, “No new form of tourism is suddenly about to change human nature.” With regards to human nature Butcher (2003, 2009, and 2012) warns of the over-moralisation of tourism. His argument, albeit overly pessimistic, is that debates about environmental and societal wellbeing through tourism have for too long been removed from economic welfare. As such, this thesis proposes a
behavioural analysis of the tourism industry removed from the paradigmatic environmental, socio-cultural and economic tripartite of sustainable tourism.

In addition, the tourism industry is subject to a plethora of structural concerns, which lead to the emergence of ethical dilemmas. Miller (2001) purports that limited price freedom, over-capacity of supply, intensive competition, and low customer loyalty are at the root cause for unethical trading in tourism. He explains, “the professionalism and short-term nature of the industry prevent it from taking a more responsible position.” (Miller 2001, p. 591) A report by the UK charity Tearfund in the same year confirms that industry consolidation threatens ethical behaviour and quality (Tearfund 2001). Payne and Dimanche (1996) call for an employment ethic for tourism, arguing that the service-orientation of the industry leave too much room for controversies. They state, “Often, the tone for an organisation’s standard of ethics will be given by its human resource management practices.” (Payne and Dimanche 1996, p. 1001) In addition to these industry factors, Walle (1995) concludes that the tourism industry in itself has the capacity of destroying its own product, thus making it a volatile contender for ethical transgressions. These structural issues result in operational challenges that once more need to be translated into adequate behavioural responses for sustainable tourism.

There is a common consensus, that complexity is the arch-fiend of the tourism industry (Fennell 2006, Lovelock 2004, Miller and Twining-Ward 2005). This begs the question, what exactly is meant by ‘complexity of the industry’? Hall and Brown (2006, p. 6) define complexity in tourism as the involvement of “several types of
actors representing a range of perspectives and objectives.” In other words, the existence of multiple stakeholders is regarded as the most challenging characteristic of the tourism system (Fennell 2006, Guttmann 1999, Miller and Twining-Ward 2005, Walle 1995). Tourism does not take place in isolated factories or on assembly lines. It is situated within communities and demands a responsibility for those communities in the form of a community ethic (Payne and Dimanche 1996). A community ethic stresses a collaborative approach to stakeholder involvement (Jamal and Stronza 2009), incorporating the concepts of procedural and distributive justice (Jamal and Camargo 2014). This involves values of fairness and empowerment. These preceding paragraphs make the case for adopting a value and behaviour perspective for sustainable tourism. As the review of the literature has shown, there is awareness of the structural issues that incur ethical dilemmas in tourism. Yet, little is known about appropriate behavioural responses and values to these dilemmas.

Two more ambiguities in the tourism system are worth mentioning at this stage as they impact on ethics in tourism directly. First, there is the question of growth. Growth is something generally regarded as positive. In recent developments, growth in GDP in the UK has been welcomed as a positive sign out of recession. There is an underlying expectation of growth in today’s society and any stagnation is seen as threatening (Sedlacek 2011). The tourism industry has delivered on its growth promise. Over the last 20 years, the world travel and tourism industry has grown steadily year on year at an average of 2.9%, with the exceptions of 2002 and 2009, both years following two major global crises – the September 11 attacks in 2001 and the financial crises of 2008 (WTTC 2014c). Total employment in tourism
has increased from 225 million globally in 1994 to 274 million in 2014 (WTTC 2014c) and over the next 20 years, the industry is set to see a rise in middle class consumers of 2 billion, with 1 billion coming from India and China alone (Blankfein 2010). Such growth projections will have a profound effect on the tourism industry, particularly on the demands on destination infrastructure and the distribution of resources (Moufakkir 2012, Jamal and Camargo 2014). Payne and Dimanche (1996) have called for a nature ethic to protect the limited resources from exploitation through tourism. Yet, Fennell (2006) assumes that it is not the scarcity of resources that will pose problems to tourism, but the poor stock-management track record of humankind. This rapid growth of tourism has been the catalyst for the tourism ethics debate (Lea 1993). As such, this thesis seeks to revisit the growth conundrum during the second phase of the empirical research.

The second ambiguity mentioned relates to the tourism product itself. Tourism is a peculiar product as such that consumption and production seems to happen simultaneously. Tourism is an experience rather than a tangible product. Ateljevic and Li (2009) argue that this highly experiential product gives reason for many ethical dilemmas. The question of character and judgement making becomes very prevalent due to the simultaneous process of production and consumption in tourism. Motivational, moral, emotional and practical standards can clash on many levels in what can be called an experience industry. The tourism industry finds itself in constant metamorphosis (Wheeler 1995), and with every metamorphosis comes potential for new ethical dilemmas. The experience conundrum requires further investigation and also forms part of the second phase of the empirical research.
2.3.3 Applied business ethics in tourism

It has been suggested that tourism ethics is an applied form of ethics (Fennell 2006, Hall and Brown 2006). Put differently, existing ethics theory is applied to practical situations in the tourism system. In considering business ethics and its effect on tourism activity, it has been found that as of yet most emphasis has been laid on the benefits and concerns of tourists. Consumers are one of the three groups for which companies have fiduciary responsibilities, in addition to society-at-large and equity holders (Raiborn and Payne 1990). Therefore, marketing tourism products and ensuring a person’s right to leisure – and by extension travelling – can provoke ethical dilemmas, those of which are usually discussed in tourism business ethics (Lovelock 2008). Visitor-related aspects of tourism activity are juxtaposed to host-related aspects in Minnaert et al.’s (2006) analysis of social tourism. In their subsequent, related study (Minnaert et al. 2011), three out of the four identified models of social tourism focus on the benefits for visitors and only one – the Stimulation Model – looks at host-related issues. This supports Lovelock’s (2008) argument that ethical issues in tourism business are usually related to the traveller, not so much to other stakeholders. Newer research has seen intensification into tourism business ethics with a strong visitor focus (Malone et al. 2014, Marchoo et al. 2014). This thesis seeks to shine light on other stakeholders in the tourism system beyond the consumer.

Payne and Dimanche (1996) purport that offering ethical travel products equals higher quality tourism for the visitor. Similarly, Tearfund (2001) suggests that supplying ethical travel is in itself a unique selling proposition and strengthens the
company-consumer-relationship. Yet, recent literature also suggests that there is a service quality gap between what consumers perceive as ethical travel and what tourism practitioners understand it to be (Smith and Font 2014). This consumer focus has a historical tradition according to Walle (1995), whereas it is only nowadays that companies start looking beyond their management sphere and into their wider influence on society (Fennell 2006). These developments in the literature open avenues for a reorientation away from the consumer focus towards adopting the perspectives of other actors in the tourism system.

The need for a more holistic approach in considering ethics and a company’s fiduciary responsibilities has led to the emergence of codes of ethics in tourism – most notably the inauguration of the *Global Codes of Ethics for Tourism* by UNWTO in 1999 (Guttman 1999). It has also sparked an academic interest in codes of ethics (see Fennell and Malloy 2007, Malloy and Fennell 1998, Payne and Dimanche 1996). Codes of ethics can be seen as a way to reconcile an organisation and its members with the greater good and benefit society at large (Hultsman 1995, Malloy and Fennell 1998). In tourism specifically, codes of ethics exist for both consumers and providers (Malloy and Fennell 1998). However, it is suggested that they must relate to government and the host community as well (Payne and Dimanche 1996). Hultsman (1995) warns though that codes need to be philosophically grounded, otherwise they would only serve the purpose of an operational guideline. Their main pitfalls are a lack of epistemological and cultural foundations as well as a lack of rationale and their tendency to appear as public relations devices (Malloy and Fennell 1998). However, they can be useful tools for the tourism industry. Payne and Dimanche (1996) explain that it is the diversity of the tourism industry that gives
reason to develop global ethical standards. In return because the industry is so
diverse, it needs global ethical standards. The latest endeavour of such a kind,
although not strictly relating to tourism ethics only, is the creation of the Global
Sustainable Tourism Criteria launched in 2008.

Despite a prolonged theoretical debate into codes of ethics, their usefulness has only
been marginally empirically tested. Marchoo et al. (2014) support the efficacy of
codes of ethics and their potential to positively influence travel behaviour and travel
choices. Contrary, Buckley (2002) has been less optimistic about the usefulness of
other forms of tourism accreditations. Suffice to say that codes of ethics and other
such tools are contested in the tourism literature.

Laws, rules and codes of ethics serve the purpose of being tools for making the right
decision (Hudson and Miller 2005). Despite the theoretical grounding attached to
those codes of conduct, Hudson and Miller (2005) also point out that two people
may still reach the same decision based on different ethical foundations. This
pluralistic approach assumes that cultural differences may lead to different
consequences regardless of applying the same rules and vice versa. In other words,
what seems right in one context might not be in another. Cultural relativism is
important when it comes to solving ethical dilemmas as it avoids moral superiority
and cultural hegemony (Fennell and Malloy 1999, Hudson and Miller 2005). Its
downside is that nearly every decision could be argued right or wrong applying the
rule of cultural relativism or a utilitarian calculus (Fennell 2006).
More recently, the role of emotion rather than reason has been highlighted as a strong motivational factor for ethical decision-making in tourism (Malone et al. 2014). This idea challenges the advocacy of utilitarian calculus in decision-making and deontological codes of ethics in applied business ethics in tourism. It calls for a reorientation on values that support ethical travel choices and behaviour, both from the consumer and the industry side. Applied business ethics in tourism has been mainly consumer-orientated and focused on consequences of travel choices. This thesis proposes to adopt a value-behavioural lens for applied business ethics in tourism, with a reorientation towards other important actors, such as entrepreneurs, in the tourism system.

2.4 Conclusion

The aim of this chapter was to bring together the research areas of tourism and ethics, with a particular focus on applied business ethics. The review has shown that there are competing schools of thought on business ethics, namely a separatist, a symbiotic and a differentiating one. All are embedded within the notions of individualised and socialised societies. However, while the first two views – separatist and symbiotic – focus on the relationship between the business and wider society; it is only the differentiating school of applied business ethics that considers the individual’s values and types of behaviours. More work is required in linking this particular view on business ethics to entrepreneurial motivation, as it is motivation that triggers action.
The literature review has also demonstrated that there are largely four areas of business responsibilities. These are fiduciary responsibilities, corporate social responsibility, economic responsibility and the responsibility to create employment – although the latter can be considered as a form of any one of the former responsibilities. Agreement exists over fiduciary and economic responsibilities, i.e. the money-based ones. The literature, however, is inconclusive about corporate social responsibility and particularly the job creation responsibility.

With regards to the profit versus principles debate, it has been shown that profit does not stand up as a primary business objective, but rather is a prerequisite for development and also a result out of economic activity. It is intricately linked to both. Profit optimisation outweighs profit maximisation as a business objective. Unclear, however, is what exactly constitutes profit optimisation. Graafland (2002) has attempted to provide a more nuanced view on the concept. Yet, the literature this far fails to give guidance for actions or types of behaviour that would lead to profit optimisation.

The literature on business dilemmas with an ethical dimension is diverse and scholars have developed a plethora of different ethical dilemma types. The review has shown, though, that these can be largely grouped into three categories: misrepresentation dilemmas, relationship dilemmas and distribution dilemmas. The underlying principle for each is that there is a clash of internalised standards that lead to the dilemma and that needs to be solved. The focus of research thus far has been on the dilemmas themselves. The standards (values) and problem-solving types of behaviour, however, have been neglected to some extent.
The emergence of tourism ethics as a field of academic research has coincided with the global sustainable development paradigm shift in the early 1990s and the rapid growth of the tourism industry. The literature on tourism ethics is largely focused on four areas of concern: ethics theory and tourism, applied business ethics, environment and development ethics, and a tourist ethic. The susceptibility of the tourism industry to ethical dilemmas has been well researched and agreement exists that behavioural, structural and multi-dimensional stakeholder relations are at the root cause of this ethical sensitivity. The literature focuses largely on the effects and consequences of these behavioural and structural issues. Great emphasis is put on the consumer as the centre of attention within tourism ethics. Furthermore, the growth and the experience conundrum have been acknowledged in the literature. Yet, they have not been addressed from an ethical judgement perspective.

Resulting from this review, this thesis seeks to address the following issues:

- Use the differing schools of thoughts on business ethics to understand the ethical nature of best practice;
- Apply the profit versus principle debate on values and types of behaviour for best practice in tourism;
- Use the categorisation of business dilemmas as primary themes for analysis during the first part of the empirical research;
- Use the growth and experience conundrum as explained in the literature to investigate entrepreneurial judgement making;
- Use the literature on tourism ethics to inform the discussion for developing an ethic for best practice in tourism.
3 Key Concepts: Entrepreneurial Role Behaviour and Ethic

Scholars should be very clear about why some individuals were identified as entrepreneurs to be studied in entrepreneurial activity.

(Gartner, Shaver, Gatewood and Katz 1994, p. 6)

3.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to examine the key characteristics of entrepreneurial role behaviour and in relation to this an entrepreneurial ethic. Drucker (1985) describes entrepreneurship as a form of behaviour rather than a person typology, and this view is also taken in this research. In response to Gartner et al.'s (1994) quote above, the question is not who is an entrepreneur, but rather how do they behave and which values underpin their behaviour. Entrepreneurial role behaviour is underpinned by certain personality traits. Personality traits include attitudes, motives and values (Brandstätter 2011). This chapter reviews the distinguishing attitude, motive and values for entrepreneurship. According to the Psychological Characteristics School of Entrepreneurship, these behaviour-influencing traits have been identified as the attitude towards risk-taking, the motive of need achievement and an entrepreneurial ethic (Cunningham and Lischeron 1991).

Entrepreneurship has been widely researched and enjoys a longstanding tradition dating back more than 300 years (Chell 2008). It has been looked at through various different lenses; and certain themes have been recurring throughout the ages of entrepreneurship research. Entrepreneurship has been described as an economic
function from an economist’s point of view (Kirzner 1973, Schumpeter 1934), a social interaction between individuals from a sociologist’s perspective (Chell 2008, Goss 2005), as a managerial function by means of acting on behalf of a firm (Adaman and Devine 2002) or indeed, as a transformational function and individual form of becoming an entrepreneur from a psychological perspective (Gartner 2008, Johannisson 2011).

Each lens has its merits. In relating back to the opening quote by William Gartner et al. (1994), it is very important to clarify which elements of entrepreneurship are relevant to the research – the economist’s, the sociologist’s or the psychologist’s perspective. The economist’s perspective has in the past dominated entrepreneurship research, but entrepreneurship is as much cultural and psychological as it is economic or technological-managerial (Drucker 1985). This research adopts the psychological perspective and focuses on the values and behaviour of individual entrepreneurs, rather than setting them against the backdrop of firm, economic system or society.

In this thesis, the aim is to uncover the ethical foundation of entrepreneurs and analyse their role behaviour within the realm of best practice tourism entrepreneurship. Values, virtues and vices need to be an integral element of this literature review, so do judgements of risk and opportunity. In addition, motivational aspects such as the need for achievement play a vital role as a cause for behaviour. This chapter first reviews entrepreneurial risk-taking, followed by the need for achievement motive for entrepreneurs. It then examines the current state of knowledge for an entrepreneurial ethic and concludes with a purposeful
definition for an entrepreneur in this research context. As argued in Chapter 1 of this thesis, the Psychological Characteristics School of Entrepreneurship builds an appropriate framework for achieving these research objectives. It stems from behavioural psychology and is based on three core principles: risk, achievement and ethics. It looks at entrepreneurship through the eyes of the founder who has control over the means of production and asks questions about their value system (Cunningham and Lischeron 1991). As such it offers the best and most relevant lens for understanding entrepreneurship, entrepreneurial role behaviour and entrepreneurial characteristics in the context of this thesis.

3.2 ENTREPRENEURIAL RISK-TAKING

Being an entrepreneur a risky business (Sarasvathy, Simon and Lave 1998). It is risky because there are only few entrepreneurs that have the abilities to run their business successfully and commercially viable (Drucker 1985). In a recent statistic by the UK House of Commons, this problem is highlighted as follows: “There were 270,000 business births in 2012 and 255,000 business deaths.” (House of Commons 2014, p. 1) Such a high rate of entrepreneurial failure begs the question, why anyone would enter this risky business at all. Unsurprisingly, attitude to risk is one of the main distinguishing features between an entrepreneur, who chooses the hazards of self-employment and potential self-finance, and the employee who prefers the “safety of wages” (Newman 2007, p. 11).

There is widespread consensus in the literature that risk-taking is closely linked to entrepreneurial behaviour (Arthur and Hisrich 2011, Caliendo, Fossen and Kritikos
Disagreements, however, exist over the definitions of the concepts of risk and uncertainty, over the importance between risk propensity and risk perception as the guiding principle for entrepreneurial risk-taking and over various forms of risk beyond the monetary one that the entrepreneur bears. What is for certain is that taking risks is a fundamental element of any entrepreneurial activity (Arthur and Hisrich 2011). Taking risks means making judgements, often in situations that denote business dilemmas as described in Chapter 2. A review of entrepreneurial risk-taking is thus directly linked to research aim two and its objective to understand which risks or challenges affect best practice entrepreneurs and how they judge these situations. The following section will look at various risk concepts in more detail.

3.2.1 Risk: A Polysemic Construct

In everyday language risk is often used synonymously with other words, such as uncertainty, challenge, variance, loss, or opportunity. However, although these concepts are intricately linked to one another, they are not the same. In a Knightian view, risk emerges from uncertainty and the two concepts are not synonymous (1921). Risk is measurable uncertainty and allows the actor to estimate a probability of a negative consequence to happen. In other words, risk can be calculated and Knight (1921) acknowledges the ability to calculate risk to be a managerial skill, but not an entrepreneurial skill. The differentiating factor is that under conditions of true uncertainty a probability estimate of the likelihood of the event to occur is not
possible – it is immeasurable. He distinguishes the entrepreneur as being the person who cannot only calculate risk, but also navigate through times of true uncertainty (Knight 1921). Navigating uncertainty in everyday decision-making is based on intuition, common sense and judgement and not on logical reasoning (Knight 1921). He states: “The ordinary decisions of life are made on the basis of “estimates” of a crude and superficial character.” (1921, p. 210)

Kirby (2003) supports this argument. It is only through knowledge and judgement, foresight, superior managerial ability and confidence that the entrepreneur can successfully navigate through uncertainty without the possibility of calculating risk. Knowledge here is imperfect and Knight (1921) asserts that the entrepreneur has the ability to adapt to this imperfect knowledge and convert it into workable knowledge that goes beyond calculations of probability.

Risk and uncertainty are therefore not the same. Risk is an effect of uncertain conditions and uncertainty most likely causes risk. However, in both instances, the entrepreneurial activity is adaptive to external conditions – a prerequisite to Knight’s (1921) understanding of the entrepreneurial life. In conclusion, it has become evident that risk and uncertainty are not synonymous. However, they are intrinsically linked to one another and thus, risk-taking has inevitably become an entrepreneurial attribute (Arthur and Hisrich 2011).

In addition to the risk–uncertainty relationship risk has other meanings that need to be understood in order to comprehend entrepreneurial risk taking. McClelland (1961) points out that risk must not be confused with challenge. In his view, risk is
the effect of uncertain conditions, but a challenge describes the character of a task (McClelland 1961). Entrepreneurs tend to perform better in challenging tasks than routine tasks (McClelland 1961). Performing well in a challenging task, however, does not give insight into an entrepreneur's risk attitude. It simply gives an indication of the entrepreneur's ability to perform at a task. However, as previously noted, superior managerial ability is a prerequisite to performing well under conditions of uncertainty (Kirby 2003). Therefore, challenge is also linked to uncertainty, although it is not synonymous with risk.

If risk is neither challenge nor uncertainty, then what constitutes risk that makes it so important an attribute in the entrepreneurship literature? Janney and Dess (2006, p. 388) construe several meanings of risk. In their view there are “... different phenomena that all carry the same name: risk.” First, risk can be seen as variance. This means that risk manifests itself through the variation or spread of possible outcomes, and outcomes of varying identity create uncertainty. Second, risk is regarded as a downside loss or the likelihood of a negative event occurring. Janney and Dess (2006) argue that this is the most salient of risk perception in start-up businesses. Entrepreneurial survival depends on the willingness to take further risks rather than retreating from the venture in order to avoid even further losses (Faragó et al. 2008). Lastly, Janney and Dess (2006) recognise risk as opportunity. This construct manifests itself through weighing up different opportunities and calculating the opportunity costs. The question is what is at stake for the entrepreneur by exploiting one or the other opportunity. Faragó et al. (2008) conclude that entrepreneurs value the stakes at risk higher than the probability of the win. Herein lies one of the ethical complexities of entrepreneurial role
behaviour. While Janney and Dess (2006) conceptualise risk as a form of utilitarian calculus, Faragó et al.’s (2008) interpretation emphasises the value of means (the stakes) higher than that of ends (probability to win). This reflects a deontological view on risk-taking. In conclusion, risk differs from challenge as in the former being a behavioural attitude and the latter being a characteristic of a task and risk manifests itself through the constructs of variance, loss and opportunity.

3.2.2 Risk perception versus risk propensity

Consensus on this entrepreneurial attribute has failed to be reached among the academic society. Kirby (2003) purports that there is no general agreement as to whether an entrepreneur possesses a higher propensity towards taking risks than a business manager does, or in fact the general population. Risk perception is more important in understanding entrepreneurial risk-taking than risk propensity (Janney and Dess 2006). The argument is that entrepreneurs perceive risks differently from their non-entrepreneur peers and perceive their chances of success higher (McClelland 1961). As a consequence, entrepreneurs may be seen to be less risk averse by engaging in riskier activities than non-entrepreneurs, whereas in actuality they simply see the situation as less likely to go wrong.

Perception depends largely on the context in which they perform their activity. As Sarasvathy et al. (1998, p. 208) state: “... it is not risk propensity that is relevant to understanding risk perception, but feelings of control and responsibility and personal values.” Entrepreneurs tend to take higher risks when they are already making a profit, as the perception of their situation is a favourable one (Faragó et al.
Contrary, in a losing situation an entrepreneur seeks to reduce risk under conditions of uncertainty by shifting them onto other stakeholders (Rae 2007). However, risk is not always related to financial aspects of the entrepreneurial venture. In addition to monetary risk three other types of perceived risk exist and impact on entrepreneurial role behaviour. These are functional, social and psychological risk (Solomon, Bamossy and Askegaard 2002) and are now discussed in more detail.

3.2.3 Types of perceived risk

3.2.3.1 Monetary risk

Monetary risk relates to asset investment, including money and property. The least vulnerable is the agent with the least assets involved in the entrepreneurial venture. From an economist’s perspective, ownership is not a pre-requisite for entrepreneurship (Kirzner 1973, Schumpeter 1934). As such, this research does not focus on (small) business owners. Rather, the focus is on the elements comprising entrepreneurial activity that are of interest. This fundamentally includes: first, entrepreneurial activity manifests itself through an alertness to new possibilities (Kirzner 1973) and second, through the innovation of new creations, such as goods, production methods, sources of supply, markets or organisational forms (Schumpeter 1934). These new creation can also be intangible, such as applying innovative management structures or a changing set of values (Drucker 1985). In both instances, ownership is not a necessity for being an entrepreneur. This limits the scope of monetary risk.
However, whilst ownership can be excluded, the notion of founding a venture cannot be. The process of founding a venture is characterised by recognising an opportunity and acting upon it while securing financial means to do so. For the purpose of this research, this reveals an important criterion towards a definition of an entrepreneur. An entrepreneur is not necessarily a small business owner, but someone who has founded a new business venture. It is the process of individual creation that characterises an entrepreneur (Gartner 2008).

3.2.3.2 Functional risk

If founding a business does not necessarily mean monetary risk, or the ownership of assets, it certainly incorporates a functional risk to the founder-entrepreneur. Functional risk manifests itself in the locus of control. Locus of control is another personality construct of the entrepreneurial personality that is closely associated to the construct of risk-taking (Brandstätter 2011). Control does not equal ownership. It rather manifests itself in the ability to exercise power and make decisions over means of production and should be viewed along a continuum from single-individual control towards control sharing with other stakeholders (Rae 2007). Entrepreneurship is also a pluralistic activity and involves a plethora of stakeholders (Gartner et al. 1994), so the functional risk that the entrepreneur bears is the degree to which he or she has to share control with various stakeholders of the new venture. Functional risk becomes pertinent in tourism entrepreneurship due to the plethora of stakeholders involved in the tourism system.
3.2.3.3 Social risk

The existence of various stakeholders also creates a social risk for the entrepreneur. Social risk “consists of affiliations and status. Those lacking in self-esteem or attractiveness to peers are most sensitive.” (Solomon et al. 2002, p. 247) The status of a successful entrepreneur depends on their ability to foster co-operation with the community, their ability to convince customers of the benefits of the new innovation and their ability to withstand group resistance to new innovations (Schumpeter 1934). Weber (1930, p. 69) warns “A flood of mistrust, sometimes hatred, above all moral indignation, regularly opposed itself to the first innovator.” A successful entrepreneur is a moderate risk-taker (McClelland 1961), not a gambler, and understands his or her role in creating value for businesses and communities (Fillis and Rentschler 2010). Miller and Collier (2010) speak of transformational entrepreneurs who overcome social risks by creating value for the wider society. This is closely linked to Wempe’s (2005) assertion that ethical entrepreneurs contribute to the betterment of wider society.

3.2.3.4 Psychological risk

Social risks are often connected to psychological risks and often associated to low self-esteem and insecurity (Solomon et al. 2002). Insecurity can also be seen as a form of anxiety. Entrepreneurs are known to have the quality of self-efficacy, which is said to be a dominating characteristic of the entrepreneurial personality (Brandstätter 2011). They have a tendency to over-estimate their chances of winning and over-confidence arises out of conviction to be able to modify the results
because of one’s personal skills (McClelland 1961). For the entrepreneur, psychological risk usually does not result from low self-esteem.

However, it is the second element of psychological risk – insecurity or anxiety – that plays a crucial role in entrepreneurial risk-taking. As Hagen (1964) points out anxiety is a fundamental element of any entrepreneurial or innovative behaviour. The anxiety of not having done enough to succeed pushes the entrepreneur towards greater activity, but also increases psychological risk. Concluding, psychological risk factors are important when analysing entrepreneurial risk taking. Despite a general high self-esteem and self-efficacy, it is anxiety that generates psychological risk for the entrepreneur. Risk-taking has been established as a distinguishing attitude for entrepreneurial behaviour. Understanding what worries best practice tourism entrepreneurs, in other words, which risks they perceive, which external conditions of uncertainty they need to navigate, and how they judge these situations is a key objective of this research as it contributes towards developing a deeper insight into entrepreneurial role behaviour for best practice or ethical entrepreneurship. First though, it is prudent to look at the distinguishing motive for entrepreneurs.

3.3 ENTREPRENEURIAL NEED FOR ACHIEVEMENT (N(Ach))

Whilst risk-taking constitutes the distinguishing behavioural attitude of entrepreneurs, the need for achievement has been identified as the distinguishing motivational factor for entrepreneurs (Cunningham and Lischeron 1991). Contrary to the risk element of the Psychological Characteristics School of Entrepreneurship, the concept of n(Ach) is well defined and clearly understood. N(Ach) means need for
achievement and pertains to a particular psychological factor responsible for economic growth or decline (McClelland 1961). In other words, it is the personality trait that drives a person towards a certain type of behaviour, which results in either economic success or failure. It is thus a motivational factor. Brandstätter (2011) points out that motivational factors are as much personality traits as attitudes and values are. This research seeks to understand this motivational factor in relation to the values for best practice in tourism entrepreneurship. Questions are raised over the achievement of what and how this is achieved. A focus on an entrepreneurial mission in the second phase of the empirical research directly mirrors a value and behaviour lens for ethical entrepreneurship.

3.3.1 Achievement motivation

Both, risk-taking and motivation are elements of a dynamic and process-orientated entrepreneurship theory (Chell 2008, Rae 2007). “Motivation refers to the processes that cause people to behave as they do. From a psychological perspective, motivation occurs when a need is aroused that the [entrepreneur] wishes to satisfy.” (Solomon et al. 2002, p. 92) When the need to be satisfied relates to becoming a member of a certain group, the motivation is called psychogenic (Solomon et al. 2002). This is particularly relevant for researching entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial motivation because entrepreneurship is best understood from an ontological perspective of ‘becoming’ rather than a static view of ‘being’ an entrepreneur (Bygrave 1989, Johannisson 2011). In this psychogenic view, entrepreneurial motivation refers to the need to achieve social distinction by becoming a member of the entrepreneurial group. This, in effect, is seen as one of
the core motives for entrepreneurial role behaviour in addition to the will to conquer and to create something new (Schumpeter 1934).

In addition n(Ach) relates to the need to overcome challenges (Chell 2008). Therefore, n(Ach) can be classified as an entrepreneurial motivation and falls under the achievement models. It is a mix between a perceived high self-efficacy and the intrinsic motivation of just wanting to do well (Kirby 2003). In this regard, n(Ach) relates back to entrepreneurial risk-taking, which is shaped by an entrepreneur’s perception of higher chances of success stemming from higher levels of self-efficacy. From this perspective, n(Ach) is not a motivational factor for necessity entrepreneurship (work hard or you will starve to death), but rather an opportunistic motivation (Kirby 2003). The entrepreneur with high levels of n(Ach) and thus a strong motivation to act entrepreneurially strives towards exploiting an opportunity and in so doing achieves social distinction.

3.3.2 THE PROFIT VERSUS THE ACHIEVEMENT MOTIVE

If n(Ach) was the distinguishing motivation for entrepreneurs it would logically override the profit-motive that is often associated to be the driving force behind any entrepreneurial activity. It is important to qualify this idea of the profit motive in order to better understand entrepreneurial motivation. From an economist’s perspective, Schumpeter (1934, p. 154) has been known to advocate the profit-motive strongly as he explains, “...without development there is no profit, without profit there is no development. For the capitalist system, it must be added further that without profit, there would be no accumulation of wealth.” However, from a
psychological-behavioural perspective, Schumpeter (1934) also states that the entrepreneur distinguishes him or herself from the business owner by creating change – or development. At this point the profit-motive loses its strength.

Profit is regarded as a necessity to instigate change. The primary motivation is the achievement of change; after that comes profit (McClelland 1961). Profit should thus not be regarded as a primary motivation for acting entrepreneurially. Rather, it should be seen as a result that follows after the need for achievement has been satisfied. The entrepreneur is seen to be wanting to earn, rather than to consume (McClelland 1961, Weber 1930) and earning is associated with achievement, whereas consuming is associated with reaping the benefits of a profit. Weber (1930, p. 71) purports “He gets nothing out of his wealth for himself, except the irrational sense of having done his job well.”

Another argument against profit as the primary motivation for entrepreneurial behaviour is that entrepreneurial behaviour is seen as a transformational activity that transcends the profit motive (Hagen 1964). According to Gartner (2008) entrepreneurship is always transformational on an individual level as it relates to the process of becoming an entrepreneur, rather than being one. Transformational entrepreneurship, which transcends the profit motive, then includes non-profit and social entrepreneurs (Miller and Collier 2010). For the purpose of this research, this is of particular importance. Tourism activity is often instigated by non-profit organisations that aid tourism development. Non-profit organisations founded by social entrepreneurs will, therefore, not be excluded from this research.
Lastly, profit maximisation is also a contentious subject as Chapter 2 has shown. In essence, profit maximisation is a contractual agreement between different stakeholders, namely the entrepreneur and the equity interest holder. Profit maximisation is the assumed outcome of this contract. By nature, this makes it non-entrepreneurial because in entrepreneurship the outcome is often unknown (Adaman and Devine 2002). In conclusion, the profit motive does not stand up to fully explain the primary driver behind entrepreneurial motivation. It is a secondary motive following that of achievement of change. It is transcended by transformational entrepreneurship and it is contractual and managerial, not entrepreneurial.

3.3.3 n(ACH) and the Entrepreneur

McClelland (1961), who pioneered the concept of n(Ach), characterises people with high levels of n(Ach) as follows: people with high n(Ach) are said to be moderate risk-takers, but not gamblers; they are known to perform better in challenging tasks and perceive their chances of success higher. They also display a higher level of entrepreneurial ambition, which is said to equal innovativeness, not efficiency. High n(Ach) personalities rank personal accomplishments higher than public recognition and have a sense of achievement when having helped a group, and thus are characterised by a form of individualistic altruism. In essence, people with high n(Ach) have greater satisfaction of their achievements (McClelland 1961).

Hagen (1964) adds to this characterisation that innovative personalities usually display higher levels of n(Ach), but the sense of achievement is not always positive.
Sometimes, they are driven by a sense of duty, a belief in a higher order of things, and a need to overcome a persistent feeling of anxiety (Hagen 1964). Personalities with high levels of n(Ach) are said to be hard working and feel a need to master skills. Yet, they lack to display a notion of competitiveness (Carsrud and Brännback 2011). Although surprising it may seem at first, having a competitive personality does not necessarily match that of an entrepreneurial personality. Competitiveness requires an outward orientation, whilst the entrepreneur's perspective is inward looking and individualistic. Competitiveness is a necessity to exercise one's energy and ingenuity (Schumpeter 1934), but competitiveness is not a primary driver for an entrepreneur. His or her objective is to create something new, which in itself defeats the object of competition (Schumpeter 1934).

The question remains, however, whether these psychological characteristics are unique to the entrepreneur. It was stated earlier, that having a high level of n(Ach) is the distinguishing motivation for entrepreneurial activity. There is a need to qualify this statement and to substantiate it with findings from previous research. Kirby (2003) purports that a high level of n(Ach) is not a distinguishing feature between entrepreneurs and non-entrepreneurs. Rather, n(Ach) is a differentiating measure for acting or thinking entrepreneurially. Acting entrepreneurially can take place in various walks of life. As Drucker contends (1985, p. 21) “..., entrepreneurship is by no means confined solely to economic institutions.” For example, you may find entrepreneurially minded artists or musicians, teachers or hospital nurses. These individuals will have high levels of n(Ach) and engage in a form of entrepreneurial behaviour in order to achieve the social distinction they are aiming for within their group of peers (Kirby 2003). Fillis and Rentschler (2010)
support this view and state that many similarities can be found between artistic
behaviour and entrepreneurial behaviour. For this research, it is important to
understand that n(Ach) is a behavioural concept and not a means of developing
person typologies. This is not an objective of this research. Rather, this research
aims to analyse how values and behaviour for ethical entrepreneurship are (if at all)
influenced by the need for achievement.

Nevertheless, it is McClelland’s profound emphasis of n(Ach) as an entrepreneurial
concept (1965) that has led researchers to investigate this correlation in more
depth. Concluding from a longitudinal study of Harvard university graduates,
McClelland (1965) contends that individuals with higher levels of n(Ach) gravitate
towards choosing an entrepreneurial occupation. He clarifies his understanding of
an entrepreneurial occupation to be one that requires high levels of self-initiative, a
greater degree of individual responsibility and more personal risk (McClelland
1965). He carefully avoids the classification of the entrepreneur-occupation as the
subject of interest in this study. McClelland’s distinction between an entrepreneurial
occupation and an entrepreneur occupation supports Kirby’s (2003) view that
people can act entrepreneurially in different occupations. This conclusion leaves to
believe that high levels of n(Ach) are not a unique feature of entrepreneurs versus
non-entrepreneurs, but are most certainly a unique motivation for acting
entrepreneurially. The emphasis once more lies on entrepreneurial behaviour,
which is the focus of this research. In conclusion having high levels of n(Ach) is
indeed a unique and distinguishing feature for entrepreneurial role behaviour and
entrepreneurial motivation, even if high levels of n(Ach) are not exclusive to the
entrepreneur-group. Finally, in the next section literature about an entrepreneurial ethic is reviewed more closely.

3.4 AN ENTREPRENEURIAL ETHIC

The discussion on ethics in relation to entrepreneurship has become an accepted field of study in the recent literature and is often concerned with the nexus between means and ends, or resources and targets of entrepreneurial activity (Wempe 2005). It constitutes the third core element of studying entrepreneurship through a behavioural psychological lens according to Cunningham and Lischeron (1991). They purport that entrepreneurs are more ethical and socially responsible than the majority of the population (Cunningham and Lischeron, 1991, p. 49). This bold claim demands further analysis of the entrepreneurial ethics literature and some substantiating evidence. This section of this literature review chapter aims to uncover the meaning of an entrepreneurial ethic in academia to date and opens new paths for research for this thesis. As previously mentioned, ethics is also known as moral philosophy and concerns itself with the judgement of what is right and wrong. In this respect, the terms ethics and morals will be used interchangeably. The focus of this section is on an entrepreneurial ethic. Chapter 2 has highlighted that ethical dilemmas arise from situations of change and conflict. Consequently, there are constantly ethical dilemmas that entrepreneurs encounter, since change is at the heart of entrepreneurship (Brenkert 2009).

Hannafey’s (2003) comprehensive review of the literature on ethics and entrepreneurship concludes that there are two perspectives dominating current
research. First, there is a concern about the individual entrepreneur and their ethical foundation. This, perspective looks at personal characteristics such as virtues and vices and the behavioural psychology of decision-making. It follows a personal-constructivist epistemology. Hannafey (2003) further identifies entrepreneurship and society as a second lens of research. The focus here is on the effects of entrepreneurial activity on society. This lens is built on the notion that entrepreneurship requires social approval and legitimisation from stakeholders in order to be deemed ethical (Anderson and Smith 2007). It is based on a social constructionist view that although an entrepreneurial ethic is voluntary, it has to be socially legitimated (Anderson and Smith 2007). Harris, Sapienza and Bowie (2009) further expand on these two perspectives to include the emerging field of social entrepreneurship. So far, academia has focussed on the definition, performance and purpose of such social entrepreneurial ventures (Harris et al. 2009). However, it is the individual and personally constructed entrepreneurial ethic that is the focus of this research and corresponds to Cunningham and Lischeron’s (1991) Psychological Characteristics School of Entrepreneurship. The remainder of this chapter examines these individual virtues and vices of entrepreneurs as well as behavioural responses. First though, a review of entrepreneurship and ethics theory is advisable.

3.4.1 Entrepreneurship and ethics theory

Entrepreneurship and ethics theory research mostly originates from the late 1980s when Longenecker, McKinney and Moore (1988) conducted a large-scale, quantitative, psychological analysis on ethical standards between self-employed members of the public and those in formalised employee relationships. Prior to that,
the field of ethics and entrepreneurship was barren with the exception of Max Weber's seminal work *Protestant Ethics and the Spirit of Capitalism* at the cusp of the 20th century. Although situated at a time of cultural hegemony, Weber sets out to rationalise the peculiarities of Western capitalism and develops a baseline ethic for a capitalistic entrepreneurship.

By analysing historical and technological developments in different world regions, he concludes that Western capitalism differs from any other form of economic development in the following ways: it is based on the rational organisation of free labour, it evolved from the separation of the household from economic life, it is recorded through rational book keeping, it has been strongly influence by technological advancements, and it relies on a rational legal system and business administration (Weber 1930). He calls this the "rational ethic of ascetic Protestantism." (Weber 1930, p. 27) It is situated within the deontological ethical paradigm and according to Weber (1930) it is the duty of the individual to participate in economic development for the sake of increasing profit and capital. Making profit, thus, becomes the highest virtue of economic activity and "is above all completely devoid of any eudemonistic, not to say hedonistic, admixture." (Weber, 1930, p. 53) This is in essence the spirit of capitalism. It means to make profit is the highest virtue in itself. This does not contradict the earlier discussion about the profit motive. In fact, his argument supports the achievement motive as a primary motivational factor. In Weber's (1930) view, it is profit that has to be achieved for the sake of earning it and not of consuming it. To Weber (1930, p. 75) entrepreneurship is a calling "toward which the individual feels himself to have an ethical obligation." By using casuistry as a form of theoretical differentiation (Weber
1922), Weber has created an Ideal-Type construct for the capitalist entrepreneur. This thesis seeks to do the same for the ethical tourism entrepreneur. The theoretical differentiation stems from the different narratives that best practice tourism entrepreneurs have provided for this thesis.

It may not come as a surprise that entrepreneurship has been linked to a utilitarian perspective, or even its more extreme variation of egoism. Longenecker et al. (1988) argue that entrepreneurship is a very individual activity and focused on one’s self-enhancement or self-interest. In their view, self-interest is the core criterion for the egoist’s ethical orientation and this links entrepreneurship to egoism (Longenecker et al. 1988). Cordeiro’s (2008) supporting argument for this view is that individualism is the underlying characteristic of entrepreneurship and thus, every entrepreneur is at the core an egoist. In looking back at the concept of n(Ach), further support for this argument can be found, as it has been established that individuals with higher levels of n(Ach) rank personal accomplishment (self-enhancement) higher than public recognition (McClelland 1961). The utilitarian perspective is also underpinned by entrepreneurial risk-taking tendencies. As stated earlier, the entrepreneur takes higher risks in situations, which are already favourable to them (Faragó et al. 2008). Thus, entrepreneurs are less averse to risk in order to maximise their pleasure.

It seems the utilitarian perspective is the most closely linked to entrepreneurial role behaviour. However, this view excludes the darker sides of entrepreneurship, such as the lack of safety of wages (Newman 2007); the psychological and social risks faced by many entrepreneurs (Arthur and Hisrich 2011); and lastly the ethical
obligation to simply perform well in one’s occupation (Weber 1930). Such side effects of entrepreneurship certainly do not correspond to the concepts of happiness and pleasure advocated in a utilitarian ethical perspective.

In contrast to the notion of self-interest, Plinio’s (2009) work on ethical leadership suggests that ethical behaviour is something that is expected from society. This corresponds to the earlier mentioned argument by Anderson and Smith (2007) who contend that ethical behaviour demands to be socially legitimised. The question arises as to how such approval or legitimisation should look like? In addition, Weber (1930) has emphasised that the duty to perform well is an ethical obligation for entrepreneurs. These arguments are founded in a deontological ethics framework. However, as Plinio (2009) contends entrepreneurship is much too pluralistic to be deontological in nature. Value pluralism stems from constantly changing circumstances, which in itself is an underlying criterion for entrepreneurship. New values are created when entrepreneurs see conflicts between existing values (Wempe 2005) and different values may exists in business and in non-business environments (Brenkert 2009).

Once more, as other concepts in this thesis, entrepreneurship also emerges to be ethically complex. It is a mixture between a deontological, duty-bound work ethic and the utilitarian notion of achievement that best describes an ethic for entrepreneurs. Some researchers conclude that it is best understood through a virtue ethics lens (Brenkert 2009, Colonomos 2005, Johannisson 2011, Macdonald and Beck-Dudley 1994, Miller and Collier 2010) As Macdonald and Beck-Dudley (1994) explain; deontology and utilitarianism are not mutually exclusive.
The traditional teleology [or virtue ethics] is a synthesis of the thesis of deontology and the antithesis of utilitarianism. [...] It contains the best of both approaches and can be used to focus on the individual’s role within the organisation.

(Macdonald and Beck-Dudley, 1994, pp. 615-616)

The complexity of the entrepreneurial environment makes an ethical evaluation in accordance with either rules (deontology) or consequences (utilitarianism) insufficient. Rather it is virtuous behaviour that has to build the basis for an entrepreneurial ethic (Brenkert 2009, Hartman 2011, Plinio 2009, Wempe 2005). This lens reflects the aim of this research for understanding virtues, values and types of behaviour for best practice in tourism entrepreneurship.

3.4.2 ENTREPRENEURIAL VIRTUES AND VICES

A virtue approach to ethical behaviour surpasses rules and consequences and puts emphasis on the individual’s character (Dawson, Breen and Satyen 2002, Plinio 2009) with the aim of contributing to the flourishing of society (Brenkert 2009). In an entrepreneurial context, Colonomos (2005) defines virtue as follows:

Virtue is defined by reference to efficiency; the moral entrepreneur takes on board the reality of the functioning of capitalism and – with a view to general good, subject to the capitalist’s accepting and observing certain criteria governing professional ethics – consents to work for financial and social
profitability of the firm.

(Colonomos 2005, p. 463)

This definition embraces numerous concepts that are central to an entrepreneurial ethic. First, efficiency can be extended to utility and puts emphasis on the need for useful consequences of actions. It is also mirrored in the need for achievement motive. Second, the moral entrepreneur operates within the rational framework of capitalism. He or she will be subject to internal and external forces. Third, the general good relates to the notion of a flourishing society. Fourth, the moral entrepreneur’s work is legitimised financially by shareholders and socially by stakeholders and embraces deontological rules and duties. Virtuous behaviour is connected to reward, whereas unethical behaviour is linked to punishment (Colonomos 2005). Lastly, it is the free will of the entrepreneur that results in ethical behaviour for the benefit of the firm and society-at-large. The last point touches upon Hartman’s (2011) view that virtuous behaviour includes both internal and external goods. They are internally good for the benefit of the firm and externally good for the benefit of society, whereby these goods must be goods and not bads. Otherwise, as Hartman (2011) states, there is no evidence of virtuous behaviour.

Virtuous behaviour manifests itself through the virtues of prudence, justice, courage and temperance (Miller and Collier 2010). The entrepreneur acts prudently in as such that he or she does not take exacerbated risks when conducting business (McClelland 1961). Entrepreneurial justice expresses itself in the form of individualistic altruism. This means an entrepreneur strives towards achievement by helping a group of people and believing in a higher order (Hagen 1964,
McClelland 1961). He or she shows courage by breaking with traditionalism and creating new combinations (Schumpeter 1934, Weber 1930). Entrepreneurial temperance manifests itself in the satisfaction the entrepreneur gets from achievement rather than profit and the want to earn rather than to consume (McClelland 1961, Weber 1930).

As every coin has two sides, so does entrepreneurship. Kets de Vries (1985) and Kuratko (2007) call this the dark side of entrepreneurship when virtues turn into vices. In a series of interviews with former entrepreneurs who have abandoned their businesses to become managers in organisations, Kets de Vries (1985) identified three particular vices relating to entrepreneurial role behaviour. These are a need for control, a sense of distrust and the desire for applause. Vices like these stem from anxiety and need for achievement. Anxiety has been enhanced by the loss of control since entering into a managerial position; and need for achievement, which has been subdued by internal managerial rules and politics. Kuratko (2007) sees the same set of vices in entrepreneurs who are still in self-employed situations and concludes that these vices often result from risk confrontation, the stress of working too much and an inflated ego. With regards to entrepreneurial virtues and vices Brenkert (2009, p. 457) states: “The entrepreneur, I shall contend, is a figure of the good and flourishing life that, at times, may trump the moral life as well.”

3.4.3 ENTREPRENEURS AND ETHICAL BEHAVIOUR

A review of virtues and vices must follow a review of the literature on ethical behaviour of entrepreneurs. This is in keeping with the psychological-behavioural...
lens of this research. Two key themes emerge from the entrepreneurial, ethical behaviour literature. First, there is a question as to whether entrepreneurs behave more ethically than non-entrepreneurs. And second, a debate exists over the changes in behaviour of entrepreneurs under differing circumstances relating to personal strains, locus of control and general ethical standards.

It is useful to bring back to mind the opening remarks of this section and within it Cunningham and Lischeron’s (1991) bold claim that entrepreneurs are generally more ethical and socially responsible than the rest of the population. In response, a study of entrepreneurs versus managers conducted by Bucar, Glas and Hisrich (2003) concludes that they could not find a significant difference in ethical attitudes between managers and entrepreneurs. They did, however, find a significant difference in ethical behaviour between entrepreneurs and managers (Bucar et al. 2003). In simpler terms, both groups know what is ethical, but entrepreneurs tend to act upon it too. One explanation could be that managers may know what is ethical as much as entrepreneurs do, but their actions are much more restricted by the guidelines and policies of the organisation that employs them. Freedom to act is more restrained for the employed than for the self-employed.

Another explanation comes from looking at the subject towards which ethical behaviour is directed. In 13 in-depth interviews with US entrepreneurs Cordeiro (2008) discovered that an entrepreneur’s ethical orientation is most likely to be internally focused within the company, not externally. An internal focus also leaves more room to act if one is the owner of the firm and has a stronger locus of control. Dawson et al. (2002) revealed that it is indeed the case that entrepreneurs have
much greater concern for their own employees than for other stakeholders outside of the organisation. Yet, there is insufficient evidence in the literature that entrepreneurs are more ethical than non-entrepreneurs. If the degree of ethical attitude and behaviour may not differ, it is the variation of ethical behaviour that does. As Longenecker et al. (1988) convincingly conclude:

*Entrepreneurs are sometimes stricter and at other times more lax than others in their ethical judgements, depending upon which issues are being considered. Most notable is the fact that they do differ from others in their ethical judgments.*

(Longenecker et al. 1988, p. 68)

They go on to summarise that in situations revolving around financial loss or gain; entrepreneurs tend to be less ethical than their manager counterparts. In situations relating to health and safety issues, on the other hand, entrepreneurs have displayed a stricter level of ethical judgement (Longenecker et al. 1988). In conclusion to the first theme of the ethical behaviour literature of whether entrepreneurs behave more ethically than their non-entrepreneur peers, the literature shows that entrepreneurs do behave differently in ethical matters, but there is no answer as to whether they are more ethically in general.

The second literature theme as mentioned earlier looks at factors that are influencing ethical judgement. In particular, they look at the locus of control and personal strains that may shape moral behaviour. De Clercq and Dakhli (2009) conclude that entrepreneurs’ ethical standards drop with a decrease of household
income. This corresponds to Longenecker et al.’s (1988) argument that entrepreneurs display a weaker ethical commitment in situations revolving around financial loss or gain. De Clercq and Dakhli (2009) further reveal that the more associational memberships an entrepreneur has, the laxer are his or her ethical standards. They explain that membership scenarios may be conducive to collective misbehaviour. Interestingly, membership organisations have been at the forefront in the past of developing codes of conducts for their members. One may speculate as to whether this trend emerged in order to hone in on group misbehaviour (De Clercq and Dakhli 2009). Lastly, it has been shown that a stronger locus of control, typically one that entrepreneurs hold, leads to the advancement of promotional values such as inter-personal trust, effective team-building, greater moral awareness and collective decision-making (Bryant 2009). It is often the pursuit of a higher good over and above profit that is the main driver for a moral entrepreneur to enter into business (Choi and Gray 2008). Changing circumstances and resulting conundrums for tourism entrepreneurs will build the basis for discussion in the second phase of the empirical research.

### 3.5 Conclusion

There are three core elements that inform entrepreneurial role behaviour: risk, need for achievement and an entrepreneurial ethic. Since the inception of the concept of entrepreneurship, it has always been connected with conditions of risk and uncertainty. In the literature, there is consensus that risk-taking is a fundamental element of entrepreneurial behaviour. Yet, risk and uncertainty as well as risk and challenge must not be understood synonymously. Rather risk can be
construed as variance, loss or opportunity. Risk perception is a better guiding principle for understanding entrepreneurial risk-taking than risk propensity. In addition, perceived risks come in the form of monetary, functional, psychological and social risks.

The entrepreneur is generally regarded as an actor with a moderate risk-taking approach, who performs better on challenging tasks, navigates through uncertainty and perceives risks lower than their non-entrepreneurial peers (Knight 1921, McClelland 1961). He or she regards the stakes at risk as more important than the probability of winning and is prepared to take higher risk in favourable, wining situations (Faragó et al. 2008). Lastly, functional, psychological and social risks are influenced by other personality constructs that are defining for the entrepreneurial personality, including locus of control, anxiety, self-efficacy and resilience (Brandstätter 2011).

The concept of risk has proven to be elusive and polysemic. It is further ethically complex as it incorporates types of behaviour that are associated with a utilitarian calculus on the one hand, but also attaching intrinsic values to stakes on the other hand, which is profoundly deontological. The question over risk judgement is yet to be fully explored from an ethical perspective. The different types of risk associated to entrepreneurship further complicate this debate. It has been shown that monetary risk, in the form of ownership, is not a pre-requisite for entrepreneurial role behaviour. Rather the notion of founding a business has received more emphasis and thus informs the sampling strategy and definition towards an entrepreneur for this thesis.
The concept of n(Ach) has proven to be a distinguishing motivational factor of entrepreneurial role behaviour and is a psychogenic motivation referring to an ontology of ‘becoming’ an entrepreneur rather than ‘being’ an entrepreneur. N(Ach) transcends profit as the primary motive for entrepreneurs. As McClelland (1961) contends, first comes achievement, then profit. Profit remains insufficient as entrepreneurial motive as it is contractual and managerial and not entrepreneurial. Much has been said about the characteristics of a person with high levels of n(Ach) in relation to entrepreneurial role behaviour. However, there has been a debate as to whether these personality traits are unique to the entrepreneur. High levels of n(Ach) are indeed unique as a motivational factor. They are unique for entrepreneurial acting / thinking / behaving; thus for entrepreneurial role behaviour (Kirby 2003). In conclusion, a high level of n(Ach) has been correlated positively to the choice of entering into an entrepreneurial occupation (Collins, Hanges and Locke 2004, McClelland 1961).

This has several implications for this research. The definition of n(Ach) is found to be too narrow and questions are raised over what is to be achieved and how this is done. This supports once more the value and behaviour perspective of this research. Furthermore, as n(Ach) transcends the profit motive, implications for the sampling strategy arise. Social and non-profit entrepreneurs cannot be omitted from this research, as profit is not a primary driver for entrepreneurial role behaviour. In this thesis, n(Ach) is understood as a behavioural concept, rather than a person typology.

Lastly, the literature on entrepreneurship and ethics looks at three particular themes: the entrepreneurial ethics, social entrepreneurship and entrepreneurship
and society (Hannafey 2003, Harris et al. 2009). The literature is also relatively young, except for Max Weber’s work on a capitalist, entrepreneurial ethic. Weber (1930) concludes that entrepreneurs who bring about change incorporate the spirit of capitalism at its best. They are aimed at achieving, earning profit and this is seen as the highest virtue. Entrepreneurs feel an ethical obligation in form of a calling to engage in economic life (Weber 1930).

With the development of the literature on entrepreneurship and ethics, a close link emerged between entrepreneurship and utilitarianism, especially egoism. The arguments supporting this view came from the assumption that entrepreneurship is foremost an individualistic exercise built on self-interest (Cordeiro 2008, Longenecker et al. 1988). This view does not take into account the need for social approval for entrepreneurial behaviour to be seen as ethical (Anderson and Smith 2007, Plinio 2009). However, scholars have surmised that the complexity of entrepreneurship, the changing circumstances and value pluralism as well as the individual character make it necessary to understand the entrepreneurial ethics from a virtue ethics perspective (Brenkert 2009, Colonomos 2005, Hartman 2011, Plinio 2009).

Entrepreneurial virtues include prudence, temperance, courage and justice (Johannisson 2011, Miller and Collier 2010). Kets de Vries (1985) and Kuratko (2007), however, warn of the darker side of entrepreneurship when virtues turn into vices such as a need for control, a sense of distrust and the need for applause. The literature on ethical behaviour of entrepreneurs is inconclusive. What is assumed is that entrepreneurs and managers, for example, both possess the faculty
of ethical awareness, although with different emphases. Yet, entrepreneurs tend to act or behave more ethically, possibly because of having more freedom to act (Bucar et al. 2003, Longenecker et al. 1988). An entrepreneurial ethic is again a complex one and does not sit comfortably within one of the leading ethics theories.

With these conclusions in mind, this thesis seeks to:

- Use the literature on entrepreneurial risk-taking to inform the discussion about an ontology for ethical entrepreneurship and the barriers against it;
- Use the literature on the achievement motivation to inform the discussion about a mission for ethical entrepreneurship and further motivational factor;
- Apply the literature on entrepreneurial virtues and vices to gain a better understanding of ethical entrepreneurship.

From a methodological perspective, this chapter enables:

- The need for the sampling strategy for entrepreneurs in the second phase of this research to focus on the founder of a business and further to include social and non-profit entrepreneurs;
- The need for the research philosophy to situate this research within a personal-constructivist epistemology, focusing in the individual and their constructed and interpreted understanding of their realities.
4 KEY CONCEPT: THE TOURISM ENTREPRENEUR

*They are consuming the very same product that they are producing, that is, tourism. They have been attracted to set up businesses in order to be able to ‘consume’ its landscape and life-style.*

(Williams, Shaw and Greenwood 1989, p. 1650)

4.1 INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this chapter is twofold. First, the chapter aims to combine the remaining areas of research that build the basis for this thesis, namely entrepreneurship in tourism. The second aim is to produce learning outcomes from the review of the key concepts in Chapter 2 to 4 in order to develop a working definition for an ethical tourism entrepreneur and to create a theoretical framework for this thesis based upon the three key research areas: ethics, entrepreneurship and tourism. Within each, the review of the key concepts has narrowed the focus on particular areas. Tourism is linked to the context of sustainable tourism, ethics to applied business ethics, and entrepreneurship to entrepreneurial role behaviour according to the Psychological Characteristics School of Entrepreneurship (Cunningham and Lischeron 1991). The second aim will be described in the chapter conclusion.

Tourism entrepreneurship has some peculiarities and is shaped by barriers that lead to these features. As the opening quote from Williams *et al.* (1989) shows, production and consumption happen simultaneously in tourism. This holds true for
different actors in the tourism. The tourist consumes the tourist experience at the point of its production. But the entrepreneur is also involved in the simultaneous production and consumption. This is with particular reference to so-called lifestyle entrepreneurs and opens up questions about entrepreneurial motivation and other role behavioural responses. Much of the relatively young tourism entrepreneurship literature has focused on this phenomenon.

However, Section 4.2 starts by setting the scene for tourism entrepreneurship. This section investigates the barriers of the tourism environment that shape tourism entrepreneurship. From this macro-perspective, Section 4.3 then moves onto the micro-perspective, namely the individual tourism entrepreneur and his or her respective role behaviour. A stronger emphasis is placed on an entrepreneurial ethic for tourism in Section 4.4. This focus builds on the review from Chapter 2 on business ethics and examines the possibilities for ethical dilemmas in tourism entrepreneurship. Subsequently, the ethical tourism entrepreneur is defined. This definition informs the empirical part of this research with regards to the sampling strategy and the focus within the discussion. Lastly, all strands of research in this thesis are combined to develop the theoretical framework upon which this research is based.
4.2 ENTERPRENEURSHIP IN TOURISM

4.2.1 AN OVERVIEW

The entrepreneur is the persona causa of tourism development (Koh and Hatten 2002); an assertion that Kirzner (1973) has already specified three decades earlier in his study of entrepreneurship in general. Yet, entrepreneurship in tourism has not received much academic attention until the late 1980s, when Williams et al. (1989) discovered the peculiarity of tourism entrepreneurship in coupling production with consumption. This new discovery led to a surge in academic interest in entrepreneurship under the auspices of the tourism context. As Williams et al. (1989) have exposed the phenomenon of lifestyle entrepreneurship; it is not surprising that much of today's tourism entrepreneurship literature centres exactly on this idea. Studies of lifestyle entrepreneurship have been set against the backdrop of differing geographical regions, such as New Zealand and Australia (Ateljevic 2009, Ateljevic 2007, Ateljeciv and Doorne 2000, Getz and Carlsen 2000, Hall et al. 2004, Page, Forer and Lawtong 1999), the UK and Ireland (Lashley and Rowson 2010, Morrison and Teixeira 2004, Mottiar 2007, Williams et al. 1989), Croatia (Skokic and Morrison 2011), Denmark and Sweden (Getz and Petersen 2005, Ioannides and Petersen 2003, Lundberg and Fredman 2013) or the United States (Dawson, Fountain and Cohen 2011). This list is not exhaustive.

The corroborated findings of these studies suggest that entrepreneurial behavior in tourism is closely linked to the locale where it takes place (Cooper and Hall 2008). The lifestyle entrepreneur seeks to establish a commercial home that allows him or
her to reinforce domestic origins (Lashley and Rowson 2010) and to consume the touristscape as much as add to its development and production (Williams et al. 1989). The notion of the commercial home stands in stark contrast to the Weberian view that the separation of household and economic life is a key feature of modern Western capitalism (Weber, 1930). This business/household organisation is quite distinctive for some tourism businesses, especially in the hospitality sector. Unfortunately, it also allows room for conflicts and business dilemmas which will be shown in Section 4.4.2 of this chapter. Furthermore, for lifestyle entrepreneurs, economic motives become secondary, but not void and the urge for self-determination and more control drive entrepreneurial behaviour (Dawson et al. 2011, Getz and Peterson 2005).

Lifestyle entrepreneurs can be completely driven by non-economic motives. Ioannides and Petersen (2003) coined the term ‘non-entrepreneur’ to describe this group of people who simply wish to escape the dullness of daily routine by engaging in a new activity, albeit an entrepreneurial activity. They warn that such non-entrepreneurs may actually have more negative effects on a tourism destination. The more virtuous type of the lifestyle entrepreneur is advocated by Ateljevic and Doorne (2000), who purport that this group of entrepreneurs is ethically bound to a set of values based on sustainability and beyond-profit motives. This claim is investigated later in this research as part of unpacking entrepreneurial motivation. Their impact on a destination is one of increased diversification and positive economic growth through strong linkages and multiplier effects (Andriotis 2002, Ateljevic 2009). Profit is optimised to suit one’s lifestyle needs, not maximised. This suggests a high level of self-interest for lifestyle entrepreneurs. The research
compares these motives with those identified as motivational factors for ethical entrepreneurship.

Lifestyle entrepreneurship is a highly elusive concept, shaped by historical and geographical parameters (Skokic and Morrison 2011). It also only represents a minority of tourism entrepreneurs. The business-oriented, economically-minded entrepreneur makes up the majority of their group (Shaw 2004). Therefore, lifestyle entrepreneurship in tourism, although a deserving subject of academic interest, will not be the focus of this review. Rather, it will inform the analysis of the motivational factors of tourism entrepreneurs in line with the Psychological Characteristics School of Entrepreneurship. This thesis now turns to the distinct features of tourism entrepreneurship and the barriers that shape the tourism entrepreneurial environment.

4.2.2 ENTREPRENEURSHIP IN THE TOURISM ENVIRONMENT

Entrepreneurship in tourism is characterised by a number of distinguishing features compared to entrepreneurship in other industries, such as manufacturing or financial or communication services. It is important to understand those features in order to analyse barriers for best practice in tourism in accordance with the first research aim of this thesis. The tourism industry is largely made up of small and medium size enterprises (Lashley and Rowson 2010). In the UK alone, the tourism industry comprises of over 200,000 businesses, 80% of which are small and medium size firms (DCMS 2011). Yet there is a divergence between the quantity of small tourism businesses and their impact. As Shaw (2004, p. 122) explains “In most
tourism economies the growth of large organisations, and their increased market share, stands in contrast to the numerical importance of small enterprises.” In another study on firm size and their impact on tourism development in a region, Andriotis (2002) purports that larger firms tend to cause labour migration and import supplies, whereas smaller firms harbour stronger economic linkages to local businesses and thus, has a preventative effect on economic leakages. This view is quite simplistic and the empirical research seeks to make inferences on whether firm size is in fact a barrier or enhancer of best practice.

Furthermore, small enterprises can act as an interface between the host community and the tourism industry and foster the development of strong social capital (Shaw and Williams 1998). In addition, small tourism enterprises tend to add to a greater sense of place and authenticity in the touristscape (Cooper and Hall 2008). However, small tourism enterprises may also have a constraining effect on regional development as often they are run sub-optimally and suffer from under-management (Cooper and Hall 2008, Shall and Williams 1998). This is seen as a direct consequence of non-economic motivations and aspirations, which is a precursor to smallness (Morrison and Teixeira 2004). Smallness can thus be seen as one distinguishing feature of entrepreneurship in tourism. Although Drucker (1985) contends that size is not a distinguishing feature for entrepreneurship. Yet, in the context of tourism, it so happens, that most businesses are small or medium-sized enterprises. Yet, assessing the importance of size is difficult.

Smallness inadvertently leads to another distinguishing feature of tourism entrepreneurship, namely informality. This informality is expressed in numerous
ways. From an inter-organisational perspective, informality means that cooperation between enterprises within a tourism destination lacks a formal structure and is often based on family or friendship ties, rather than business networks (Mottiar 2007). On an intra-organisational level, this informality is often practiced by the obvious lack of any formal business plans or marketing plans and simple organisational structures (Ateljevic 2007, Morrison and Teixeira 2004). However, as Ateljevic (2007) points out, informality does not necessarily mean lack of knowledge or management expertise. It simply means that due to the nature of the industry it is deemed unnecessary to engage in formal business planning. The analysis of types of behaviour for best practice in tourism entrepreneurship makes inferences about the barrier of informality as references here in the literature.

This form of management thinking encompasses what Russell and Faulkner (2004) call ‘serendipitous entrepreneurship’, which means entrepreneurial behaviour resulting out of an unregulated and often chaotic environment that is characteristic of the tourism industry. It is indeed the case that due to the tourism industry’s flexibility and often highly differentiated products there is much scope for entrepreneurial opportunities (Cooper and Hall 2008, Shaw and Williams 2004). Opportunities for tourism entrepreneurs, especially in the niche-market arena, have also resulted out of the growth of the experience industry and an increasingly more postmodernist consumption pattern (Shaw 2004). Thus far, tourism entrepreneurship is shaped by smallness, informality and flexibility.

In addition to these distinguishing factors, entrepreneurs in tourism often benefit from relatively low entry barriers to the industry (Shaw and Williams 1998, Williams et al. 1989). In comparison to other industries, infrastructure and capital
requirements for creating a tourism business are relatively low. It is thus not surprising that many tourism entrepreneurs are self-financed, as findings from the study of Williams et al. (1989) show. It is possible to say then, that in the environment of tourism, the entrepreneur is often the same person as the capital provider. Their monetary risk is much higher than Schumpeter’s (1934) and Kirzner’s (1973) economist perspectives of the entrepreneur would suggest.

The distinguishing features of smallness, informality and flexibility can be derived from a number of conditions that are specific to and shape the entrepreneurial tourism environment. One is seasonality, which is seen as a major barrier to the running of a tourism enterprise and has effects of the planning processes of any entrepreneurial venture (Ateljevic 2007, Koh and Hatten 2002). Seasonality is often coupled with peripheral locations of tourism destinations, such as remote mountain resorts or isolated islands. Both factors are not conducive to a competitive environment in which entrepreneurship can thrive (Ioannides and Petersen 2003). These barriers can create a lifecycle of smallness for tourism enterprises.

Another barrier faced by tourism entrepreneurs is the ownership of tourism products by governments, such as National Parks or public museums (Koh and Hatten 2002). This high degree of public sector involvement in tourism entrepreneurship is often coupled with a lack of organisation and co-ordination (Ateljevic 2009). In addition to government agencies, the tourism industry is filled with a plethora of stakeholders with differing motivations and aspirations. Ateljevic and Li (2009) speak of an often collective form of entrepreneurship with many different actors contributing to one or more tourism innovations. Under such
circumstances, the locus of control for tourism entrepreneurs is decreased, which constitutes a functional risk for the tourism entrepreneur.

Product innovation is subject to another significant barrier in as much that the product is intangible, and thus cannot be tested before consumption. Tourism entrepreneurs are therefore exposed to a much greater risk than entrepreneurs in other industries (Koh and Hatten 2002). This denotes a social risk as it affects the approval and legitimisation of the tourism enterprise by its stakeholders. Lastly, entrepreneurship in tourism largely relies on the second labour market (Ateljevic 2007) or part-time employment. In the UK around 40% of all tourism jobs are part-time roles (ONS 2013). Under such circumstances it is often the case that entrepreneurial growth is stalled by lack of skilled personnel and wider human and financial poverty of the tourism enterprise (Morrison and Teixeira 2004). The tourism environment provides many barriers to best practices in tourism entrepreneurship and offers grounds for unethical conduct. In order to begin building a picture of an entrepreneurial ethic in tourism as this research intends, the next section of this chapter addresses entrepreneurial role behaviour in a tourism context.

4.3 Entrepreneurial role behaviour in tourism

As Chapter 3 has shown, the Psychological Characteristics School of Entrepreneurship includes three core elements: risk, achievement and an entrepreneurial ethic (Cunningham and Lischeron 1991). This section presents if and how these elements relate to tourism entrepreneurship. Notably, there is a lack
of research dedicated to the relationship between these psychological characteristics and entrepreneurial role behaviour in tourism. Rather, these topics are marginally discussed in existing literature on entrepreneurship in tourism. There is a gap in understanding entrepreneurial role behaviour in tourism beyond the lifestyle void and this research aims to contribute to filling this gap. Sections 4.3 and 4.4 will begin to explore entrepreneurial role behaviour and an entrepreneurial ethic in tourism and thus, lay the foundations for the second phase of empirical research.

4.3.1 Tourism entrepreneurs and risk-taking

The first subject of consideration is that of risk and uncertainty. In the tourism literature, risk and uncertainty feature marginally and are largely associated with commercial or business-orientated entrepreneurship (Shaw 2004, Swierczek and Ha 2003). Koh and Hatten (2002) corroborate this view and add that any tourism entrepreneur who creates a business venture has a willingness to assume risk and uncertainty.

Monetary risk is seen as the most obvious of entrepreneurial risk-taking as it involves the financing of the business. Although entry barriers are considered relatively low in tourism (Shaw and Williams 1998), Williams et al. (1989) conclude that tourism businesses are heavily reliant on self-finance. The understanding that tourism businesses bear the brunt of financial risk by investing greatly into the business through existing property or personal savings has long been held and also corroborated in follow-up studies on tourism entrepreneurship (Lashley and
Rowson 2010, Morrison and Teixeira 2004). However, recent findings by Skokic and Morrison (2011) suggest that contrary to the common conception, tourism entrepreneurs are not particularly risk-averse and certainly not opposed to borrow funds to finance their tourism business.

A more commonly referenced risk factor in tourism entrepreneurship relates to the locus of control, and thus to functional risk. As Getz and Petersen (2005) and Lashley and Rowson (2010) have discovered that control and self-determination are primary motives for many tourism entrepreneurs to start their own business. By approximation, the studies suggest a latent fear of loss of control over one’s business. Dawson et al. (2011) and Mottiar (2007) conclude that this fear of losing control often results in tourism entrepreneurs acting more individualistic and opposing formalised inter-organisational networks. Although this conclusion is reflected in the informality of the tourism entrepreneurial environment (Ateljevic 2007, Morrison and Teixeira 2004), it stands at odds with the notion of collective entrepreneurship as advocated by Ateljevic and Li (2009) and the stakeholder complexity in tourism (Miller and Twining-Ward 2005).

Further, Hall et al. (2004) suggest that tourism entrepreneurs perceive the risks of self-employment as lower than those associated with their previous employment. The psychological risk of suffering increased anxiety due to self-employment is perceived lower than the pressures experienced in situations of employment. This finding is supported by McClelland’s (1961) theory that entrepreneurs generally tend to perceive risks lower than non-entrepreneurs. Without such low risk-perception, the tourism entrepreneur might not even enter into business in the first
place. Hall et al. (2004) also conclude that the perceived risk is often perceived as shared risk. This is predominantly the case for family-run tourism businesses where risk is shared with the partner.

A more commonly perceived risk in tourism entrepreneurship is of another psychological nature, but also constitutes a social risk as it requires the approval and legitimisation of the entrepreneurial venture. Tourism entrepreneurs have to have a strong belief in the quality of their offering and high self-esteem that they will succeed with their business. This results out of the intangibility of the tourism product, which does not allow for testing prior to launching (Koh and Hatten 2002).

This brief review has differentiated different types of risk associated to entrepreneurship and how they are understood in relation to tourism entrepreneurship. In so doing, it has become evident that the literature on entrepreneurial risk-taking in tourism is inconclusive. With the exception of the study by Swierczek and Ha (2003) on Thai and Vietnamese tourism businesses and their perceptions of risk and uncertainty, the literature on the subject is very slim. The second aim of this research is to gain a deeper understanding of entrepreneurial role behaviour in tourism and specifically asks the question: what concerns best practice tourism entrepreneurs? The aim is to build awareness about entrepreneurial risk-taking under the special conditions that the tourism environment provides. The second phase of the empirical research concentrates on this topic more specifically.
The second pillar of the entrepreneurial personality is need for achievement. It has been established that n(Ach) is a distinguishing motivation for entrepreneurial role behaviour (Collins et al. 2004, McClelland 1965). At this point, it is prudent to emphasise again that this relates to behaviour, not so much to a person typology. McClelland (1961) defines n(Ach) as the psychological factor that drives behaviour towards the pursuit of economic growth. *Ipso facto*, economic growth is the primary motivation for any entrepreneur. This is not to be confused with profit-making, as it has been shown that the need to achieve and do one’s job well outclasses the desire for profit (McClelland 1961). Profit is a secondary motive. It is a consequence of n(Ach).

In the context of tourism, this bears far-reaching consequences. It has been widely acknowledged that a special group of entrepreneurs in tourism are so-called lifestyle entrepreneurs. There is a clear consensus in the literature that the primary motivation for lifestyle entrepreneurs to enter into business is to enjoy a self-employed life (Getz and Petersen 2005, Mottiar 2007) and that location is a primary driver (Lashley and Dawson 2010, Williams et al. 1989). Economic growth as a business motivation falls behind other motives and success is judged by non-financial matters (Lashley and Rowson 2010, Mottiar 2007, Williams et al. 1989). Mottiar (2007) asserts that profit motivation, if at all, comes over time and Hall et al. (2004) contend that lifestyle entrepreneur find it difficult to estimate how much economic growth and profit are reasonable to maintain the desired lifestyle. Need for achievement is thus a difficult concept with regards to tourism.
entrepreneurship, particularly those lifestyle entrepreneurs. To regard it purely from an economic growth perspective is too narrow in the tourism context. A more advisable approach is to examine which achievements are valued highly by tourism entrepreneurs. This reflects this thesis’s intention to focus on values for tourism entrepreneurs.

The line of argumentation cannot end here. Traditionally, wanting to earn rather than to consume is a defining characteristic of entrepreneurship (Schumpeter 1934, Weber 1930). In the case of the tourism entrepreneur, however, consumption and production often fall together. The philosophical stance of the lifestyle entrepreneur, does not sit comfortably with the concept of n(Ach). However, since the majority of entrepreneurs in tourism are indeed business-orientated (Shaw 2004) and measure success by economic growth (Skokic and Morrison 2011), n(Ach) cannot be ruled out as a distinguishing motivational factor for tourism entrepreneurs. It may, however, have to be altered to include other values and business priorities beyond the profit and achievement motives. Once more, the second phase of this research’s empirical work will focus on values and business priorities of tourism entrepreneurs. The next section focuses on the third element of the Psychological Characteristics School of Entrepreneurship, namely an entrepreneurial ethic, and combines these characteristics and barriers to tourism entrepreneurship with the concepts of business ethics, specifically business dilemmas from Chapter 2 of this thesis.
4.4 AN ETHIC FOR TOURISM ENTREPRENEURS

4.4.1 AN OVERVIEW

With the beginning of the sustainable tourism paradigm also coincided a focus on post-modernist consumption of experiences rather than material products. Shaw (2004) attributes this to a shift in entrepreneurial cultural towards ethical considerations and corporate social responsibility in tourism. Furthermore, Ateljevic and Doorne (2000) purport that lifestyle entrepreneurs in particular are bound to morals and ethics as they substitute values of profit maximisation and economic growth with principles relating to profit optimisation and sustainable development. However, the literature on an entrepreneurial ethic in tourism is scant and these views are yet to be corroborated by further research.

As Koh and Hatten (2002) define the tourism entrepreneur, they specifically include marginal activity. They state “Marginal tourism entrepreneurs are those who operate their enterprise in the informal sectors [...] of the travel/tourism industry such as street vendors, hawkers, and unlicensed tour guides.” (Koh and Hatten 2002, p. 37) Such entrepreneurs are typically unlicensed but tolerated by authorities. In contrast, Anderson and Smith (2007) argue that entrepreneurship has to be socially legitimised in order to be considered to be entrepreneurship. Their argument is then that any marginal activity cannot be seen as entrepreneurial activity. Marginal employment, however, contributed to 31% of the tourism workforce in the UK in 2011 (ONS 2013). Despite the lack of reliable figures of marginal self-employment or marginal entrepreneurship, it is possible to assume that the marginal
entrepreneur plays an important role in tourism entrepreneurship. Legitimisation and the entrepreneurial value of transparency as advocated by Colonomos (2005) and Anderson and Smith (2007), thus, are doubtful as a basis for an entrepreneurial ethic in tourism. In conclusion, entrepreneurial ethic in tourism is a barren field of research. It is the foremost aim of this thesis to bridge this gap in academia and to provide a deeper understanding of applied ethics for best practice tourism entrepreneurs. First, however, tourism entrepreneurship is set against principles of business ethics as reviewed in Chapter 2 of this thesis.

4.4.2 BUSINESS DILEMMAS IN TOURISM ENTREPRENEURSHIP

The peculiarities of entrepreneurship in tourism stem from the coupling of tourism production and consumption (Williams et al. 1989). This coupling can be the cause of role conflicts in tourism entrepreneurship, which denote a form of relationship dilemmas. The commerce and leisure binary becomes blurred and boundaries between the business and the home are broken down. The roles of the tourism entrepreneur become entangled (Wempe 2005). Tourism enterprises can be family-run businesses. In the UK accommodation industry, 6% of all businesses are family-run accommodations employing a number of unpaid family workers (ONS 2013). As such the home environment is turned into a commercial environment. The conflict here lies within a person’s role of being an entrepreneur and a home-maker at once, both within close proximity (Lashley and Rowson 2010).

While the Entangled Hands Dilemma relates to role conflicts within an individual, it is also possible that too many people are involved with the same task or project. This
is called the ‘Many-Hands-Dilemma’ (Wempe 2005) and originates from the serendipitous nature of tourism entrepreneurship, which is characterised by informality and flexibility (Russell and Faulkner 2004). A lack of formalisation and planning dissolves role responsibilities and may lead to conflicting responsibilities (Cadbury 2002). Ateljevic and Li (2009) have identified the collective entrepreneur within the tourism industry. As previously stated, the tourism product is often a public good, such as a nature or cultural heritage, and therefore falls under public ownership and multiple jurisdictions. The tourism entrepreneur has to navigate those partnerships with public institutions in order to bring the tourism product to market. Among the collective and the lifestyle entrepreneur, Ioannides and Peterson (2003) have also identified the non-entrepreneur in tourism. The concept detaches the profit motive from the entrepreneur (Hall et al. 2004), emphasising other values as driving motivators for entrepreneurial role behaviour (Ateljevic and Doorne 2000). Society-at-large is not considered much by the non-entrepreneur (Peterson 2003), which can lead to conflicts over fiduciary responsibilities and more relationship dilemmas.

The issue of smallness leads to distribution dilemmas for tourism entrepreneurs. Tourism is riddled with distributive injustice. The very nature of tourism is that it is an activity that benefits the few versus the many (Fennell 2006). Some forms of tourism, such as ecotourism, even increase distributive injustice as access to and benefit from ecotourism activities are very thinly spread. From an entrepreneurial perspective, this also means that the divergence between the power relationships of a few large tourism corporations compared to the vast number of small tourism enterprises puts the tourism entrepreneur at risk (Shaw 2004). One such example
is the tourism supply chain in vertically integrated tourism corporations. Individual tourism entrepreneurs, who provide services to larger, vertically integrated operators, are under threat of distributive injustice (Piercy and Lane 2007). Jamal and Camargo (2014) have also written about procedural injustice in the tourism system. The collective nature of tourism entrepreneurship as described by Ateljevic and Li (2009) has potential to fall victim to procedural injustice by means of limited decision-making powers of tourism entrepreneurs.

Lastly, the informal, flexible and often un-regulated nature of tourism entrepreneurship opens avenues for rogue behaviour that might lead to misrepresentation dilemmas. Informality may cause a lack of transparency, which is crucial to ethical entrepreneurship (Colonomos 2005). However, the biggest threat to tourism entrepreneurship and misrepresentation stems from the intangibility of the tourism product. As experiences are difficult to market, a divergence from the marketing truth of the holiday experience and the actual real-life experience is almost inevitable (Wheeler 1995).

A discussion about business ethics in tourism entrepreneurship has thus far been largely neglected in the academic literature. Although there has been research done into ethics and tourism, most notably by Fennell (2006) and others, a focus on the tourism entrepreneur and his or her ethical foundation is not evident. The closest research into an entrepreneurial ethics in tourism scholarship relates to applied business ethics and decision-making. However, these studies focus on the employees (Lovelock 2004, 2008), students (Hudson and Miller 2005) or the
consumer (Malone et al. 2014). An ethic for tourism entrepreneurs is yet to be fully understood. This research aims to contribute to this gap in the literature.

This review seeks to shown the peculiarities of entrepreneurship in tourism and how they are linked to role behaviour and an entrepreneurial ethic. The empirical research of this thesis aims to:

- Use the literature on lifestyle entrepreneurship to discuss motivational factors for ethical entrepreneurship;
- Use the literature on barriers and peculiarities of tourism entrepreneurship to investigate dilemmas and behavioural responses for best practice in tourism;
- Use the literature in risk in this chapter to inform the discussion about an ontology for ethical entrepreneurship;
- Use the literature on n(Ach) in this chapter to inform the discussion about priorities for ethical entrepreneurship;
- Use the literature on ethics in tourism entrepreneurship to substantiate the findings for dilemmas and behavioural responses in research aim one.
4.5 CONCLUSION AND RESEARCH FRAMEWORK

4.5.1 DEFINING THE ETHICAL TOURISM ENTREPRENEUR

Literature on entrepreneurship in tourism is very recent and focuses much on the phenomenon of lifestyle entrepreneurship. Lifestyle entrepreneurship has been identified as a specific form of tourism entrepreneurship and includes the following elements. First, it is centred on the idea that tourism production and consumption is coupled (Williams et al. 1989). Second, it is built on the premise of a commercial home (Lashley and Rowson 2010) which contradicts Weber's (1930) belief that modern capitalism is based on the separation of household and economic life. And third, lifestyle entrepreneurship has strong links to the locale (Shaw 2004).

By reviewing the wider tourism entrepreneurial environment barriers become evident that lead to certain features of tourism entrepreneurship. Tourism entrepreneurship is characterised by smallness, informality and flexibility. These are characteristics derived from barriers of seasonality, periphery, multiple stakeholder-relations, high degree of involvement of the public sector, intangibility of the product and reliance on the second labour market as well as a high degree of marginal entrepreneurship (Ateljevic 2007, Koh and Hatten 2002).

These barriers and features raise concern over business dilemmas in tourism entrepreneurship. Relationship dilemmas have been identified following role conflicts from lifestyle and collective entrepreneurship. Distribution dilemmas have been derived from smallness and multiple stakeholder agencies. And
misrepresentation dilemmas can occur due to the flexible and informal nature of the tourism entrepreneurial environment.

Corroborating the literature of entrepreneurial role behaviour with that of tourism entrepreneurship has revealed specific features of tourism entrepreneurs. However, the role behavioural concepts are also highly elusive in the tourism entrepreneurship context. It has been suggested that tourism entrepreneurs perceive low risks derived from psychological or monetary factors (Hall et al. 2004, Skokic and Morrison 2011). Yet, they perceive high risks from functional and social factors (Dawson et al. 2011, Getz and Peterson 2005, Lashley and Rowson 2010, Mottiar 2007). The latter is largely due to the strong fear of loss of control and the peculiarity of the tourism product as being an intangible experience.

As the previous chapter has established, founding a business overrides business ownership. This corroborates Skokic and Morrison’s (2011) findings that tourism entrepreneurs are not opposed to external funding of assets. Locus of control and being a business founder is more important. The achievement and profit motivations are also inconclusive in the tourism literature on entrepreneurship. Although lifestyle entrepreneurs do not pursue economic growth (Getz and Petersen 2005, Lashley and Rowson 2010), Skokic and Morrison (2011) argue that they do indeed pursue profit and Shaw (2004) points out that most tourism entrepreneurs are business-orientated. Lastly, looking at an entrepreneurial ethic, the tourism entrepreneurship literature is a barren field.
Based upon this review of key concepts in Chapters 2 till 4, a working definition for ethical tourism entrepreneurs has been developed that builds the basis for this thesis. It informs the sampling strategy as well as the subsequent discussion. The definition is as follows:

A tourism entrepreneur is an individual who has founded his or her own business, which has tourism at the heart of its operations. He or she will have commercialised their venture, although with varying degrees possible, including profit, non-profit, and social businesses. His or her entrepreneurial role behaviour is based on an ontology of becoming an entrepreneur, which may include the lifestyle motive. The basic premise of the venture includes exploiting existing opportunities not just for him or her, but also for environmental and societal wellbeing.

(Present author)

4.5.2 Research framework for this thesis

This thesis combines three strands of research: ethics, entrepreneurship and tourism. Within each, the focus is narrowed to specific areas that contribute towards achieving the two primary research aims of this research: first, to develop an ethical framework for best practice in sustainable tourism; and second, to investigate role behaviour and an ethic for best practice tourism entrepreneurship. The contracted research areas are sustainable tourism as a research context, business ethics as an applied lens, and entrepreneurial role behaviour as the individual agency in this research. Figure 1.2 in Chapter 1 has visualised how these areas are interconnected.
This literature review has critically evaluated the areas of overlap for each of the key concepts. Chapter 2 has studied business ethics and tourism ethics. Chapter 3 has looked at entrepreneurial role behaviour and an entrepreneurial ethic, applying Cunningham and Lischeron’s (1991) Psychological Characteristics School of Entrepreneurship. Finally, Chapter 4 has reviewed entrepreneurship in the tourism literature and drawn parallels to an ethic for tourism entrepreneurs. Each of these chapters has informed each other, but most notably, each of these chapters informs the subsequent empirical research.

From a methodological point of view, Chapters 3 and 4 have influenced the sampling strategy for this research. A definition for a tourism entrepreneur builds the basis for this sampling strategy. Chapter 3 has also laid out the research philosophical grounding of this research, namely that of a personal constructivist epistemology with a focus on the individual and their values and types of behaviour. However, it is in Chapter 2, predominantly, that the foundations have been laid for the coding and analysis strategy for the first part of a two stage empirical research. Figure 4.1 overleaf visualises the key learning outcomes from this literature review in relation to the key concepts.
In addition to these broader learning outcomes, the review of the key concepts has also formed the basis for the direction of the data analysis. A priori themes for coding derive from the Psychological Characteristics School of Entrepreneurship. As risk attitude arouse dilemmas, achievement motivation triggers types of behaviour and an individual ethic shapes values, these are the dominant themes: dilemmas, values and behaviours. Table 4.1 overleaf outlines the coding themes that have
emerged from this literature review. This represents the basis for the findings and discussion in Chapters 7, 8 and 9.

**TABLE 4.1:** Coding themes and associated literature for research phase 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A priori themes for analysis</th>
<th>Primary coding theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Characteristics School of Entrepreneurship <em>(Cunningham and Lischeron 1991)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A priori themes for analysis</strong></td>
<td><strong>Primary coding theme</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Psychological Characteristics School of Entrepreneurship (Cunningham and Lischeron 1991)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>An entrepreneurial ethic informs...</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Values</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Achievement motivation triggers...</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Types of behaviour</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fairness, e.g.</strong></td>
<td><em>(Colonomos 2005, De Clercq and Dakhli 2009, Sedlacek 2011)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collaboration, e.g.</strong></td>
<td><em>(Bryant 2009, Jamal and Stronza 2009, Miller and Twining-Ward 2005)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accountability, e.g.</strong></td>
<td><em>(Cadbury 2005, Dawson et al. 2002, Longenecker et al. 1988)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: present author
In addition to these coding themes for research phase 1, this literature review has also opened up avenues for discussion and analysis for the second part of the research – the interviews with tourism entrepreneurs. Semi-structured and with a focus on narrative, these interviews are aimed at gaining a deeper understanding of the individual entrepreneur’s ethical foundations and role behaviour. Chapter 2 has highlighted two areas of debate that will serve as a proxy for studying an entrepreneurial ethic for best practices in tourism. First, the Malthusian growth conundrum for sustainable tourism is to be discussed (Blankfein 2010, WTTC 2014c), followed by the experience conundrum for sustainable tourism (Ateljevic and Li 2009, Wheeler 1995). Using scenarios like these can help revealing higher-order standards, such as ethical standards from individuals (Graafland et al. 2006). The technique is called laddering (Fransella 2005) and will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 6. However, other questions have emerged, such as how entrepreneurial motivation of best practice entrepreneurs fits in with different perspectives on business ethics – separatist, symbiotic, differentiating. Furthermore, business priorities and business responsibilities demand further examination in research phase 2. Concluding, following an iterative approach, the review of the concepts has informed the empirical part of the research and has set guidelines for sampling, coding and data analysis.

The following chapters now discuss research philosophy and explain the methodological approach (Chapter 5); and outline and justify the methods chosen for data collection and analysis (Chapter 6). This is followed by a succinct chapter of the research findings, without further commentary (Chapter 7). A discussion for both research aims follows in Chapters 8 and 9.
5 Research Philosophy, Methodology and Ethics

Philosophy is merely the study of assumptions made by a human reasoner.

(Rychlak 1981, p. 9)

5.1 Introduction

The aim of this chapter is to provide the philosophical and methodological underpinning that guides this research. Research philosophy includes ontology and epistemology; the studies of what are existence and knowledge. Central to these studies is the human reasoner (Rychlak 1981). In this research, the human reasoner is me – the researcher – who studies assumptions about existence and knowledge. However, the human reasoners are also the research participants – or actors in this research – who make assumptions and anticipate realities through their own interpretation. Sedlacek (2011, p. 94) explains that “Truth and reality were hidden in speech, stories and narration.” The stories in this thesis are best practice example, while the speech and narration come from tourism entrepreneurs, who have a reputation for ethical business conduct. The underlying research philosophy reflects these elements and supports an applied ethics approach to the research (Werhane 1996).

First, this chapter outlines this research’s philosophy and explains how this is reflected within the theoretical framework. Then, the research aims are reiterated and situated into the theoretical framework as well. The chapter then gives an overview on research methodology. It emphasises the importance of iteration and
visualises the methodological path that is taken. The research is undertaken in two phases that essentially inform each other. The first phase adopts the strategy of archival research, which is explained in more detail in Section 5.3.2 of this chapter. Following this, research phase two combines a series of interviews with methods taken from the Personal Construct Theory spectrum. This constitutes the strategy for the second phase of the research and is explained in Section 5.3.3 of this chapter. Section 5.4 is dedicated to research ethics and gaining access. This is particularly pertinent in this thesis as the use of secondary data is required that has been collected prior to and outside of the research process. The section finishes with notes on positionality and reflexivity in qualitative tourism research. The chapter then concludes with the implications of the philosophical and methodological framework for the choice of methods and processes that follow in Chapter 6.

The importance of having a separate chapter dedicated to philosophy and methodology here lays in the originality of the research strategy. Both strategic approaches – archival research and Personal Construct Theory – are currently under-used in tourism research. Combining both through the process of iteration constitutes an original approach to tourism research. Furthermore, the uniqueness of the secondary data set that has been accessed for this thesis also demands that the research methodology and strategy is discussed in more detail than perhaps a combined methods and methodology chapter would have allowed. First though, it is important to return to the opening quote for this chapter and Rychlak’s (1981) definition of philosophy.
5.2 RESEARCH PHILOSOPHY

5.2.1 ONTOLOGY AND EPISTEMOLOGY

Rychlak captures the meaning of philosophy in a concise and appropriate way. The *human reasoner* refers to an individual with agency. The individual is capable of constructing ideas from assumptions that they have made about the world they inhabit. *Assumptions* refer to experiences and past events that are deconstructed in one’s mind for the purpose of creating a new construction or anticipation of what is likely to happen in the future. It is this personal construction of knowledge that forms the philosophical underpinning of this research. It is also believed that the individual is responsible for the conclusions derived from facts by their own interpretations (Kelly 2003). Abstractly speaking, constructivism “is premised on the belief that people have agency, and their observed behaviour is guided by subjective meaning.” (Slote Morris 2009, p. 210) This epistemological approach acknowledges that knowledge is interpreted and constructed, albeit by an individual rather than through social interaction. This approach is reflected in Max Weber’s use of the idea-type epistemology. He states that the ideal type is a one-sided (personal) interpretation of individual events (Weber 1922). Moreover, knowledge is in a constant state of revision and emerges from a world that is subjective in nature (Kelly 2003, Slote Morris 2009). Thus, the ontological foundation of this thesis is a subjectivist one.

Following a subjectivist ontology, this research adopts a personal constructivist epistemology. The rationale for this approach is fourfold. First, the essence of an
entrepreneurial ethic and role behaviour is difficult to capture. Much research into this topic has followed a positivist approach. Hypotheses about entrepreneurial behaviour, personality and ethics were tested for falsification in order to prove or disprove assumptions (see for example McClelland 1965, Longenecker et al. 1988). Yet, such an approach assumes that the key concepts in this research are concrete and measurable constructs. Chapters 2 to 4 have shown that this is not the case and the key concepts are very complex indeed. The view taken in this research is in accordance to that of Rychlak (1981), who contends that personality with its underpinning values and resulting types of behaviour are quite elusive concepts, and thus impossible to study through quantitative methods as applied in positivist research.

Second, uncertainty is a key construct of entrepreneurship. Knight (1921) has argued that uncertainty is based on having no measurable knowledge about future events. Consequently, this is by definition at odds with a positivist approach, which aims to observe existing patterns of knowledge, not delve into the unknown (Seymour 2006). A constructivist approach, on the other hand, emphasises the importance of the new, uncertain event and the knowledge an individual construes from this event (Kelly 2003). In this research, events can be business dilemmas as dealt with in Chapter 2 of this thesis. They create uncertainty over what is axiologically required to address the dilemma (Lurie and Albin 2007).

The third argument for a personal constructivist epistemology is that the research aims to understand judgement approaches for these dilemmas and thus, draw conclusions for an entrepreneurial ethic for best practice tourism entrepreneurs. As
such, the goal is to explore what *ideal* judgements and values are, and not which ones are *typical*. Once more, Weber’s ideal-type epistemology serves as a grounding for the research. It serves the purpose to develop a normative ideal, i.e. what ought to be, not what is representative of an entire population (Roger 1969). The normative ideal here are synonymous with the ethical framework for best practice in tourism as well as the ethical entrepreneur construct. Constructing such an ideal, or normative type is, according to Weber (1922), what gives significance to interpretivist studies. This calls for a qualitative research approach, ideal for an idiographic study such as this (Hollinshead 2004). As previously mentioned, the objective of an idiographic study is to compose meaningful descriptions by individuals of actual events, and not generalisable conclusions (Rychlak 1981).

The final argument for a personal constructivist research philosophy is rooted in the subject of ethics itself. Whilst there are a number of research papers which advocate an objective, value-free research for ethics in tourism (see Fennell 2006, Malloy and Fennell 1998), ethics is a highly subjective discipline. Macbeth (2005) supports this view and contends that positivist approaches are unsuitable for studying ethics in tourism due to the complexity of ethical considerations in tourism research. He calls for a new, ethically reflexive and value-full platform for tourism scholarship. He states that ethics is hugely subjective and this subjectivity has to be taken into account when researching the subject (Macbeth 2005). By employing approaches from the Personal Construct Theory spectrum of methods, this research takes subjectivity into account.
Based on these considerations, the philosophical underpinning of this research is found in an ontology of *subjective becoming*, a process that requires agency and the capability for human reasoning. It is assumed that all facts are subject to alternative constructions (Kelly 2003) and that an epistemological reality is found in interpretations of past events, which results in the anticipation of future events. Jamal (2004) suggests tourism ethics research to have a micro-level dimension and a macro-level dimension. The micro-level concerns the individual. In this thesis, these are tourism entrepreneurs and their values and types of behaviours. The macro-level concerns wider situational contexts. In this thesis, these are barriers and dilemmas for best practice in tourism.

5.2.2 **Research Aims and Objectives**

As with many qualitative studies pursuing an inductive line of inquiry, the key aim is often to build new theory (Bryman and Bell 2011). As the preceding, comprehensive literature review has shown; there is a gap in research at the academic juncture of ethics, tourism and entrepreneurship. Admittedly, there has been research into tourism entrepreneurship and tourism ethics, as well as ethics in business and entrepreneurship. However, the three areas of research have thus far not been linked. This constitutes the most significant intended theoretical contribution of this research. In order to achieve this contribution a two phase research approach has been devised. Research phase one is dedicated to dilemmas, values and types of behaviour for best practice in tourism; research phase two delves deeper into the ethical foundations of tourism entrepreneurs and their
respective entrepreneurial role behaviour. More concretely, the two key aims of this research are as follows:

- **The first aim of this research is to develop an ethical framework for best practice in tourism.**

- **The second aim of this research is to gain a deeper understanding of the role behaviour and judgement making of ethical tourism entrepreneurs.**

The first aim seeks to conceptualise best practices from an ethical perspective. The ethical framework intends to give insight into the dilemmas that arouse the need for best practice in tourism. Following the review of the business ethics literature, particular attention is paid to ethical dilemmas relating to misrepresentation, distribution and relationship conflicts. The framework further seeks to conceptualise the values and motivations that then trigger types of best practice behaviour. These can be both extrinsic and intrinsic in nature. The framework aims to understand the behavioural responses to dilemmas as displayed in best practice tourism. In summary, research aim one applies a value-behavioural lens for the conceptualisation of best practices combined with an applied ethics analysis.

The second aim is to understand entrepreneurial role behaviour and an entrepreneurial ethic for best practice tourism entrepreneurs. The focus is shifted from an ethic of the bigger picture to the individual entrepreneur. This part of the study thus adopts an idiographic view. It is linked to Personal Construct Theory (PCT), which assumes that people’s behaviour in unique circumstances is
psychologically conditioned by the “way they anticipate events” (Kelly 2003, p. 7). In other words, by the way they make judgements in an uncertain situation. These judgements are interpreted through an applied ethics lens in order to gain a better understanding of an entrepreneurial ethic. Questions are raised over entrepreneurial risk-taking, responsibilities and priorities, as well as motivational factors for ethical entrepreneurship. The literature on tourism ethics has revealed the growth and the experience conundrums as starting points for the discussion.

5.3 Research methodology

5.3.1 An overview

Devising an appropriate research strategy and methodology is dependent on the requirements specified by the research aims and objectives. Although, this may appear pragmatic in nature, methodology and strategy are also informed by ontology and epistemology (Pernecky and Jamal 2010). In line with a personal constructivist research philosophy a qualitative methodology is seen as the most appropriate pathway for achieving both research goals (Denzin and Lincoln 2005). Although the research follows an inductive approach from the outset, that is to generate theory or hypotheses from un-confined observations and findings, Saunders et al. (2012) argue that much qualitative research is in fact abductive as it follows an iterative process. The line between both approaches is very fine and Bryman and Bell (2011) purport, that even in inductive, qualitative studies, theory often informs the observations and findings. It is iteration that is central to this study. Research phase one informs research phase two and vice versa. In return the
findings of research phase two are used to revise the analysis of research phase one. Figure 5.1 depicts this process.

**FIGURE 5.1: Iteration**
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This iterative process corresponds to Kelly’s belief that all facts are subject to alternative constructions and subject to constant revision (2003, p. 4). Iteration and a constructivist research philosophy support accountability of a research project and thus add rigour to qualitative research. In addition, Goodson and Phillimore (2004) state:

> The aim of the researcher is to take account of subjectivity, of their ethics, values and politics, and use a range of appropriate interconnected interpretive methods to maximise understanding of the research problem.

(Goodson and Phillimore 2004, p. 34)

Accountability, thus, is dependent on the researcher’s own value paradigm. Here, this is situated within a paradigm of best practice research. Best practice research is based on the idea that practices can be turned into principles (Overman and Boyd
Practices are those values and types of behaviour that this research seeks to understand that lead to societal and environmental wellbeing. The actors are tourism entrepreneurs. Conceptualising these into principles, and thus into new theory, is at the heart of research aim one and in line with best practice research. Overman and Boyd (1994, p. 81) argue that best practice research is “bold and creative, visionary and potentially transformational.” (Overman and Boyd 1994, p. 81), and this view is upheld in this thesis through the belief that learning from those who do best enhances learning opportunities in general. Best practice research represents a subjectivist, regulatory research paradigm, advocating change by turning practices into principles (or norms) (Saunders et al. 2012). Before the research strategy for both phases of research is explained in more detail, Figure 5.2 overleaf gives an overview of the proposed research design.
FIGURE 5.2: Research design
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The first aim of this research is to develop an ethical framework for best practice in tourism.

With this research aim in mind, the research strategy that has been chosen to achieve this aim is archival research. Archival research is best understood as a collection of methods rather than a set methodology (Timothy 2012). Its methods of data collection and analysis follow a strategic approach towards theory building. Although, theory generation is often attributed to Grounded Theory (Glaser and Strauss 1967), it has not been seen as appropriate for this thesis.

In Grounded Theory data is systematically collected and analysed until no new key themes emerge from the collection of new data. It often involves the collection of primary data in a successive manner. Sampling and data collection can become very drawn out processes, while data analysis is quite descriptive in Grounded Theory (Bryman and Bell 2011). Sampling and data collection are dictated by research realities (Hoggart, Lees and Davies 2002). When considering the use of best practice examples or case studies, Grounded Theory does not sit comfortably with the reality of collecting these as they may be limited in access and numbers. As previously argued in the introductory chapter of this thesis, obtaining high-quality examples is indeed a hindrance to best practice research. The requirements of Grounded Theory extenuate this hindrance. Furthermore, best practice examples are by default secondary data, and thus not suitable for Grounded Theory.
Archival research, on the other hand, presents an attractive, alternative research strategy for Grounded Theory for the generation of a theoretical framework. It is much more flexible for both aspects of data collection and data analysis. The key advantage of archival research lies in the collection of data that lies outside of the research process, i.e. it has been collected before the research takes place for a different purpose. This minimises researcher bias in the data collection phase (Saunders et al. 2012), although not in the phase of analysis. This, however, is not problematic for an interpretivist research paradigm, which takes researcher positionality into account. Archival research also supports a speedy data collection time frame. It has been recommended as particularly useful for studying values and types of behaviour (Andriotis 2010). In his single-method archival research study Andriotis (2010) analysed British newspaper articles about tourist behaviour in Greece. He demonstrates the benefits of archival research as a research strategy by looking at types of behaviour and values. This supports the use of archival research as an appropriate research strategy for achieving research aim one and adopting a value-behavioural lens.

However, archival research in qualitative tourism research is currently under-used. A comprehensive literature search dated September 2014 has identified only five tourism studies utilising archival research from a pool of approximately 28,000 peer-reviewed tourism studies (see Andriotis 2010, Kreck, Guenther and Kopczynski 2000, Lee and Jannings 2010, Ormsby and Mannle 2006, and Winson 2006). Herein lays an important methodological contribution of this thesis. This research contributes to demonstrating the usefulness and benefits of archival research for qualitative tourism research. It does so by showing unique paths to data
collection and alternative ways of data analysis, that have thus far not been used in the archival research context.

The reasons for the limited uptake of archival research in contemporary tourism studies are twofold: first, access to archival (or secondary) data is often difficult to obtain; and second, the success of archival research depends crucially on the quality of the secondary data that has been collected (Saunders et al. 2012). The thesis addresses both by first, carefully negotiating access to a unique set of archival data; and second, conducting a usefulness test as developed and recommended by Saunders et al. (2012) to evaluate the quality of the archival data.

Moreover, archival research is a strategy rather than a methodology as Timothy (2012) explains:

Archival research itself is not an analytical method but rather a set of approaches to understanding physical data and their meanings.

(Timothy 2012, p. 403)

The strategy involves three key areas – data, analysis and rigour – as outlined in Figure 5.2. In archival research, data involves the collection of secondary data by means of intelligent and appropriate sampling, analysis usually occurs in the form of a content analysis, either qualitative or quantitative (Timothy 2012). For this research a qualitative form of content analysis was chosen, which is more specifically named template analysis. Lastly, rigour is established through various methods including usefulness-testing, source triangulation, establishing an audit
trail, an external code-check and iterative coding. To conclude, archival research has the power to reveal meanings through data that portrays the realities of people rather than data that is constructed in a research situation (Saunders et al. 2012). In other words, archival research deals with people's products, not people themselves (Timothy 2012). The term ‘products’ should be seen in the widest possible way as these products may well be forms of behaviour or values.

5.3.3 PERSONAL CONSTRUCT THEORY

The second aim of this research is to gain a deeper understanding of the role behaviour and judgement making of ethical tourism entrepreneurs.

The ethical foundation of an individual is based on their axiological judgement of what is morally right or wrong (Lurie and Albin 2007). These moral values of right and wrong are personal constructs developed by people. They are super-ordinate to other values, such as religious, cultural, legal or practical ones (Graafland et al. 2006). Consequently, to understand the personal construction of these super-ordinate values and to be able to link them to entrepreneurial role behaviour and an entrepreneurial ethic, a research strategy is required that enables an insight deep into the world of the personal constructions of individuals. This strategy can be found in the theoretical foundations of Personal Construct Psychology.

Personal Construct Psychology, or Personal Construct Theory (PCT) as it is more commonly known, is a psychological theory developed by American psychologist George Kelly in the 1950s that is premised on the belief that “a person's processes
are psychologically channelled by ways in which he anticipates events.” (Kelly 2003, p. 7) As a theory, it concerns itself with the behaviour of people that immediately results out of construing and anticipating events (Kelly 2003). In other words, our actions are triggered by motivations that derive from the personal interpretation of the world around us. These events can be anything from leisure activities, work situations, or indeed ethical dilemmas in tourism. The theory emphasises the relationship between personal constructs and human experiences (Botterill 1989). It is also closely linked to Weber’s ideal-type epistemology as it emphasises the individual actor in interpretivist research (Rogers 1969).

Kelly (2003) devised a number of parameters that are theoretically central to this research. First, events are never identical, just similar and there are constantly new events. These characteristics of events tie in with Lurie and Albin’s (2007) definition for ethical dilemmas – the events in this research – which, according to them, are situational and may be recurring, but are never permanent. This also resonates in the notion of uncertainty, which forms part of the entrepreneurial environment (Knight 1921). Second, constructs (about right and wrong) are open to personal paradoxes and only serve the purpose for a finite range of events. This corresponds to Brenkert’s (2009) Differentiation Thesis for business ethics, which allows ethical ambiguities between personal and business situations. Third, constructs (about right and wrong) differ between individuals and the individual can extend and change the constructs according to their experiences. This parameter supports a subjective ethics platform as recommended by Macbeth (2005) and thus is embedded in the ontology of this research. Finally, experiences change constructs, which is based on an ontology of becoming. This ontology has also been linked to
entrepreneurial role behaviour in a way that entrepreneurship is seen as a personal calling and a form of personal development (Brandstätter 2011, Johannisson 2011, Schumpeter 1934, Weber 1930).

PCT sits comfortably within the overall research philosophy of this research. An ontology of becoming is mirrored in individual narratives. Therefore, it relates to the use of an applied ethics lens (Werhane 1996), which seeks to apply individual narratives to specific events. Furthermore, PCT as a research strategy also complements the Psychological Characteristics School of Entrepreneurship as it focuses on values and types of behaviour of individuals. As a result, the theoretical foundation and proposed methods of PCT can be applied to the second overarching aim of this research.

PCT originated from clinical psychology, but has become more popular in recent years in business studies, particularly those relating to research on trust or attitudes. However, a similar search as for archival research dated September 2014, has revealed that from 28,000 peer-reviewed academic journal articles in tourism studies, only six have adopted a PCT research strategy. PCT is usually associated with quantitative methods, particularly the repertory grid method. It is unsurprising then that five of the six studies follow this approach (see Botterill 1989, Lawton 2005, Mansfeld and Ginosar 1994, McNicol 2004, and Waitt, Lane and Head 2003). More recently, Caruana, Glozer, Crane and McCabe (2014) conducted a study of eliciting higher-order constructs of tourists about their accounts of responsible tourism. While this study appears as a PCT study in the search output and could be situated within PCT from a research philosophical background, the methods
employed in this study did not represent methods from the PCT spectrum, nor did the actual text make claims towards utilising PCT. Crucially, this research contributes to advocating the use of PCT in qualitative tourism studies. It does so by demonstrating how the use of 'laddering' – a specific PCT technique – supports the elicitation of higher-order constructs relating to ethics and morals.

In summary, PCT is a rigorous strategy that can be used to elicit super-ordinate meanings, the understanding of personal realities and behavioural responses by utilising a structured theoretical foundation and methods. The disadvantages of PCT are that it is time-consuming, requires skilled interviewers and that it is often associated with small sample-sizes (Mansfeld and Ginosar 1994). As Figure 5.2 has shown, a successful PCT strategy requires data, analysis and rigour. Data is collected from individual tourism entrepreneurs and is as such primary. Laddering is used a means of elicitation of higher-order constructs. This is followed by thematic and narrative analysis. Finally, rigour is established by developing an interview guide, employing method triangulation and using the laddering technique from the PCT spectrum.

Finally, notes on research ethics and access are necessary in the context of this research due to the nature of the data that is collected. Firstly, secondary data that is owned by a third party poses ethical and access issues. Second, the nature of discussion primary data collection is sensitive as it relates to personal moral and ethics. A comprehensive research ethics procedure was followed to safeguard the legitimacy of this research.
5.4 Research Ethics and Access

5.4.1 Access and Ethical Approval for Secondary Data

The originality of this research lies in its ability to access and use secondary data during research phase one. This data is unpublished and guarded under strict data protection regulations by the data owner. Through this a number of ethical considerations arise. First, although the data is not subject to copyright status or patented, it falls under the right to confidentiality as it is not in the public domain (Le Voi 2010). Second, the data was not compiled by the organisation that currently holds it and owns it, but instead consist of written accounts from individuals outside of this organisation who did not know, at the time of writing, that this may become subject of a wider research project. From an ethical perspective, Saunders et al. (2012) refer to this as the voluntary nature of participation and the right to withdrawal. And third, the data dates back to 2005 and any facts presented may have been subject to change. This relates to an ethical responsibility when analysing data and reporting findings responsibly (Saunders et al. 2012).

The secondary data considered for this research are written documents concerning the *Tourism for Tomorrow Awards*. More specifically, they are the 32 winning entries for WTTC’s annual *Tourism for Tomorrow Awards* from the years 2005 to 2012 and their 32 corresponding audit reports. These are the unpublished application forms from all 32 winners of these years and the 32 unpublished reports from on-site evaluators for the submission to the final judging panel. WTTC has compiled and collected the data over time, stored it securely and is by proxy the data owner.
In order to address the above ethical concerns, a number of steps had to be taken. First, with regards to confidentiality and privacy access had to be carefully negotiated with WTTC. The organisation was presented with the research framework and motivation for using the awards applications and audit reports. Based on the premises of reciprocity and trust and a promise of full anonymity about the winners and auditors of the awards, an exclusive access was then granted for the purpose of this study. Reciprocity and trust relates to the relationship between the researcher and the data owner or research participant and requires a mutually beneficial relationship (Bryman and Bell 2011). It denotes a form of cognitive access to the data (Saunders et al. 2012). Physical access was given by means of handing over the electronic data files. Full anonymity here includes removing any name or place references in the presentation of the findings that would allow readers to make inferences about the identity of the applicants or auditors. It should be noted that the names of the winners and auditors are permanently available to see on the internet. However, the exact quotes, as used in the presentation of the findings, are not available online. In other words, full anonymity here means ensuring that it is not possible to match these verbatim quotes to any winners or auditors that one may find on the internet.

Second, with regards to the voluntary participation issue, WTTC acts as a guardian of this data. As a membership organisation, which carries out this award, it has been entrusted by its members and awards participants to act in accordance to their interest. WTTC has provided informed consent on behalf of its stakeholders. Le Voi (2010) suggests that informed consent on behalf of stakeholders is permissible, as long as these stakeholders do not fall under vulnerable groups or the researcher is
in danger of committing a restricted act. As neither is the case, WTTC’s informed consent on behalf has been accepted by the University of Surrey Research Ethics Committee.

Third, in considering the presentation of the findings, as will be shown in Chapter 7, the findings are not presented as facts. Rather they denote subjective truths of the applicants and auditors at the time of writing. Projected truths are realities of the way the applicants and auditors understand their world to be. This view sits comfortably within a subjectivist research philosophy that seeks to unravel individual interpretations of the truth. Finally, upon considering the points above, this thesis has received a favourable ethical opinion from the University of Surrey’s Research Ethics Committee (see Appendix A).

5.4.2 ACCESS AND ETHICAL APPROVAL FOR PRIMARY DATA

Collecting primary data essentially means collecting data from humans. Oates (2010, p. 207) defines this as “any activity that aims to generate knowledge that can be trusted and valued by the searcher and others.” When collecting data from humans, Diener and Crandall (1978) recommend that four considerations take place. First, can research participant come to harm in this research? Second, have research participants given informed consent? Third, is there an invasion of privacy? And fourth, is the research deceiving its participants in any way?

The research participants in this thesis are tourism entrepreneurs that have been purposefully selected as will be shown in Chapter 6. They are not considered
vulnerable individuals. To address the issue of harm a risk assessment was carried out (see Appendix B) and it was decided that there is a low risk involved with this research. Furthermore, research participants were briefed in writing about this research (see Appendix C) and asked to return a signed consent form agreeing to their participation in this research (see Appendix D). It should be noted here that 15 interviews were conducted in total. However, one participant failed to return a signed consent form and it was necessary to omit this particular interview from the research in order to comply with the University of Surrey’s ethical guidelines. With regards to privacy and confidentiality, once more all interview transcripts have been anonymised and the findings are presented in a manner which does not allow inferences about a person’s identity. Lastly, all research participants have been advised on the purpose and motivations for this research, without any deception.

The individuals identified as potential interviewees are tourism entrepreneurs, who have founded, own and manage their own tourism businesses. As such, these individuals may be classified as élites. Élites are generally regarded as groups of people in a position of power and of being able to make decisions that have a meaningful impact on others (Lilleker 2003). Researching this group of people often poses challenges over and above the normal obstacles involved in sampling, addressing and dealing with research participants. Welch, Marchan-Piekkari, Penttinen, and Tahvanainen (2002) identify access as a key issue when interviewing élites. Access barriers include keeping contact details private, having personal assistants to shield them from direct enquiries, or simply having extraordinarily busy diaries (Thomas 1995). These access barriers have been overcome because of a close, professional relationship between me and sustainable tourism
entrepreneurs. The proximity results from my previous employment. All potential interviewees were known individuals and contact details were available. In addition, interest was solicited through a personal message from my to a range of potential candidates using my professional social media networks LinkedIn and Facebook (see Appendix E). 27 individuals expressed an interest in participating in this research. Of these, 16 candidates fit the sampling criteria. 15 then participated and 14 interviews were used. The sampling strategy is explained in Chapter 6.

5.4.3 Notes on Positionality and Reflexivity

Positionality refers to one’s own subjectivity and positioning (Cloke, Cook, Crang, Goodwin, Painter and Philo 2004). Subjectivity means that one’s own value system becomes part of the research. This is in line with the subjectivist ontology of this research. Personal subjectivity and one’s own experiences influences the research paths that are taken (Hall 2004). My own value system has been shaped by years of professional practice in the field of sustainable tourism and awarding best practice in tourism. Out of this comes the primary motivation for this research. My work has led to a positive and optimistic view on sustainable tourism, but also to the need to find out more on why certain people decide to do ‘good’ in business and how this is best done. It has also influenced my position as a researcher for this thesis. As the Manager of the Tourism for Tomorrow Awards between 2006 and 2011, I was ideally positioned to gain access to the secondary data set and also establish a professional network that has been useful for soliciting interest in participation for this research.
As previously stated, written permission to use the Awards data was granted by the newly appointed Manager of the Tourism for Tomorrow Awards (see Appendix F). Her role as a gatekeeper was crucial in obtaining access to this data set. Before leaving WTTC, I have trained the new Manager and have handed over the awards programme to her. As such, my own positioning in this research becomes an integral part of the project. When reflecting on this positionality, it becomes evident that this can have a positive effect on the research and the development of a rapport between the researcher and the gatekeeper of the secondary data set (Valentine 2005). It becomes even more evident that my position is an emic one in research phase two, when conducting interviews with tourism entrepreneurs. The goal of any good qualitative research is to “capture an emic worldview of the public that is being inspected.” (Hollinshead 2004, p. 71) As such, the existing bond between me and the WTTC Tourism for Tomorrow Awards puts me in an ideal position to capture such an emic perspective.

While such close proximity can solicit interest, establish rapport and help in gaining access, it also requires a reflexive approach to the research. Reflexivity refers to one's self-awareness and self-consciousness during the research process (Hall 2004). It is also linked to analysing, reporting and presenting findings in a responsible manner (Saunders et al. 2012). This self-awareness is helped through a number of methods that strengthen the rigour of this research. These include triangulation, iteration as well as an audit trail and doing external coding checks. Whilst this methodological reflexivity is important, deconstructive reflexivity is crucial for this research. It refers to one's own value-system. As a researcher studying ethics, I cannot take my own views for granted, but must allow for other
voices to be heard (Johnson and Duberley 2003). It is not my task to judge what is right and wrong, but rather to let the research participants reflect on their own views and narratives about right and wrong.

5.5 Conclusion

This research adopts a two phased research strategy. First, archival research is carried out. And second, interviews are conducted using a Personal Construct Theory approach. In so doing, this research constitutes an original methodology for qualitative tourism research. Iteration is used throughout to interweave the two strategic research phases. Iteration, however, also significantly adds to the accountability of a research project.

The research philosophy or personal constructivism is grounded in the theoretical framework of this thesis. It supports research with elusive and complex concepts, such as those examined in Chapters 2 to 4 of this thesis. The idea of personal constructivism is also mirrored in the notion of uncertainty, which is central to an entrepreneurial environment. A personal constructivist approach also supports an idiographic study of values and types of behaviour. Lastly, personal constructivism sits comfortably with the subjective nature of ethics and a deconstructive researcher reflexivity.

Archival research has been chosen as an ideal research strategy for studying best practice because it looks at existing data that has not been subjected to researcher bias during the data collection process. For this thesis, archival research is ideal
because of access to a truly unique set of secondary data. This data has never been used for academic research, which adds significantly to the originality of this thesis. The second research strategy – Personal Construct Theory – is equally rare in tourism research as archival research is. It is, however, very beneficial for eliciting higher-order constructs relating to values of right and wrong.

Finally, research ethics have been taken very seriously in this thesis due to the nature of the data that is collected. One the one hand, there is secondary data, which poses some ethical difficulties that have been addressed. On the other hand, there is the collection of primary data from individuals about a sensitive subject, namely ethics. My own positionality has helped immensely to secure support for this research from research participants. Furthermore, this thesis has received a favourable ethical opinion from the University’s Research Ethics Committee. After exploring the wider philosophical and methodological foundations for this thesis, the next chapter looks in detail at the employed methods.
6 METHODS AND PROCESSES

Method should be a guiding light for a precise approach to avoid getting lost, or losing one’s way in this mental exercise, which goes so far that the natural light of our intuition or of our sense of experience is not enough.

(Sedlacek 2011, p. 107)

6.1 INTRODUCTION

The aim of this chapter is to provide readers with a torch that shines a light onto the methods and the processes that guided this research. In so doing, readers should gain confidence in the transparency of this research and in the rigour of the research findings. The empirical research for this thesis has been conducted in two stages. First, research phase one aims to achieve the first aim of the research and is rooted in an archival research strategy. Second, research phase two aims to achieve the second aim of this thesis and is situated within Personal Construct Theory as a research strategy. It is important to note though, that the findings from both phases inform each other, which becomes clear in the findings chapter (Chapter 7) and the two discussion chapters of this research (see Chapter 8 and 9). This process of iteration adds accountability to the research (Goodson and Phillimore 2004).

Particular emphasis is put on establishing rigour. Rigour in qualitative research refers to the credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability of findings (Lincoln and Guba 1985) as well as the dimension of accountability (Phillimore and Goodson 2004). Throughout the chapter, references to each of these dimensions are
made and tools and methods presented that enhance the rigour throughout. The conclusion provides a summary of these tools for establishing rigour that have been utilised in this research.

In line with the chronological reality of this research, the chapter begins by explaining in detail the methods and processes that were undertaken during research phase one. After a brief overview, the secondary data set is introduced, including the sampling strategy and a usefulness test for assessing the quality of the data. Following this, the data collection and analysis are explained. While data collection in research phase one was very brief and convenient due to its nature of being secondary data, the analysis phase presented itself with a much longer timeframe. Template analysis provided the most appropriate strategy and is explained in detail in this part of the chapter.

Following this, research phase two is then explained in detail. This concerns the data collection, preparation and analysis of primary data that stems from a series of 14 semi-structured interviews with supposedly ethical tourism entrepreneurs. The sampling strategy, which is grounded in this thesis’s theoretical framework, is introduced and methods from the PCT method spectrum are presented that have added rigour to this research. Finally, the chapter conclusion provides a summary of events, an overview of the rigour and the implications for the presentation of the findings in Chapter 7.
6.2 RESEARCH PHASE ONE

6.2.1 AN OVERVIEW

The first phase of the empirical research conducted in this thesis concerns the development of an ethical framework for best practice in tourism and thus, aims to achieve the first research aim. It is based on an archival research strategy, which seeks to collect and analyse secondary data (Timothy 2012). The secondary data is introduced and the sampling strategy described, while this section of the chapter concludes with a detailed review of the data analysis that has taken place.

Throughout the presentation of the methods and processes of the first research phase emphasis is put on the rigour that has been added to this as of date under-used research strategy. The rigorous approach includes different dimensions. First, for the choice of secondary data, a usefulness test method is applied that Saunders et al. (2012) strongly recommend in order to assess the quality of the secondary data. This method should dispel any doubts over the suitability of the secondary data set that was chosen here. It adds credibility and dependability to the overall research. Second, data is collected from two sources. This form of triangulation adds credibility and transferability to findings in qualitative research (Baxter and Eyles 1997) because the findings from one data set should be corroborated by the findings from the second data set. Finally, an iterative coding process is used during the stage of the data analysis including an external code check, coding template revisions, code memos and manual coding each influencing each other. Iteration adds accountability to qualitative research (Goodson and Phillimore 2004).
6.2.2 Secondary data

6.2.2.1 The Tourism for Tomorrow Awards

The Tourism for Tomorrow Awards (www.tourismfortomorrow.com) are an internationally recognised sustainable tourism award or prize. The awards are organised by the World Travel & Tourism Council (WTTC), which states that the purpose of the awards is to recognise "best practice in sustainable tourism within the industry worldwide." (WTTC 2014a, online) As such, the awards claim a leadership role for best practice in tourism. Applicants to these awards are travel and tourism companies and organisations from around the globe, which believe their business conduct constitutes best practice in sustainable tourism. Recognition occurs in the form of a widely publicised awards ceremony held during WTTC's annual Global Travel & Tourism Summit. The location of this ceremony changes every year to highlight the global nature of this programme. The recognition is symbolic and not monetary. As one previous winner stated, “We didn’t make money from winning the award or all of the sudden had more guests. But we are now taken seriously and it has helped open many doors for us.” (Huntley-Khajavi 2010, personal communication)

The Tourism for Tomorrow Awards were initially inaugurated in 1989 by the Federation of Tour Operators, and then subsequently led by British Airways from 1992. WTTC took over the awards from British Airways in 2003. The move from a corporate awards organiser to a non-profit awards organiser was aimed to demonstrate the independence and integrity of the awards away from a corporate,
profitable business. The awards are run as non-profit programme within WTTC and have a dedicated *Tourism for Tomorrow Awards* Manager.

The take-over in 2003 has led to a re-design of the awards categories and criteria. The first call for entries opened in 2005 under the new rules and guidelines. It should be noted here that the awards were handed out in four separate categories (Destination Stewardship, Conservation, Community Benefit and Global Tourism Business) during the time of the research. However, the focus of this study lies on their overall criteria, which span across all four categories. The difference between the category criteria with regards to sustainable best practice are minor and can be overlooked here. 2013 saw the addition of two additional categories and a change to the overall awards criteria. Therefore, for reasons of coherence, only documents from the years 2005 till 2012 have been used.

Following the revision of guidelines and categories in 2003, the awards’ reputation has improved and they are now seen as one of the most prominent sustainable tourism award globally. The following quote from a green travel online TV channel highlights the importance of the awards.

*The awards have become the green tourism Oscars, recognising the most planet and people-friendly travel projects around the globe.*

(Greentravelguides.tv 2009, online)

However, there are a plethora of tourism awards available and the claim for superiority of these particular awards has to be made cautiously. Nevertheless,
Buckley (2012) purports that the *Tourism for Tomorrow Awards* can be considered among the most recognised global awards besides the *World Legacy Awards* from National Geographic and the *Ecotraveler Awards* from Condé Nast. This positive reputation of the *Tourism for Tomorrow Awards* is a result of the rigorous three step-judging process that centres around an on-site audit for shortlisted applicants and the high calibre of awards judges. Both, the process and the judges, are independent from WTTC.

### 6.2.2.2 Sampling strategy

The sampling strategy for this research is based on two premises: non-probability sampling and source triangulation. Non-probability sampling is often used in qualitative research. When aiming to develop an ethical framework and key themes, Saunders *et al.* (2012) recommend purposive, heterogeneous sampling as the ideal sampling strategy to achieve this aim. Purposive sampling stresses the need for information rich cases, which are theoretically central to the study (Baxter and Eyles 1997, Hoggart *et al.* 2002). The purpose is to make generalisations about “theory rather than about a population.” (Saunders *et al.* 2012, p. 283) Therefore, the purposive element is crucial to the sampling strategy and is derived from the ability to conduct an applied ethics analysis for best practice in tourism.

The *Tourism for Tomorrow Awards* material enables this research to do so as the overall awards criteria encompass various elements of ethics theory. The introduction chapter to this thesis has already shown that sustainable tourism is ethically complex and can be used as a proxy to studying ethics. This is also the case
for the *Tourism for Tomorrow Awards* criteria. Table 6.1 outlines in no particular order how each of the overall awards criteria relates to a particular value perspective and an ethical dimension. These 10 criteria can be viewed online at [http://www.wttc.org/tourism-for-tomorrow-awards/award-categories/](http://www.wttc.org/tourism-for-tomorrow-awards/award-categories/).

Following the change in 2013, these now do not appear as ‘overall’ criteria anymore, but have been incorporated into six new categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Tourism for Tomorrow Criterion</strong></th>
<th><strong>Value Perspective</strong></th>
<th><strong>Ethical Dimension</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct benefits to local people and host communities</td>
<td>Reciprocal altruism</td>
<td>Utilitarianism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring maximum positive benefits with minimum negative impacts</td>
<td>Utility calculus</td>
<td>Utilitarianism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundamental respect for human rights and that of indigenous people</td>
<td>Universality principle</td>
<td>Deontology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local stakeholder collaboration</td>
<td>Procedural justice</td>
<td>Virtue ethics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and reporting</td>
<td>Accountability and transparency</td>
<td>Deontology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles of sustainability are integrated into tourism planning and policies</td>
<td>Obligation and duty</td>
<td>Deontology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles of sustainability are reflected in daily business practice</td>
<td>Practical wisdom</td>
<td>Virtue ethics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raising awareness</td>
<td>Stewardship</td>
<td>Virtue ethics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce, reuse, recycle and environmental best practice</td>
<td>Utility calculus</td>
<td>Utilitarianism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational leadership</td>
<td>Eudemonia and benevolence</td>
<td>Virtue ethics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: field studies

The individuals in this data set are not representative of the tourism industry as a whole. However, the sample in the data set is theoretically central to the study and rich in diversity (Hoggart *et al.* 2002). This heterogeneity supports the development of key themes and emergent theory (Saunders *et al.* 2012). The individual applicants come from every corner of this planet and are spread out over all sectors of the
tourism industry and of different sizes. Figures 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3 below demonstrate the sector, geographical and size distribution of the applicants. The audit reports incidentally have the same spread as they concern the same organisations.

*The regions are those used by WTTC.

Source: field studies

Source: field studies
In total, the sample size is $N=64$ and consists of 32 applications and 32 audit reports. For qualitative research, this is a large sample size. However, for the development of an ethical framework, this is indeed beneficial. Section 6.2.3 will outline the implications of analysing a large sample with qualitative methods.

The second element to the sampling strategy besides non-probability sampling relates to the use of two sources – or source triangulation. Triangulation is a strategy ensuring rigour in qualitative research (Baxter and Eyles 1997). It can be applied in two different ways: either via source triangulation, i.e. the use of multiple data sources to examine the same research question, or by using method triangulation, i.e. the use of different methods within one data source. Although sampling from two sources in archival research is not a prerequisite, this method considerably strengthens the credibility and transferability of the findings (Baxter and Eyles 1997). They state:

*The most important principle for guiding qualitative studies is the notion of credibility. [...] Triangulation is one of the most powerful techniques for...*
strengthening credibility. It is based on convergence: when multiple sources provide similar findings their credibility is considerably strengthened.

(Baxter and Eyles 1997, p. 512)

Decrop (2004) asserts that source triangulation – or informant triangulation also adds to the transferability of findings, which indicates how externally valid findings are if applied to different groups of people. It is not to be confused with the aim of generalisation about a population, but is associated with the ability to generalise about theory rather than people (Saunders et al. 2012). Two sources have been selected for developing an ethical framework for best practice in tourism. These are the applications of winners for the Tourism for Tomorrow Awards and the audit reports from the second phase of the judging process. The data spans over eight years. As there are four winners each year in four different categories and then corresponding audit reports for each winner, a total of 64 documents was obtained. The data ranges from 2005 when the first call for entries under the new rules and guidelines was made, until 2012 when the last complete set of applications and reports under these guidelines was available. Each set of two sources concern the same entity, i.e. the individual applicant. One source is a self-evaluation of the applicant’s performance and the second source is the evaluation of the same applicant by an auditor. Although Buckley (2012) contends that on-site visits depend on goodwill and voluntary services, they have been conducted independently from the awards’ organising body WTTC; as was the remainder of the awards’ judging process. In addition, on-site auditors have no judging capability, thus limiting respondent bias. Building on these assumptions, the audit reports have
the power to corroborate the claims made by the applicants, and to triangulate the findings in this research.

The success of archival research is largely dependent the quality of the secondary data that is obtained (Timothy 2012). While it is my opinion that the *Tourism for Tomorrow Awards* data is appropriately sampled, I have also conducted a usefulness test for the data as recommended by Saunders *et al.* (2012). This includes testing the overall suitability of the data, the precise suitability and conducting a cost-benefit-analysis for the secondary data. The method of usefulness testing adds to more rigour to this methodological approach.

6.2.2.3 Usefulness test for secondary data

Overall suitability is concerned with the topical suitability of the data in relation to one’s research question (Saunders *et al.* 2012). In other words: Does the data fit the purpose of the research? In the case of the *Tourism for Tomorrow Awards*, one can be confident that the data collected is suitable for presenting best practice in tourism. This is explicitly stated by WTTC (2014a online, own emphasis) “The *Tourism for Tomorrow Awards* are aimed at recognising best practice in sustainable tourism within the industry worldwide.” The *Tourism for Tomorrow Awards* follow the sustainable tourism paradigm that acts as a proxy for studying ethics in this research. Furthermore, as Table 6.1 has shown, the overall awards criteria encompass a wide array of ethical dimensions. This makes the data from the awards particularly useful for answering the research questions.
In addition to topicality, overall suitability is also concerned with coherence and completeness (Saunders et al. 2012). Coherence of topicality can be assumed as all applicants have acknowledged the sustainable tourism paradigm and the auditors are all internationally recognised experts on sustainable tourism ranging from members of academia, industry, media and government. Note here that the applicants’ claims may be construed as marketing rather than fact. However, the marketing value is limited, as reports remain unpublished. Moreover, any inconsistencies will be highlighted by the on-site auditors. This check mechanism is important for the triangulation of the data and inconsistencies are discussed in Chapters 7 and 8 of this thesis as a form of relationship dilemma. Completeness is also given. There are no missing applications or audit reports for the period from 2005 to 2012.

Lastly, only winning entries were considered to support the overall suitability for this data set. This has been done for three reasons. First, corresponding audit reports are only available for winners and finalists applications. Therefore, source triangulation can only be guaranteed for shortlisted applicants. Second, the winning entries were then chosen as they demonstrate what has been judged as best practice and thus, provide richer material for the development of a theoretical framework (Timothy 2012). Last, the technical quality of winning entries has been regarded as superior to general ones in terms of English language proficiency and completion levels of the application forms. To conclude, the overall suitability of this data has been established.
Moving from overall to precise suitability, Saunders et al. (2012, p. 323) explain “The reliability and validity one ascribes to secondary data are functions of the method by which the data were collected and the sources.” Reliability and validity are contested criteria for qualitative research (Decrop 2004). A more preferable typology is that of Lincoln and Guba (1985) who associate reliability to the qualitative dimension of dependability, i.e. how coherent and consistent the data is, whilst validity refers to the internal credibility of the findings. In this instance, this means how well equipped are the research respondents to make credible assumptions about the subject area.

An examination of the data collection and the sources determines the precise suitability of the secondary data set. Whilst all winning entries are valid sustainable tourism companies, all auditors are experts in sustainable tourism. The validity of their corroborating accounts can be assumed. Dependability (or reliability as per Saunders et al. 2012) is given as all application forms have the same structure with the same questions. Equally, this applies to the audit reports. Appendices G and H show examples of a blank application form and an audit report respectively. In the case of the Tourism for Tomorrow Awards, the method of data collection has not been changed for the eight years that concerns this research. Each year, applicants had to complete a comprehensive application form which has not changed over the period of time in this research. Forms were completed as Microsoft Word document and then emailed to WTTC. Alternatively an online form could be used, which resulted in an automated email notification with the completed application form attached.
Each year, the application form consisted of the same six sections: 1) contact details, 2) project summary, 3) description of work undertaken in relation to the Tourism for Tomorrow Awards criteria, 4) description of best practice and leadership, 5) two independent references, 6) and a check list including the rules and guidelines for entry. The fact that the Tourism for Tomorrow Awards criteria have not changed between 2005 and 2012 also adds to the dependability of the data collection method. As such, the data itself and method of data collection have been coherent for all applicants in this data set. The same applies to the audit reports. Auditors were first asked to present an overview of the project, and then they were asked to evaluate the work undertaken by the applicant in relation to the Tourism for Tomorrow Awards criteria, followed by a conclusion and recommendation for the final judging panel. These audit reports were sent to WTTC as Microsoft Word documents as an email attachment. Finally, the rigour of the judging process, the transparency of the awards and the international reputation of the awards and of WTTC allow the assumption that the secondary data sets are reliable and suitable for this research.

To finalise the usefulness test, a cost-benefit-analysis was conducted. According to Timothy (2012) one advantage of archival research is that often it is less expensive and less time consuming to conduct because data collection is done by a third party prior to one’s own research. A disadvantage, however, is that access to the data can be restricted, particularly if the data is not available in the public domain (Timothy 2012). In order to assess whether using secondary data for archival research is a beneficial strategy, a cost-benefit analysis was conducted. Costs include money and time to obtain the data, benefits relate to the usefulness of the data as well as the
form in which the data was made accessible (Saunders et al. 2012). Table 6.2 demonstrates that the benefits of using *Tourism for Tomorrow Awards* applications and audit reports for this research significantly outweigh the costs. It was decided that archival research is a useful strategy for this research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consideration</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Money to obtain data</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td></td>
<td>No costs have been incurred in obtaining the data, data was handed over free of charge and the data transfer was done electronically, i.e. no travel costs for the researcher either</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to obtain data</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Very little time was necessary to obtain the data, data was readily available on the WTTC server, a WTTC employee only had to send it over to the researcher as a ZIP file, two days of email correspondence were necessary to obtain permission to access data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain access permission</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td></td>
<td>As data is property of WTTC, written permission to access and use data for this research had to be obtained, this was granted without further restrictions provided that anonymity of applicants and evaluators is guaranteed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall suitability of data</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>The previous analysis has demonstrated that the data is topically suitable for the research project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precise suitability of data</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>The previous analysis has demonstrated that the data is suitable for the research project in terms of dependability and credibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form in which data was received</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Data was handed over in electronic format as 64 individual Microsoft Word document files, ready for data preparation and analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: present author

6.2.3 DATA ANALYSIS

6.2.3.1 DATA COLLECTION AND PREPARATION

Before any analysis is possible, data has to be collected and prepared. As stated above, the form in which the data was received was very convenient and not at all time consuming. 64 documents were handed over in electronic, word processing
format, ready to be used. However, in order to obey by ethical standards, the data
needed further preparation to be made usable for analysis. This was also necessary
for the data to be successfully imported into the data analysis software NVivo10. As
such, the following steps have been undertaken:

- All files have been renamed as saved as follows: APP01-2005 till APP32-2012
  and AUD01-2005 till AUD32-2012

APP stands for applicant and AUD stands for auditor. The numbers 01 till 32 denote
the individual organisation. Lastly, the numbers 2005-2012 refer to the year in
which the application or audit report was written. This is particularly important for
the historical aspect of the analysis. However, for the purpose of presenting the
findings the year was dropped and the organisation numbers were randomised. In
other words, APP01-2005 could end up being APP48 or any other number. This step
was considered important as WTTC had specifically stipulated that no inferences
could be made about the identity of the applicants and auditors in the presentation
of the findings. Following this:

- All corporate branding items such as logos and imagery have been removed
  from the files.
- In each application, section 1 (contact details), section 5 (references) as well
  as section 6 (check list and rules and guidelines) have been removed. These
  sections do not contain topical information and had to be removed for the
  purpose of anonymity.
In each audit report the auditor’s name, contact details and time and location of the evaluation have been removed.

All text has been anonymised. Name references to the individual organisation have been replaced with insertion like [company] or [project] and geographical references have been replaced by [country] or [region].

This data preparation is crucial for a rigorous analysis of the data using computer software NVivo10.

6.2.3.2 Template analysis

The methods chosen for data analysis are those combined together known as ‘template analysis’. Template analysis is a qualitative form of content analysis and thus recommended for an archival research strategy.

Broadly speaking, all forms of archival research involve content analysis, because signs, symbols, patterns and meanings are sought from archived materials regardless of the methodological approaches utilised.

(Timothy 2012, p. 406)

It sits on a continuum between content analysis and a Grounded Theory approach to theory buildings (King 2012). In essence, when conducting template analysis the initial template is deduced from themes resulting out of the literature review and the research objectives. It is then step-by-step revised inductively through coding and analysing the data. As such, template analysis starts with a deductive approach,
but soon turns into an inductive, qualitative data analysis. This is not at odds with qualitative research as Bryman and Bell (2011) argue that often the boundaries of deduction and induction are blurred in qualitative studies. Template analysis sits comfortably in a constructivist research philosophy (King 2012). The fact that large data sets can be analysed within the philosophical stance of personal constructivism makes template analysis an appropriate method for research phase one in this thesis.

King (2012) highlights the advantages of using this approach as being able to cope with a large set of qualitative data in a structured manner without it being too prescriptive as Grounded Theory may be at times. In reality, this proved to be correct. 32 applicant reports and 32 corresponding evaluator reports (in future abbreviated as APP or AUD) were coded and analysed. This equated to 128,000 words or 427 pages of transcribed data. The initial coding and first round of full text coding was computer-assisted using NVivo10 – a qualitative data analysis software. Computer assisted coding allows for the work to be done in a structured way and supports project management and data organisation (Lewins and Silver 2007). Memos and other notes can also easily be added to relevant data sections and the retrieval and output of large quantities of data is also improved by such software. Furthermore, NVivo10 is a powerful software for coding and allows to code hierarchically at different levels of specificity and parallel, provided that the analysis remains qualitative. The latter was more useful for the second phase of the research, which employed both thematic and narrative coding in parallel. Finally, using computer software enables the coding to be done on an on-going basis as is required by the template analysis method. Previous templates and findings can be stored and
revised at any time. This supports the iterative nature of the research. As a rule of thumb, King (2012) suggests that a template needs two revisions before it can be considered to be a final template. The application of a final template constitutes the basis of the findings ready for discussion.

Despite its obvious advantages – such as application to large data sets, being highly flexible, easy to learn for novice researchers and few prescriptions and procedures – template analysis suffers from some disadvantages too. These include the lack of literature on the application of the method. A search similar to those on archival research and PCT in tourism studies has found only one study that utilised template analysis. This was Rhoden, Ralston and Ineson’s (2008) analysis of disruptive in-flight behaviour. The sample size of N=8 was very small and therefore, the implications for the data analysis are very different from this thesis. This constitutes a methodological contribution of this thesis as it showcases the usefulness of template analysis for qualitative tourism research. In particular when dealing with large data sets.

Furthermore, templates may end up too simple or too complex if not developed thoughtfully and with detailed knowledge of the qualitative data set (King 2012). In combination with computer-assisted coding it can lead to alienation between the researcher and the data, as the process can be very mechanical. Deep interpretation, however, is only possible by immersing yourself into the data and manually coding and analysing it (Saunders et al. 2012). For this purpose, a second round of more interpretative coding was done manually in order to formulate the final template.
Finally, template analysis has the capacity to reveal relationships and explore deeper meanings of events (King 2012). However, it can also be too descriptive if not carefully conducted. To ensure validity of codes and to add rigour to the analysis process, an independent, external academic was asked to conduct a code check and he corroborated the codes from the emergent template. Once more, iteration plays a vital role for this research. As shown in Figure 5.1 in the previous chapter, the findings of research phase two will add to the findings of the template analysis in order to conceptualise an ethic for best practice in tourism.

The initial starting point for developing a coding template was rooted in the thesis’s theoretical frameworks, i.e. the categorisation of ethical dilemmas and the value-behavioural lens for entrepreneurship. These constitute the broad a priori themes for analysis (column 1 in Table 6.3). Following this, an initial coding template was developed on the basis of themes emergent from the literature (column 2 in Table 6.3). The focus was then further intensified through the process of inductive and iterative coding with the help of an audit trail and coding memos. After two revisions of the initial template a final template was developed which builds the basis for the findings and the discussion (column 3 in Table 6.3). An important aspect of the coding was that initially, codes were sub-divided into the three parameters that exist in the triple-bottom line of sustainability: environmental, socio-cultural and economic sustainability. However, upon further analysis, it was decided that this traditional division of sustainability was not helpful for an applied ethics lens to best practice in tourism. Once more, the ethical complexity of sustainable tourism became evident. Table 6.3 shows the final coding template, which constitutes the
basis for the discussion of the findings. A detailed audit trail of the step-by-step coding process can be found in Appendix H.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6.3:</th>
<th>Final template with codes representing the basis of the findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dilemmas</strong></td>
<td><strong>Relationship dilemmas</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution dilemmas</td>
<td>Economic leakage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition for space and resources</td>
<td>Stakeholder opposition and alienation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Values</strong></td>
<td><strong>Intrinsic motivations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic motivations</td>
<td>Beliefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs</td>
<td>Values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtues</td>
<td>Guest satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Behaviour</strong></td>
<td><strong>Fairness</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness</td>
<td>Employment opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: present author
6.3 Research Phase Two

6.3.1 An Overview

The second phase of the empirical research was rooted in Personal Construct Theory and borrowed methods from this spectrum. Its aim is to develop a deeper understanding of an entrepreneurial ethic and entrepreneurial role behaviour for best practice tourism entrepreneurs. Through the elicitation of high-order constructs pertaining to moral values, PCT is a useful research strategy for achieving this particular research aim (Fransella 2005). The empirical phase consists of conducting semi-structured interviews with so-called ethical tourism entrepreneurs. These are then analysed using a combination of methods.

The rigour in this second phase of empirical research is ensured by means of employing a variety of strategies. First, a rigorous sampling strategy built upon the theoretical framework for this research establishes transferability of the findings (Decrop 2004). Method triangulation by means of using both thematic and narrative analysis adds credibility to the findings (Baxter and Eyles 1997, Decrop 2004). Finally, the dependability of the findings is safeguarded by developing an interview guide (Bryman and Bell 2011) and by employing the PCT method of laddering (Denicolo 2003).
6.3.2 PRIMARY DATA

6.3.2.1 SAMPLING ETHICAL TOURISM ENTREPRENEURS

The primary data in this second phase of the research comes from interviews with so-called ethical tourism entrepreneurs. As previously stated, an ethical entrepreneur is someone who does not just exploit opportunities for their own self-interest, but also pursues the betterment of society (Wempe 2005). As it is difficult to gauge what exactly this means, it is even more difficult to identify such individuals. To help overcome this obstacle, a definition for ethical tourism entrepreneurs from Chapter 4 of this thesis provides a set of pre-determined criteria that potential interview candidates have to meet. A personal judgment then needs to be made about the appropriateness of these candidates (Saunders et al. 2012). The definition states:

_A tourism entrepreneur is an individual who has _founded_ his or her own business, which has _tourism at the heart of its operations_. He or she will have _commercialised_ their venture, although with varying degrees possible, including profit, non-profit, and social ventures. His or her entrepreneurial role behaviour is based on an ontology of becoming an entrepreneur, which may include the lifestyle motive. The _basic premise of the venture includes exploiting existing opportunities not just for him or her, but also for environmental and societal wellbeing._

(Present author)
The key aspects for the selection criteria are marked in bold font. The selection criteria are: (1) an individual, (2) who founded a (3) commercial entity in (4) tourism and has supported (5) environmental and societal wellbeing. The first 4 criteria are relatively easy to check. The 5th criterion, however, requires some desktop research in order to find evidence of this support for environmental or societal wellbeing. Evidence can be in the form of a well-documented and publicised corporate social responsibility strategy for the tourism entrepreneur, or perhaps the person has been awarded an honour or a prize for their ethical business conduct, or they have been written about in the media or elsewhere for their ethical business conduct. Such sampling is called homogenous-purposive sampling and is ideal for in-depth and semi-structured interviews in idiographic studies (Saunders et al. 2012). The selection criteria are designed to achieve homogeneity in the sample population, whilst purposiveness achieved by designing criteria that are theoretically linked to the study.

It is difficult to estimate the appropriate sample size for qualitative research. Although there are guidelines about sample sizes, theoretical sampling seems a prudent approach. Theoretical sampling supports the notion that the sample size depends on the level of data saturation (Bryman and Bell 2011). It is an ongoing process. For this research, an initial interest in participation was registered. A number of nine interviews were initially scheduled and as they proceeded, a further six interviews were then agreed in order to achieve data saturation. In other words, 15 full interviews took place. This is a sample size that sits comfortably with the PCT research strategy (Fransella 2005). Although, it has to be noted that only 14
interviews were used for analysis as the 15\textsuperscript{th} participant failed to return a signed, informed consent form.

To recruit participants, the following steps were undertaken:

- A private message was sent from my professional Facebook and LinkedIn social media accounts to my list of contacts detailing the research project and asking for interest in participation (see Appendix E)
- 27 people registered their interest by replying to the message
- All these were then screened against the above mentioned selection criteria
- 16 people fit the selection criteria and then were formally invited to participate in the research by email invitation (see Appendix J)
- 15 people then finally agreed, interviews were scheduled and took place
- 14 people returned the signed consent form

Table 6.4 overleaf shows the final list of participants checked against the selection criteria. The table also shows the country where they are operating their business, the industry sector that they are in, and the size of their operations by number of employees. These differences do no impact negatively on the homogeneity as the key selection criteria are the founding of a tourism business and ethical business conduct. The findings will highlight any significant differences in responses between different groups, for young versus mature businesses. Once more, the participants are not representative of the entire tourism industry. However, this is not the aim of this research. The abbreviation TE stands for tourism entrepreneur. The numbers 01-15 denote the order in which the interviews took place. They have no further relevance to the analysis of the findings.
Table 6.4: Final sampling frame for ethical tourism entrepreneurs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Founder</th>
<th>Tourism</th>
<th>Ethics evidence</th>
<th>Company age</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TE01</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>CSR policy and Award judge</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Tour operator</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE02</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Award winner</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Airline</td>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE03</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Award winner</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Hotelier</td>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE04</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Media story and Award judge</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE05</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Media story and Award judge</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE06</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>CSR policy and Award judge</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Tour operator</td>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE07</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>CSR policy</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE08</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>CSR policy and Award judge</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Consultant and hotelier</td>
<td>USA and Namibia</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE09</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Award winner</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Hotelier</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE10</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Award winner</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Tour operator</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE11</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Media story and Award winner</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Consultant and tour operator</td>
<td>USA and Costa Rica</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE12</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>CSR policy</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE13</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>CSR policy</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE14</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Media story</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Tour operator</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE15</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Award judge</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Tour operator</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: field studies

6.3.2.2 Semi-structured interviews using laddering technique

The method chosen for research phase two is conducting semi-structured interviews. Similar to unstructured interviews, semi-structured interviews are a tool often utilised in qualitative research (Bryman and Bell 2011). Interviews have many advantages over structured methods. For example, interviews are very
flexible (Bryman and Bell 2011) and a useful method to extract meanings, values and beliefs from the research population (Hoggart et al. 2002). Interviews can be conducted with groups of people. However, for this research interviews with individuals are more appropriate as the interview question may be quite personal. The individual layout of the interviews is conducive to establishing a close rapport between the interviewer and the respondent (Valentine 2005). This is of particular importance when enquiring about sensitive subjects such as one’s ethical foundation and judgement approaches. The topics of the interviews contain reflexive and self-evaluating elements, which would not be suitable to a group environment, such as a focus group discussion. Individual one-on-one interviews are more conducive to preventing bias in the answers of respondents when dealing with sensitive subjects. Bias in answers because of the presence of an interviewer was not an issue in this research. All of the interviewees came from my professional network stemming from my previous employment. In other words, I had known each entrepreneur and met them before. This had two benefits. First, it contributed largely to the willingness to participate and second, it was very easy to establish a comfortable rapport and interviewees spoke open and candidly about their views. In addition, the status of the interviewees assumes that this group is confident in their actions and speech.

The use of semi-structured interviews usually implies the application of an interview guide. It is important to note that an interview guide does not tend to infringe on the flexibility of the interview, rather “the idea of an interview guide is much less specific than the notion of an interview schedule.” (Bryman and Bell 2011, p. 467) Using an interview guide helps strengthen dependability in qualitative
research. Dependability refers to how plausible an interview account is in relation to other interviews conducted in the same project. Increased dependability, for example through the use of interview guides, helps deal with idiosyncrasies that might occur during the interview process (Baxter and Eyles 1997). As such, the use of an interview guide strengthens the rigour of qualitative research. The focus now turns to the use of PCT methods for designing the interview guide for this research.

PCT is most often associated with the use of the repertory grid method. As mentioned in Chapter 5, it is the method chosen by almost all of the few PCT studies in tourism. A grid is a form of questionnaire that the respondent designs himself or herself under the guidance of the researcher (Denicolo 2003). Through preliminary interviews, topics of discussion will be identified and the respondent then designs their own grid by using the personal constructs that come to mind. The grid is then usually followed up with another interview and analysed using a mix of quantitative and qualitative tools.

The topics of discussion are called elements. The key aspect to elements is that they are “specific, drawn from the same category or domain, representative and familiar to the respondents.” (Waitt et al. 2003, p. 531) A subsequent construct elicitation is anchored into these elements (Fransella 2005). These constructs allow for conclusions about the entrepreneur’s role behaviour and ethic, which is the overarching aim of research phase two. While the grid method is considered to be too rigid, the use of elements forms the basis for the interview guide.
The elements – or topics of discussion – are derived from two sources. First, some elements have emerged from the theoretical discussion of this thesis. The second source of elements comes from the first research phase. Elements that have been elicited from the literature are: conflicting opinions about what constitute business responsibilities, the growth conundrum and the experience conundrum. Three more elements have emerged from the first phase of the research. They have emerged as topics of discussion because the secondary data alone was not able to provide all the answers to these. Chapter 7 will provide insight into these findings in more detail. These elements build the basis for the wider debate in the interview guide.

A second method that has been borrowed from the PCT method spectrum is called **laddering**. Laddering is both a method and a technique, which allows the researcher to elicit super-ordinate constructs from respondents (Fransella 1981). Super-ordinate constructs are opinions, meanings or views that are often difficult to put into words by research participants and they relate to a set of high-order values, such as values pertaining to ethics and moral (Graafland *et al.* 2006). This makes the use of laddering an appropriate technique for gaining a deeper understanding of an entrepreneurial ethic, but also for understanding role behaviour better. The basis for discussion here revolves around two areas – the entrepreneurs themselves and their understanding of best practice in tourism. Laddering is done by asking similar questions about the same subject, whilst subsequently moving to higher levels of abstraction in order to arrive at super-ordinate constructs (Fransella 1981). Biographical references to the respondent’s past are also part of the laddering method (Denicolo 2003). In essence, laddering means gradually moving from a specific topic of discussion towards a wider debate. It means moving from the
personal to the abstract. In so doing, personal narratives develop and higher-order constructs can be elicited by means of discussing abstract elements. Figure 6.4 shows the final interview guide for this research.

**FIGURE 6.4: Interview guide using laddering technique**

![Diagram of interview guide using laddering technique](image)

- **Wider debate**
  - The flying conundrum
  - The experience conundrum
  - The growth conundrum

- **Best practice**
  - Definition for best practice
  - Barriers for best practice
  - Values for best practice
  - Future for best practice

- **Entrepreneurial narrative**
  - Years of experience and company age
  - Motivation for starting a sustainable tourism business
  - Mission for the sustainable tourism business
  - Business priorities
  - Business responsibilities
  - Learning curve

*Source: present author*

Following this guide, the interviewee began by telling their own story and journey as an entrepreneur. This personal reflection was then gradually widened to include more abstract concepts. The entrepreneurial narrative is the personal level of the interview. The second level concerned a discussion about best practice. All
entrepreneurs have knowledge and experience in the field of best practice in sustainable tourism. Finally, the discussion was elevated to an abstract level during which issues of a wider debate were discussed. They were not personal to the entrepreneur, nor did they necessarily have experienced the conundrums. However, they all had knowledge of the topics of the wider debate. This allowed entrepreneurs to develop their thinking about wider ethical issues in a gradual way throughout the interview.

The interviews took place over a time period of six weeks and were held mostly via Skype internet video call; although four interviews were conducted in person as the interviewees lived within reachable proximity. The average interview duration was between 45 and 60 minutes during which the three broad topics from the interview guide were covered. As this was the case for all interviews, dependability of the findings is ensured (Baxter and Eyles 1997).

6.3.3 Data analysis

The data analysis followed a two-pronged approach by using two types of analysis: thematic analysis and narrative analysis. This form of method triangulation adds rigour to qualitative tourism research as it strengthens the credibility of findings (Baxter and Eyles 1997). During the first stage, thematic analysis, the interviews were broken up, sorted and analysed across by themes. Following this, the interviews were then once more analysed as individual entities portraying individual narratives.
However, before any analysis takes place, the data that was collected had to be prepared accordingly. During the interview process all interviews were audio-recorded. Audio recording may negatively affect the rapport during an interview situation as participants can feel intimidated by an audio-recording device and self-censor their answers. This creates a form of respondent bias (Valentine 2005). The danger of this happening in this research was minimal. First, all of the entrepreneurs have been interviewed before and were confident research participants. Moreover, during the 11 Skype Internet calls, the respondents could not actually see the recording device as it was built into the computer. The face-to-face interviews did also not show signs of respondent bias due to the use of a recording device.

All audio files were then transcribed into Microsoft Word document format. A word-by-word transcription was necessary in order to capture the super-ordinate constructs that emerged from the discussion. As with the documents from the first research phase, these transcripts were also anonymised by removing all name or place references that would allow readers to make inferences about the person’s identity. NVivo10 software was used again. However, this time only for the process of organising the data into themes ready for the thematic analysis (Lewins and Silver 2007). The actual interpretation was done manually as it allowed me to immerse myself deep into the data and the realities that are portrayed with it (Saunders et al. 2012).
6.3.3.1 Thematic analysis

Thematic analysis involves a process called entitation, by which the data is fragmented into themes or entities, which build the basis for any subsequent interpretation (Cloke et al. 2004). For Personal Construct Theory, these entities are the different elements of discussion from within the interviews. In this instance, these are the different topics discussed during the interviews as outlined in the interview guide. Thematic analysis here then refers to sifting and sorting the data by question asked and then interpreting the set of answers from all interviewees to one particular question. Thematic analysis, although contested in management research (Bryman and Bell 2011), has the advantage of ‘telling it as it is’ and thus not overcomplicating the findings. This ‘telling it as it is’ involves extrapolating the attributes of each entity (Cloke et al. 2004). For PCT this means eliciting the constructs associated to each event. However, thematic analysis is a form of data reduction (Saunders et al. 2012) and can simplify data too much. Henceforth, it should be triangulated with another form of analysis to enhance the credibility of the findings. In this instance this is narrative analysis.

6.3.3.2 Narrative analysis

The second approach to analysis that has been chosen is narrative analysis. This approach is suitable to conducting research situated within a research strategy based on the theoretical foundation of Personal Construct Psychology. The most important feature of narrative analysis is that data does not become fragmented and de-conceptualised (Bryman and Bell 2011). Instead of breaking the data down by
each element of discussion, each interview is analysed as one element in itself. This means that in narrative analysis, the respondents’ lives and events are seen as a process. Moreover, narrative analysis seeks to elicit personal narratives and personal constructs. This is best achieved through the method of laddering as discussed earlier in this chapter. Bryman and Bell (2011) endorse narrative analysis as a form of sense making through storytelling. After all, it is the aim of this research to understand how tourism entrepreneurs make sense of, and then act in situations that are seen as ethical dilemmas.

6.4 Conclusion

This chapter has explained in detail the methods and processes used in this research in order to achieve the overarching research aims. It has been shown that using template analysis and borrowing methods from the PCT method spectrum are worthwhile methods in qualitative tourism research despite their limited uptake. This in itself constitutes a methodological contribution of this thesis. Furthermore, this research contributes to original knowledge by using a truly unique set of secondary data that has never been used for academic research purposes before. Moreover, the chapter has provided a detailed overview of the methods and tools employed to strengthen the rigour of this research. Table 6.5 overleaf outlines these methods in relation to their dimension of rigour.

Finally, this chapter has set the basis for the presentation of the findings in Chapter 7. They are presented in the same chronological order in which the research has taken place. This helps to get a valuable overview of the findings that have been
derived from these two research phases. The subsequent discussion in Chapters 8 and 9 concentrates on the applied ethics analysis of the findings according to the two overarching research aims.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 6.5: Establishing rigour for this research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dimension of rigour</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transferability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: adapted from Decrop (2004), Goodson and Phillimore (2004) and Lincoln and Guba (1985)
7 FINDINGS

The goal of an ideal-type construction is always to make clearly explicit not the class of average character but rather the unique individual character of cultural phenomena.

(Weber, M. in Rogers, 1969, p. 28)

7.1 INTRODUCTION

Weber (1922) emphasises that the ideal-type construct is a means rather than an end in itself. It presents a means for theory building. The purpose of this chapter is to do exactly as the opening quote suggests – to present the interpretivist findings from both phases of the empirical research in order to develop an ideal-type construction of best practice and ethical entrepreneurship in tourism; which are subsequently discussed in Chapter 8 and 9. In accordance to the personal constructivist epistemology of this research and the ideographic nature of the study, these interpretations are those of the actors who have participated in this research: the author (myself), tourism entrepreneurs and the winners and judges of the Tourism for Tomorrow Awards.

The findings suggest ideal truths, not typical ones. Thus, they contribute towards the building of theory. These include the findings of the template analysis of secondary data, as well as those derived from the interviews with so-called ethical tourism entrepreneurs. As both phases of the research have informed each other, the
findings are presented thematically rather than chronologically. In so doing, the structure of this chapter highlights the iterative nature of this research.

Throughout the chapter verbatim quotes are used to substantiate the findings. However, these will be used in moderation for the purpose of brevity. A more expansive and illustrative list of verbatim quotes for each findings element can be found in Appendix K of this thesis. *Tourism for Tomorrow Awards* applicants’ transcripts are abbreviated with APP# whilst quotes from *Tourism for Tomorrow Awards* auditors are labelled AUD#. Verbatim quotes from tourism entrepreneurs from research phase two are indicated by using the abbreviation TE#. Also in the Appendix, a cross referencing table can be found (see Appendix L), which presents the chapter sections and page numbers of this thesis at which points conceptual findings were presented and discussed.

The chapter commences with establishing a definition for best practices (Section 7.2). Following this, Section 7.3 of this chapter presents dilemmas for best practice in tourism. These are grouped along the key themes that have emerged from the literature review: distribution, relationship and misrepresentation dilemmas. Subsequently, in Section 7.4 behavioural responses to dilemmas for best practice are presented. Once more, these types of behaviour are situated within the themes that have been identified from the literature. These include actions for fairness, collaboration and accountability. They are purposefully linked to the categorisation of business dilemmas.
The chapter then moves towards gaining a better understanding of the values and motivations that underpin best practice (see Section 7.5). It looks at intrinsic motivations, profit versus principle motivations as well as the notion of responsibility. All these themes have also emerged from the review of the literature. Finally, Sections 7.6 and 7.7 focus on the entrepreneurs themselves. Whilst Section 7.6 presents findings for entrepreneurial role behaviour, Section 7.7 concentrates on entrepreneurial judgement approaches. The chapter concludes by presenting a summary of the findings and by formulating the basis for the discussion in Chapters 8 and 9.

### 7.2 Defining Best Practice in Tourism

As the literature on best practice in tourism has failed to provide a meaningful definition of the concept, this research aims to fill this gap. The analysis of the transcripts here has revealed a number of common characteristics for best practice in tourism. Together these are the notions of balance and harmony, together with the concept of reciprocity and constant change. While TE01 argues that best practices “…means that you get all these three components – people, planet and profit – balanced”, the entrepreneur also acknowledges that “when you are in harmony, then you have best practice.” (TE01). TE11 on the other hand points out that there is no universality principle; rather “It’s about modification and also about guidance on how to do modifications relevant to each destination because each destination is definitely different”. Yet, TE14 is keen to qualify this by emphasising that “…best practice is to ensure that you are doing by others as you would have done by yourself.”
By interpreting these quotes, the following conclusions can be made. The concept of balance is linked to the present and it is attainable by following a global standard or benchmark. It is considered to be something measurable and is concerned with striking a balance between people, profit and planet. The concept of harmony, on the other hand, has to be understood as more fluid and emotive. It is described as an internalised sense of being part of something bigger and it is often future orientated. The two additional parameters that envelope the concepts of harmony and balance are change and reciprocity. Change allows for modification and differing parameters for decision-making, while reciprocity requires a sense of principle and empathy for decision-making for best practices.

*To summarise, best practice in tourism can be defined as the professional pursuit of balanced business operations in harmony with all stakeholders under the premise of reciprocity of actions in a constantly changing environment.*

(Present author)

### 7.3 Dilemmas for Best Practice in Tourism

#### 7.3.1 Distribution Dilemmas

In research phase one, two distinct distribution dilemmas have emerged: economic leakage and distributive injustice in reference to access to land and resources. While the former is linked to economic sustainability, the latter is closer related to environmental concerns. In addition, the laddering interviews with tourism
entrepreneurs have brought to light two more distribution dilemmas. These are: problem of gaining access to finance and funding derived from the international money market and issues relating to the generally accepted model of traditional capitalism and the overall growth and consumption paradigm.

Economic leakage is seen as symptomatic for the failure of tourism in many ways. It has its roots in the power imbalance between sending and receiving tourist nations. The research participants in this data set are keen to distance themselves from contributing to the cause of leakage by stating “Those who have arrived with foreign-owned tour companies that brought their own food, supplies and guides, brought no benefits to the region. Rather they took it all back home with them.” (APP38) The distribution dilemma in this context relates to inequity in the distribution of economic benefits resulting from the tourism enterprise.

Access to land and resources is often the trigger for environmental destruction such as extractive land use or killing of wildlife. While these dilemmas are considered to be an environmental sustainability concern, they are mostly spatial dilemmas in disguise. Jamal and Stronza (2009) call this the use-conservation gap. APP23 describes the tension that exists between creating spaces for wildlife and spaces for humans to thrive, by stating that “This in the past has reflected in a form of anarchy that made impossible a proper management of the land. As a result bush fires and overgrazing did increase. We have been heavily involved through regular meetings with the key community leaders, in appointing the game scouts as patroller of the ranch, to control and limit overgrazing, bush fires, poaching, destruction of the forest.”
The distributive dilemma lies in the division and access of space for humans and for wildlife, which results in competing needs between different stakeholders. In tourism, crucially, additional space is needed for tourists to enjoy. Herein lays a fundamental ethical issue in tourism. Tourist spaces are secondary spaces. In other words, they are not needed for survival of the tourist, but purely for their enjoyment. This dilemma underlines the hedonistic nature of tourism.

The laddering interviews with tourism entrepreneurs have revealed two further distribution dilemmas. The first relates to the inequity in access to finance and funding for sustainable or best practice tourism ventures. The structure of the international money market is not considered to be conducive to investment for sustainable development and sustainable tourism. As TE07 describes, “I think the biggest barrier is probably the way in which many companies’ finances are structured. I think the problem is the source of investment and the sort of financiers for sustainability is looking very short-term. That’s why I have a problem with the international money market. I didn’t buy any money to launch [company]. It cost us an absolute fortune! But we financed it from another part of our company.”

Entrepreneurs in this cohort describe a reluctance of lenders to invest in best practice because of the slow return on investment that is often associated with investments in sustainability. This leads to a high financial risk on behalf of the entrepreneur. Many businesses of the interviewees have been privately funded. Best practice entrepreneurs are certainly financial risk-takers.
A second macro-economic barrier perceived by best practice entrepreneurs is the capitalist system based on growth, consumption and traditional business models that are incorporated into this system. The distributive dilemma arises from overconsumption and the belief that this will eventually lead to the system's demise. TE04 views it as follows, "Our economic system focused on growth and consumption is broken. And this has to shift." Best practice in tourism is considered to have the potential to be a precursor for change. However, these distribution dilemmas are also closely linked to relationship dilemmas, as the following section shows.

7.3.2 Relationship dilemmas

Relationship dilemmas occur when there is a conflict of interest among different stakeholder groups, which may well relate to the distribution of benefits. The analysis of the Tourism for Tomorrow Awards applications and audit reports as well as the entrepreneur interview transcripts have highlighted three distinct areas of relationship conflicts: stakeholder opposition and alienation, business inconsistencies and industry complacency, and political ill-will. While stakeholder opposition emerged strongly from the template analysis, political ill-will was only highlighted by the entrepreneurs during the laddering interviews. The notion of business inconsistencies, interestingly, was only reported in the Tourism for Tomorrow Awards audit reports – not in the applications – but was then mentioned by the entrepreneur interviews again. This demonstrates how source and method triangulation has helped strengthening the findings.
Stakeholder opposition involves role conflicts and competing interests between different parties. Opposition has been reported from many different parties, including competing industries, local rivalries, pressure groups, guests, governments, industry competitors, and opposition posed on behalf of wildlife and nature. AUD19 reports, “In 1998, several environmental groups tried to block them in court from building an extension to [property]. It was not a question of environmental impact; the groups just didn’t want to see an extension at all to a heritage property.” Such opposition can lead to alienation when a lack of stakeholder involvement in relevant decision-making occurs. APP08 assesses this particular situation as follows: “Often resorts in the third world have both the potential to be agents to socio-economic development in less developed areas, or are a source of friction and alienation within the local community.” Actions for collaboration showing behavioural responses to this dilemma are presented in Section 7.4.2.

Preferential treatment of some stakeholder groups over others has led to inconsistencies in business operations, which constitutes another relationship dilemma. A prominent cause for concern lies within the clash of norms for the treatment of guests in comparison to wider sustainability goals. In other words, best practices take a backseat if the satisfaction of the customer may be compromised. Such occurrences are regarded as “occasional inconsistencies due to satisfying the primary customer.” (AUD17) The data suggests that the guest takes priority over society. As an example, AUD61 states, “the opportunity costs of water consumption [by guests] are in the end lower than us not being here at all.”
In addition, the entrepreneurs in the interview series have admitted that they felt the tourism industry itself has not fulfilled their role as leaders for best practices and thus, industry complacency has been identified as a barrier for best practice. It denotes a relationship problem, as it relates to the notion of role conflicts. While some accuse others of not fulfilling their roles, others are more inward looking and admit to their own part on the problem. Generally, inconsistency and complacency are regarded though as an industry-wide issue as TE13 purports, *I am not sure about other industries, but I would certainly say that in [country] we are lagging behind in terms of our sustainable operations.*”

Finally, political ill-will or least political complacency has emerged as a relationship dilemma. Here, the relationship between the tourism enterprise and the governing decision-makers is flawed and often based on mistrust. The interviewed entrepreneurs have identified this as a substantial challenge to best practice in tourism and have revealed their internal role conflicts as follows:

- *Although, I am generally positive about development in [country] and corruption is reducing, at the same time it is sometimes like bashing your head against a brick wall. And it is still very hard to operate and avoid bribery.* (TE03)

- *And often there are changes in administration within political parties. You may have made a lot of progress with one group, and then the next thing you know the other group comes in and they want to put their stamp on everything. So, everything changes.* (TE04)
The first quote showcases integrity and perseverance on part of the entrepreneur not to succumb to the political ill-will. These virtues have emerged again as values for best practices (see Section 7.5.1). The final quote demonstrates how the earlier mentioned change parameter influences best practice in tourism.

7.3.3 Misrepresentation dilemmas

Misrepresentation dilemmas have solely emerged through the triangulation of sources and methods in this research. This highlights the rigour of this study. The Tourism for Tomorrow Awards applicants have not revealed any conduct that could be construed to be misrepresenting the truth. However, the corroborating audit reports have revealed cases of misrepresentation, namely entrepreneurial plagiarism and conservation tokenism. Furthermore, the candid responses from the entrepreneur interviews have unearthed barriers for best practices that inadvertently lead to misrepresentation, such as the leadership-operations-gap, and misrepresentation resulting from misperception.

Entrepreneurial plagiarism is serious and involves actively seeking a competitive advantage, which results from the work of other people. Acknowledgement to the third party is not given. For example: “Despite their claims that their camp has led to the protection of the reserve, the truth is that the land would have been proclaimed anyway, without the development of the camp.” (AUD10). In this instance, the auditor of this project has revealed that applause and recognition is sought although it is elsewhere deserved. These forms of entrepreneurial plagiarism are subject to misperception.
In certain cases, such misperception can turn out to be of benefit in the end. One such example is presented by AUD31 who writes "Whilst there is widespread public perception that the whole of the reserve is protected, this is not in fact the case." As the benefit lies within the public support for the conservation initiative, the applicant in this case has little motivation to correct this public misperception. Brenkert (2009) calls this the Pygmalion Effect – a lie which inadvertently leads to positive impacts. However, AUD23 is less comfortable with this form of entrepreneurial misrepresentation and warns that “spin and buzz often disguise the gap between ideal and reality on the ground.”

Closely linked to entrepreneurial plagiarism is a form of misrepresentation, which in this thesis is called conservation tokenism. It describes the phenomenon of publicly engaging in conservation activities that in actual fact only have nominal value to holistic wildlife and habitat conservation. Tokenism is a prevalent conservation lie. Conservation tokenism has emerged from analysing the conservation activities that Tourism for Tomorrow Awards applicants have presented in their applications. Most entrepreneurs focus on so-called flagship animals, which are often meaningful to the locale, possess a mystical power and often have high levels of cuteness or prowess. As such, conservation efforts are often driven by emotive factors. An example of such flagship animal conservation is reported by AUD61 here: "After successful habitat regeneration, [company] and its Conservation Managers felt confident to reintroduce indigenous fauna. Its flagship animal is the Arabian Orxy, a species until recently extinct in the wild."
Finally, the entrepreneurs identified another misrepresentation dilemma. The problem exists due to the distance between the entrepreneur and the geographical location of their tourism business. TE06 describes this as follows, “I think that one of the biggest dilemmas is that people think they are having an impact, but they are not. But they are too far away in the distance to see it. And it is frustrating me. You can’t claim to be responsible in travel if you are not actually on the ground looking at your impact.” Their leadership role is limited as the geographical distance removes the ability of the entrepreneur to report truthfully and factually on their business operations. This misrepresentation is linked to a lack of knowledge and oversight.

To summarise, Table 7.1 lists the dilemmas for best practice in tourism that have been identified by analysing the Tourism for Tomorrow Awards applications and audit reports as well as the entrepreneur interview transcripts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 7.1: Dilemmas for best practice in tourism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dilemma</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution dilemmas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic leakage and periphery-induced poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to land and resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International money market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional capitalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship dilemmas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder opposition and alienation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business inconsistencies and industry complacency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political ill-will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misrepresentation dilemmas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurial plagiarism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation tokenism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical distance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misperceptions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: field studies
7.4 TYPES OF BEHAVIOUR FOR BEST PRACTICE IN TOURISM

The analysis of the transcripts from the *Tourism for Tomorrow Awards* and the entrepreneurs’ interviews has revealed a series of behavioural responses directed towards pre-empting and remedying the aforementioned dilemmas. Figure 7.1 overleaf gives an overview of these types of behaviour in relation to business dilemmas.

**FIGURE 7.1: Types of behaviour for best practice in tourism**

Source: field studies
The darker-shaded hexagons represent the cluster of dilemmas as presented in the previous section. Next to each sits a white-shaded hexagon containing a value under which types of behaviour can be grouped. Fairness is linked to distribution dilemmas, collaboration is associated with relationship dilemmas, and accountability relates to misrepresentation dilemmas. For each value, two distinct types of behaviour have been identified from the data sets. It is important to note though that these concepts are interlinked. For example, whilst stakeholder involvement addresses issues of stakeholder opposition and alienation (a relationship dilemma) and thus fosters collaboration, it also addresses issues of fair access to land and resources (a distribution dilemma). The following three sections will analyse each of these types of behaviour in more detail.

7.4.1 Actions for Fairness

Profit-sharing initiatives are used to address the issue of distributive injustice of economic benefits. In other words, they are aimed at preventing leakage and periphery-induced poverty. The data reveals that the most promising profit-sharing schemes are managed through a trust fund, and profits that are generated by the tourism enterprise are shared with the local community. The reported schemes are usually unconditional, for example "44% of all profit shares are entrusted to the conservancy without any conditions attached." (APP10) Profit-sharing schemes often involve getting the community's consensus to operate in the area.

However, it has to be noted, that profit-sharing was seen as problematic by one of the entrepreneurs that was interviewed. He/she states: "I don't believe in any of this
profit-sharing stuff and all that. You pay a fair rent every month. Eventually, you can do all this profit-sharing if you want once the business has matured” (TE10) However, the notion of fairness was not disputed, only the means to act accordingly. Profit-sharing, thus, can only be complimentary to other opportunities that support livelihoods in order to be sustainable. Creating employment opportunities is seen as one such measure.

The secondary data set of Tourism for Tomorrow Awards applications and audit reports has revealed a strong commitment towards creating local employment. First, best practice tourism entrepreneurs are committed to creating jobs for local people, and second, they are committed to creating good jobs with fair wages and opportunities for upward mobility for local people. Commitment to local employment is very high as APP55 describes, “The company employs well over 1,700 people, 99% of which are of regional origin.”

Although the percentage of local employment is important, it is also the quality of employment that plays a vital role. Crucial characteristics for best practice employment are upward mobility, job benefits, training, fair wages and job security. APP75 describes upward mobility here, “The lodge employs 80 local people with no previous work or tourism experience. Two long-term employees have reached management positions” and AUD07 explains the increases in job security as follows, “Jobs are becoming more sustainable as the tourist season extends and in the same way local businesses benefit from all-year round trade.” Beyond those, more quotes can be found in Appendix K.
7.4.2 Actions for collaboration

Actions for collaboration are aimed at pre-empting relationships dilemmas, most notably that of stakeholder alienation. The most prolific type of behaviour in this secondary data set is stakeholder involvement. Proactive stakeholder involvement ranges from information to ownership. The most common form of stakeholder involvement as the evidence suggest is consultation with the local community for joint decision-making for forthcoming tourism development projects, for example AUD16 points out, “Over the course of the first 10 years of project implementation, the applicant conducted more than 150 multi-stakeholder consensus meetings in communities throughout the region.” Participatory approaches are also pursued, linking local people directly with the development and enterprise. The following quote demonstrates this, “[Company] is based on total involvement of the local population in an enterprise of ecotourism. The local community have participated in all stages, from the building to the management to running the camp.” (APP23) The secondary data set suggests that ownership is a rare occurrence for stakeholder involvement, although evidence of ownership can be found in the following examples, “…an alliance of five communities owned and operated tourism enterprises.” (APP38)

Collaboration is also fostered by employing methods for training and skills development as these enhance employability opportunities and create a sense of belongingness and team-building. Together with stakeholder involvement, the evidence for these types of behaviour was overwhelming in the secondary data set with 84 individual references, which suggests a strong emphasis on collaborative
measures. Training and skills development is a fundamental activity for best practice entrepreneurs. It is intricately linked to the belief in empowerment of people and the high value of capacity building as the following quote demonstrates, “To illustrate this commitment to local capacity building, in 2004 alone, the hotels provided 30,562 hours of training to local community members to work at the hotels and own, operate and manage their own businesses in partnership.” (AUD08) Career advancement and upward mobility are at the core of training and skills development programmes.

7.4.3 Actions for accountability

Although misrepresentation dilemmas have solely emerged through the triangulation of sources, the findings suggest that best practice entrepreneurs engage in activities that inadvertently prevent misrepresentation. Seeing to be accountable and transparent is key to these types of behaviour. Actions for accountability include creating one’s own NGO in order to formalise best practice. 50% of all Tourism for Tomorrow Awards applicants here have created an NGO or foundation that formalises their ethical commitments as the following quotes demonstrate. APP64 explains the rationale as follows, “And lastly, in 2009 [company] spun off its sustainability department into its own company, [foundation name], as a step to further formalise sustainability and provide enhanced transparency and governance of allocation of guests funds.” It should be noted that the creation of an NGO and establishing partnership is also beneficial to eliciting further funding and accounting for it in an open and transparent manner.
In addition to forming an NGO for accountability, monitoring one’s own activities and reporting on them has emerged as an important action for accountability. It helps prevent inconsistencies in sustainable operations and fosters accountability and transparency. However, the monitoring and reporting strategies that have been found in the *Tourism for Tomorrow Awards* applications and audit reports are not particularly straightforward.

Four different forms of monitoring and reporting strategies were identified. On a continuum from weak to strong, these four forms can be found respectively: internal monitoring and internal reporting (very weak), internal monitoring and external reporting (weak), external monitoring and internal reporting (strong), and external monitoring and external reporting (very strong). Appendix K shows examples from the transcripts for each type of monitoring and reporting activity. The findings have revealed that the gap between internal and external monitoring is quite small (18 vs. 14 cases), whereas the gap between internal and external reporting is relatively large (21 vs. 11 cases). This suggests that monitoring activities are stronger than reporting activities and allows concluding that the value of accountability (expressed through monitoring) is more important than the value of transparency (expressed through reporting). In simple terms, there appears to be a lesser need to openly report on their activities than there is to monitor them. This also suggests then that best practice enterprises engage in actions for accountability for intrinsic reasons, rather than extrinsic ones that can be associated to stronger reporting activities. Following from this, the next section of this chapter presents the findings on values for best practice in tourism.
7.5 **Values for best practice in tourism**

7.5.1 **Intrinsic motivations**

Intrinsic motivations are motivations that have their origin in the actual act of doing something, rather than the end result. Intrinsic motivations are built on needs, beliefs, virtues, and values (Solomon *et al.* 2002). Table 7.2 illustrates the key needs, beliefs, values and virtues that have emerged as intrinsic motivations from the *Tourism for Tomorrow Awards* data set.

**TABLE 7.2:**
Matrix of key intrinsic motivations for best practice in tourism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beliefs: What I hold to be true for best practice in tourism</th>
<th>Needs: What makes me act towards best practice in tourism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Because it is the right thing to do</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td>Long-term commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Character</td>
<td>Self-determination</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values: What is important for best practice in tourism</th>
<th>Virtues: What good character traits I must possess to achieve best practice in tourism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accountability, Collaboration, Fairness (7.4)</td>
<td>Humility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authenticity</td>
<td>Perseverance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewardship</td>
<td>Integrity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: field studies

The above listed needs account for 32% of all intrinsic motivation references in the *Tourism for Tomorrow Awards* data set. The need for achievement is the strongest with 27 individual references. This need resonates strongly in the description of APP45, who speaks about the need to overcome ridicule and thus, to achieve. He/she states: “What State leaders and community members use to laugh at – the idea that the region could be a tourism destination – changed after more than 20 years of hard work by the [company].”
While the need for achievement is focussed on the individual entrepreneur, the need for long-term commitment has two dimensions. APP64 highlights the need for long-term commitment by stating that “…these two perspectives set the framework for what can be considered both the cycle of improvement as well as the never-ending journey which is a commitment to sustainability.” First, long-term commitment is needed for the benefit of one’s own survival and viability as an entrepreneur, and second, for the continuous wellbeing of the society in which the entrepreneur acts.

Finally, the third need identified as a motivational factor by the research participants is individual self-determination and self-determination of society-at-large. These quotes reflect this need as expressed.

- *It is often forgotten that many people are born entrepreneurs and don’t want to work for someone else, no matter how munificent that company would be.* (AUD17)
- *In addition to being an excellent case study of responsible tourism it is an outstanding example of an indigenous community achieving self-determination, cultural determination and economic determination.* (AUD63)

While needs trigger actions, beliefs are principles a person holds to be true. Among the many beliefs that have been mentioned, three beliefs stand out strongly. These are the belief in empowerment of people, the belief in doing the right thing and the belief in good character, which is reflected in virtues for best practice. Empowerment is considered to be the most helpful strategy for satisfying the need for self-determination. It is a belief that is coupled with a need and is future-
orientated and transformational. As APP75 emphasises, “Our strategy is to empower communities to tackle all the issues causing poverty, suffering and environmental destruction.” But empowerment is not one-directional and requires the participation of the local community. In order to work, it has to be a shared belief. “The community identifies its needs and the project provides the training and capacity building and helps secure funding to achieve community-set goals.” (AUD08)

The most prevalent of all beliefs, however, is a very simple one: “It’s just the right thing to do.” (AUD83) There is no explanation as to why it is the right thing to do or what constitutes the right thing. It is a belief that is based entirely on principle. The belief in the right thing to do is a very strong, almost existential belief that permeates through the views of sustainable tourism entrepreneurs.

The belief in the right thing to do is coupled with the belief in good character. Good character as per the Tourism for Tomorrow Awards reports includes virtues such as creativity, discipline, humility, to be inspiring, integrity, loyalty, openness, perseverance, and solidarity. Humility emerges as a pertinent good character trait. For example, “If asked, the leadership of the [company] would most likely say it is not worthy of an award; that nothing they are doing is noteworthy or out of the ordinary.” (AUD83). There is a paradox between this finding and the fact that these entrepreneurs applied for an award, which celebrates achievement. However, the celebration here is one of solidarity, perseverance and communal effort, which does not stand in contrast to humility.
The final group of intrinsic motivations are values. These are principles that are of particular importance to best practice in sustainable tourism. The values and corresponding types of behaviour for accountability, collaboration and fairness have already been presented in Section 7.4. The two remaining key values are authenticity and stewardship.

Seeking authenticity is two-dimensional. The first dimension is the past, whilst the second is the locale. Valuing authenticity here means protecting and preserving the past in this locale. “A large part of our mission is to preserve the [local tribe] culture.” (APP25) But authenticity here also means displaying and showing this past in this locale. This entrepreneur goes beyond simple displays of arts and crafts and takes on the locale in its entirety. “Our motivation is to conform the village’s simple infrastructure in a bold outdoor display of identity and self-validation.” (APP17) The tourism entrepreneur seeks to be true to his or her own identity and adopts an emic view with their surroundings, aiming to preserve this original identity.

While authenticity encapsulates a “sense of place” (AUD01) and is underpinned by identity, past and locale, the other predominant value of stewardship is engrafted in “pride of place” (APP45) and underpinned by respect and responsibility. They are, however, both quite similar and highly emotive values. This becomes evident in the following quote: “By that time a group of dreamers fell in love with the area, the people, the architecture, and the potential of giving a new life to these magnificent communities.” (APP08) In contrast to authenticity the stewardship value has an etic perspective. This is expressed by the following quote. “As a global player in the hotel and service industry, [company] has a responsibility towards its customers, employees,
shareholders, and the local communities where the Group bases its activities.” (APP67)

A sense of responsibility drives the stewardship value.

Following this, the next section will highlight the two most prevalent extrinsic motivations for best practice in tourism. They are grouped under the headline of profit versus principle.

7.5.2 Profit versus principle

The profit versus principle dimension for best practice encapsulates extrinsic motivational factors. Two key extrinsic motivational factors have emerged from this data set. These are progress and development goals and guest satisfaction. Progress and development goals have emerged strongly as a value for best practice in this study. They are reward orientated, albeit the reward often is directed towards someone else, for example the local community. APP64 expresses this goal as follows, “Founded with the core value of driving sustainable development, the company seeks to continue being an agent of social and economic development through responsible tourism.” Progress and development goals are agents of change. Specific progress and development goals include the improvement of quality of life for locals and staff as well as poverty alleviation. These received the most attention in the Tourism for Tomorrow Awards reports. Increasing business opportunities within the local community and improving infrastructure and transport systems have also been frequently cited and further examples can be found in Appendix K.
Contrary to the rise in progress and development goals, financial gain has lost impetus as a driving value over time. Remarkably, no tourism entrepreneur here has said that making profit for themselves or their shareholders is their motivation for striving towards best practice in tourism. Furthermore, the concept of profit maximisation seems alien to the entrepreneurs in this data set. However, profit is not disregarded. In fact, it is very much welcomed, albeit in alternative forms. APP25 explains their profit motivation as such that “Our economic initiatives are aimed at creating income for the many people who are not qualified to work and the resort. We did this to ensure that the families who owned the land will have a reliable cash income for their ancestors.” By and large, profit is considered as a means to an end. Thus, principle outweighs profit as a dominating driver for best practice.

Finally, guest satisfaction has emerged as an important principle for best practice in tourism. Different forms of guest satisfaction as a motivating factor have revealed themselves in the data set. These are here called hedonistic, normative, opportunistic and superlative guest satisfaction. Hedonistic guest satisfaction is concerned with the guests’ wellbeing and comfort. This view has been quite rare among the tourism entrepreneurs in this data set. However, evidence for hedonistic guest satisfaction is found in the following quote: “The beach vegetation was preserved to provide shade for the guests.” (APP01). This form of guest satisfaction as a principle aims at ensuring maximum pleasure for the guest.

The second form, normative guest education, takes on a different philosophy. The view is that satisfaction is provided through the process of learning. APP07 writes, “We want to provide guests with increased opportunities to understand and enjoy the
local community.” It is equally as rare as hedonistic guest satisfaction. Others write they provide learning opportunities for guests to “encounter all the life-forms of the [reserve]” (APP69) or “experience destinations in unique and enlightening ways.” (APP27) In all cases, the process of learning is the central focus of guest satisfaction.

A more common pursuit of guest satisfaction as a motivational factor is rooted in opportunism. Opportunistic guest satisfaction means, the tourism entrepreneur aims to satisfy guests not for their comfort or for the purpose of education, but to retain them as customers. It’s a profit-driven perspective. The self-interest of the entrepreneur outweighs principles for best practice here. APP19 admits, “Being green also allows us to meet guest expectations from travellers that are increasingly eco-conscious and concerned about making sustainable life-style choices. Clearly, being green also makes business sense.”

Lastly, the fourth form of guest satisfaction can be called superlative guest satisfaction. It is similar to hedonistic guest satisfaction, albeit the central focus is not on the guests’ comfort but rather on one’s own success in guest satisfaction. The goal is being the best and thereby gaining a competitive advantage. APP69 seeks to “… ensure that guests can be part of a world class lodge.” (own emphasis)

7.5.3 Responsibility – repentance for sins

The notion of responsibility has strongly permeated throughout the different value paradigms for best practice in tourism. Most notably it has been reflected in the need for achievement and the stewardship value (see Section 7.5.1). It is also revisited in
the findings for a mission for ethical entrepreneurship. In addition to these, the responsibility to repent for sins has also emerged as a notable responsibility. By triangulating the sources of applicants and auditors, it became evident that tourism entrepreneurs have little understanding of their own inconsistencies or inadequacies. The audit reports highlighted gaps in the entrepreneurial narratives of the applicants. However, actions were undertaken to repent for sin of others or sins of the past. APP33 explains, “We pursue outside criticism for our work and insist on third party accountability. It’s the only way to avoid charges of green-washing.” It shows mistrust for others and the subsequent need for accountability and transparency.

Having presented the findings for dilemmas, values and types of behaviour for best practice in tourism, the next two sections now concentrate in more detail on the individual entrepreneur’s perspective and seek to unpack the notion of ethical entrepreneurship. Section 7.6 presents the findings for entrepreneurial role behaviour, while Section 7.7 focuses solely on judgement making.

### 7.6 Entrepreneurial role behaviour for ethical entrepreneurs

The findings have been derived from the entrepreneur interviews, which used Personal Construct Theory and laddering technique to elicit higher constructs regarding ethics, values and the notion of being an ethical entrepreneur. While the previous findings from the entrepreneur interviews – those relating to best practice in tourism – have been elicited through the use of thematic analysis, these subsequent findings have resulted from a narrative approach to analysis. The focus
here is on the meaning of role behaviour and judgement approaches for ethical entrepreneurship, i.e. such as concerned with the betterment of society in addition to exploitation of opportunities (Wempe 2005).

7.6.1 AN ONTOLOGY FOR ETHICAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP

An entrepreneurial ontology is centred on the notion of becoming, rather than being an entrepreneur (Johannisson 2011, Weber 1930). This ontology has been reflected in the narratives of the entrepreneurs from this data set. It is an ontology of learning and experience that shapes the ethical entrepreneur. Five key dimensions towards this ontology of becoming have emerged from the interviews. These are: intuition, belongingness, fluidity, learning, and awakening.

The dimension of intuition is manifest in the belief that being an ethical entrepreneur is a philosophy, not a set of policies. This belief permeated through all interviews, regardless of the years of experience the entrepreneurs had in business. TE09 explains, “We opened our first hotel 32 years ago and that probably hits the sweet spot. We didn’t know at this time that this was sustainable tourism. I mean how would anyone really have known anything about sustainable tourism 32 years ago?” Further to ethical entrepreneurship being an intuitive practice, it also became evident that it meant to be part of a group. TE02 states, “When I really look around the room, from my perspective, my tribe is sustainable travel. I like the people and I relate to the people and I think they are good people.”
Ethical entrepreneurship is thus a form of identification. However, it is not a static process. The entrepreneurs expressed a sense of fluidity that required discovery, arbitration and commitment. TE06 remembers, “I have spent six years there and I realised that at the beginning we were doing so much wrong. Fostering moral imperialism for example, giving money to the wrong people.” Fluidity is further underpinned by the dimension of learning for ethical entrepreneurship. Whilst much learning takes place in the start-up phase of the enterprise, it has been acknowledge that learning continues and one learns greatly from one’s mistakes. Finally, some entrepreneurs have expressed a moment of awakening that led them to engage in ethical entrepreneurship, for example, “I went to Borneo to the first worldwide ecotourism conference that was organised by TIES. And this really opened my eyes about the possibilities for a better kind of tourism.” (TE12) This is not contradictory to the dimension of intuition. Rather, a moment of awakening can trigger the development of a new business philosophy towards ethical entrepreneurship.

7.6.2 A MISSION FOR ETHICAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP

A mission for ethical entrepreneurship manifests itself in the virtues that are associated with doing the right thing. The data suggests that ethical entrepreneurs have the ability, integrity and conviction to decline opportunities that are in contrast to their moral compass. TE07 explains, “I think that first and foremost we have to practice what we preach. We try wherever possible as a business to be sustainable. And sometimes that means making very, very difficult decisions.” They display integrity to value principles higher than profit. However, as much as one’s own conviction and
integrity is considered an important virtue for ethical entrepreneurs, humility is also considered crucial in order to be successful as expressed here "I personally think you need to make it a habit of never bringing Western baggage to the table. You need to be able to bring people together as equals." (TE04) The key is to strike a balance between integrity and humility.

It is further widely acknowledged that an entrepreneurial spirit is a crucial virtue for best practice in tourism. Whilst this includes being able to manage a business, to have knowledge of the market place and seeking out new opportunities, entrepreneurialism here is also closely connected to a sense of spirituality, albeit not in a religious sense. TE02 describes this sense of spirituality as follows:

And the last part, not to get too groovy on you, is spiritual intelligence. And I am not talking religion. There’s got to be a pursuit of aligning your organisation’s higher purpose, or just purpose, with your moral ethics. And that’s that grey area where it’s really hard to nail down, where it’s really hard to quantify. But if you are not aligning your business purpose with your moral purpose, your ethics with the organisation’s higher purpose, you are constantly going to be searching for the right versus wrong.

Finally, leaving behind a legacy is perhaps the most prominent mission for these entrepreneurs. It has to be understood that a legacy here is not considered an action or material thing that immortalises the entrepreneur’s name. Rather leaving behind a legacy refers to leaving behind something good for future generations to benefit from. TE07 expresses this mission as follows: “I’ll die when I am 80 and I am 70 now
and I want to leave this forest protected and that will be my legacy. That’s why I am doing what I do. And I think that’s really important. You’ve got to have a heart.”

Most notably though, in accordance to the virtue of humility these entrepreneurs also highlight that by being a benefactor, one must not succumb to the danger of becoming self-serving or as TE06 explains: “I think that any of these things, anything that involves humans and money, as in the same way as with benevolent dictators – you know the guy that comes next is seemingly doing good and actually just profiteering – I think that’s the challenge with being an ethical entrepreneur.”

To summarise, a mission for ethical entrepreneurship can be characterised by a pursuit of an entrepreneurial activity with the aim of leaving behind a legacy in accordance to one’s own integrity, driven by virtues of benevolence and humility, and an appreciation of a wider spiritual existence.

7.6.3 Motivational factors for ethical entrepreneurship

The dominating motivating factor is the need for supererogation, or simply put the need to do more than is required. TE11 describes this need for supererogation as follows, “I was looking for something greener. My wife and I wanted to do something more and dial up the sustainability and giving-back proportion of things. We wanted to have something that was more directly involved.” On the other hand, TE14 explains, that “I think I always had a preoccupation with these sorts of issues and thought here was so much wrong in this space. My father had hotels and I think I had really been brought up seeing really good examples of tourism and also very bad ones.” This seems
to stem from the need to atone for bad practice conducted by others at another time. It is important to note though that this atonement is non-identificational. In other words, the entrepreneurs distinguish themselves clearly from the wrongdoers of the past.

In addition, a prevailing sense of an existential responsibility emerged as a motivational factor. TE02 describes this as follows: “By creating this brand, we almost set ourselves up for being responsible.” Moreover, this is linked to a desire to affect change as expressed by TE13: “I do think that we are at a monumental time where individual ideas and opportunities can come together to fashion leading programmes of change. And I have always felt that one plus one is three and that my philanthropic desires are to play a role actively wherever that might be.” Finally, individualistic, altruistic motives are also present as TE03 describes below.

*Instead of you being the focus and doing it for gratitude, you had to look at it from the outside and see what you can do to try and develop and grow existing projects and people. And that can be quite hard because we realised we could never do what we wanted to do for any form of acknowledgement or gratitude because otherwise you're just going to get into a deep depression.*

In summary, the following motivational factors for ethical entrepreneurship have emerged from the entrepreneur interviews: a need to for supererogation; non-identificational atonement; individualistic altruism; transformational entrepreneurship; and existential responsibility.
7.7 ENTREPRENEURIAL JUDGEMENT APPROACHES

7.7.1 REFLECTIONS ON PRIORITIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The most profound finding of this part of the analysis is the acknowledgement of these entrepreneurs that their priorities over time have not shifted very much. However, their understanding of what these priorities really mean has changed. TE06 explains:

Well, I don’t think our priorities have changed. But I think our understanding of them has changed. You know, if we had asked someone and really understood the situation, the priorities probably would have been the same for the people in those communities. But for us their meaning would have changed completely.

In addition, there is consensus that profit and survival of the business is tantamount to achieving one’s mission and priorities. Also noteworthy is that being ethical shifts from being an explicit business priority to being an integral part of business operations. It is neither opportunistic nor a unique selling proposition. It is rather engrained in the core business model and links in with the intuitive ontology of being an ethical entrepreneur. TE09 expresses this view as follows, “I believe that today this sort of work has become daily and as mundane as giving your guest breakfast. I think doing the right thing is falling into the same category. It’s just becoming part of running your business. And I am glad it is this way.”
To conclude, being ethical as a business priority has started entering the realm of the mundane. It is intrinsically linked to the running of the business. The basic premise of being ethical does not seem to have changed much over time for these entrepreneurs. Their means for achieving this, however, may have done so. This suggests a consequentialist moral orientation towards ethical entrepreneurship.

With regards to responsibilities the entrepreneur interviews have highlighted fairness and welfare of employees as two more fundamental responsibilities. Employees are elevated to hold a special place in the entrepreneur’s realm of responsibilities. TE08 is convinced that “… companies that are doing well by their staff, you can sense the spirit, the esprit, and the positive attitude. And I think that this translates into a good guest experience. So, your first responsibility is your staff.” Interestingly though, the data could not reveal a consensus as to whether it is a business’s responsibility to create employment or not. As the literature suggests, this remains a contentious issue.

7.7.2 THE THREE CONUNDRUMS – MAKING ETHICAL JUDGEMENTS

Three conundrums or dilemmas have been chosen to be discussed with entrepreneurs during the interview series with the aim of drawing conclusions about entrepreneurial judgement approaches. These are the growth conundrum, the flying conundrum, and the experience conundrum. The conundrums have emerged from research phase one as open questions when neither sources was able to deliver any useful results. Furthermore, they have been in part rooted in the review of the literature (see Chapter 4, Section 4.5.2 Research Framework). All three
conundrums link back to the earlier discussed categorisation of dilemmas, namely distribution, relationship and misrepresentation dilemmas.

The growth conundrum is rooted in the continuous growth of the travel and tourism industry vis-à-vis the use of limited space and finite resources. It is in essence a distribution dilemma. First, entrepreneurs were asked to describe their preference for small versus mass tourism. Then, they were asked to debate whether a human right to travel exists. The crux of the conundrum is that only mass tourism can theoretically meet everyone’s human right to travel. It represents a Malthusian problem. Finally, their answers were contrasted and further discussed. The line of argumentation went through several stages, beginning in most instances with an absolutist view on the human right to travel and culminating in a more subjectivist, self-reflecting solution to the conundrum. Figure 7.2 overleaf outlines this line of argument with relevant examples from the interview transcripts.
FIGURE 7.2: Line of argumentation for the growth conundrum

Initially, an absolutist view on the fundamental human right to travel is adopted.

- "I do believe the human right to travel is a fundamental right." (TE04)
- "Yes, I do think you have a right to travel. I mean, this is where it all started. We stood up on two legs and looked over the edge and said: let's go! It's very powerful." (TE09)

Soon, rules and responsibilities become attached to this right.

- "Just because we have the right to travel doesn't mean that we have the right to destroy the planet. There is a difference between a right and a responsibility." (TE05)

Following this, reality is acknowledged as a driving force for action.

- "We must find ways to ensure that mass movement of people is as sustainable as it can be. We don't have a choice. I mean, you can live in a fantasy world or you can live in a real world." (TE10)

At this point, negotiation begins and relativistic arguments are introduced. These emerge from two angles. First, the growth in tourist numbers is not inevitable.

- "Not everyone wants to travel. We might think that because we are travellers. But not everyone wants to travel." (TE11)

The second argument is that the human right to travel is in fact relative.
Finally, reconciliation is reached through the process of self-reflective judgement.

To conclude, the judgement approach undergoes various different phases. Although quotes have been taken from a variety of interviews in order to illustrate this line of argument, the pattern repeated itself throughout. The final quote shows that there is no answer to the growth conundrum. Rather a form of self-reflective judgement – or casuistry – forms the opinion after a process of negotiation. The discussion in Chapter 9 will highlight the implications of this in relation to applied business ethics and distribution dilemmas as well as ethics theory.

The flying conundrum results from the reliance on air transport for travel purposes vis-à-vis claims of holiday companies to be particularly conservation minded. In essence, it is a misrepresentation of sustainability claims and is closely linked to the earlier discussed misrepresentation dilemma of conservation tokenism. As such, entrepreneurs were asked to express their opinions on both – conservation tokenism and the need to fly for touristic reasons.
Whilst the growth conundrum was subject to internal negotiation ending in self-reflective judgement, the flying conundrum was much more straightforward as a topic of discussion. Without exception, the entrepreneurs believed that the benefits derived from sustainable and ethical tourism outweighed the costs of flying. TE05 argues as follows, “If we were to stop international travel today, literally shut it down, we would within the next decade or within the next five years reek monumental damage in the world’s biodiversity.”

This suggests a consequentialist view on the flying conundrum. However, it became evident, that this view is not based on a utilitarian calculus, but rather on intuition as TE03 explains: “For me personally, that sort of evens it out and makes it worthwhile. Whether scientifically it does or not? I don’t know.” Finally, the judgement approach to the flying conundrum is centred on a collectivist philosophy involving an array of actors and actions to overcome this issue. “I think we can do more around travel choices and consumer behaviour,” suggests TE14, and TE11 predicts “it is part of that utopia of anything being solvable if we only give it the right attention.”

A comparable approach to the question of conservation tokenism emerged from the transcripts. The notion of misrepresentation of sustainability was dismissed in both instances by advocating the positive benefits that are derived from even marginal conservation activities. This is not in contrast to the findings from research phase one, which have highlighted that these inconsistencies have not been acknowledged by the Tourism for Tomorrow Awards applicants, but only by the auditors. It suggests that these entrepreneurs and awards applicants are both low in relativism about
making judgement for misrepresentation and high in idealism about their own positive impacts.

Finally, the experience conundrum is rooted in a relationship conflict between the extrinsic motivation for guest satisfaction vis-à-vis the desire to operate in an environmentally friendly and sustainable manner. Excerpts from the *Tourism for Tomorrow Award* reports have revealed inconsistencies here for best practices in order to satisfy the primary customers’ needs. Entrepreneurs were asked to argue the case for the weighing up between guest satisfaction and sustainable business operations.

The entrepreneurs in this study do not consider this to be a troublesome relationship dilemma or role conflict. By contrast, whilst the different notions of guest satisfaction (see Section 7.5.2) have been acknowledged, ethical business conduct and sustainability are considered to be an enhancement to their product. TE08 contends, “*In no way do I believe that sustainable operations would reduce or compromise the guest experience or take anything away from it.*” This view is principle-based and once more high in idealism. It has to be noted here that this high idealism is indeed coupled to high relativism too. Some entrepreneurs have acknowledged a certain threshold that has to be achieved with regards to delivering good services; whilst general consensus has been reached over making sure that one knows their target market. In other words, whilst best practices are held as an ideal, the audience for these is seen as relative.
7.8 Conclusion

The conclusions from this findings chapter are as follows: Best practice in tourism can be defined as the professional pursuit of balanced business operations in harmony with all stakeholders under the premise of reciprocity of actions in a constantly changing environment. These purposeful business activities are subject to a range of dilemmas, which are pre-empted or remedied with a number of behavioural responses. They are also intricately linked to a range of values for best practice. Figure 7.3 overleaf shows a visualisation of this framework for best practice in tourism. Although the proposed dilemmas, types and behaviours or values are not considered to be exhaustive, they are those which have emerged as key findings in this research. With regards to the rigour of these findings, they have been strengthened by using source and method triangulation and other methods of establishing rigour as shown in Chapter 6 of this thesis. Finally, these dilemmas, types of behaviour and values are not generalisable to the whole travel and tourism industry, but rather present actual cases for best practice entrepreneurship in tourism and allow to make inferences for theory (see discussion in Chapter 8).
In addition to the above, the narrative analysis of the entrepreneur interviews has revealed findings for entrepreneurial role behaviour and entrepreneurial judgement approaches. An ontology for ethical entrepreneurship could be

Source: field studies
developed based on five key characteristics: intuition belongingness, fluidity, learning and awakening. Moreover, a mission for ethical entrepreneurship as emerged from the interviews is based on three premises: to have integrity but also humility, to be entrepreneurial but also spiritual, and to leave behind a legacy but not be a benevolent dictator. Motivational factors that can be attributed to ethical entrepreneurship in particular have emerged as the need for supererogation, non-identificational atonement, individualistic altruism, transformational entrepreneurship and existential responsibility.

Finally, entrepreneurs were asked to make ethical judgements about hypothetical conundrums that have emerged from the literature reviews and from research phase one. It became evident that both for responsibilities and priorities, entrepreneurs adopted a consequentialist view coupled with an intuitive approach to ethical judgement. Further, this consequentialist view was substantiated when discussing the three separate conundrums. Collectivist and highly relativist moral viewpoints became clear here. Interestingly, depending on the locus of control of the entrepreneur (see more in Chapter 9) the level of idealism fluctuated considerably. The implications of these findings for entrepreneurial role behaviour and judgement approaches are further discussed in Chapter 9.
8 AN ETHIC FOR BEST PRACTICE IN TOURISM

*Being good is good for business.*

(Roddick 2003, online)

8.1 INTRODUCTION

Roddick’s statement above poses one fundamental question. What is the nature of being good? This chapter seeks to unravel the meta-ethical nature of best practice in tourism and in so doing presents the solution to the overarching research aim one: to develop an ethical framework for best practice in tourism. From a normative perspective, this chapter also seeks to discuss the types of behaviour that result in being good. Roddick’s statement further implies that being good has an extrinsic motivation, which is rewarded with business success. As such, this chapter also aims to shine a light closer at the ethical foundations that motivate best practice in tourism, both extrinsic and intrinsic. The discussion in this chapter relates to the findings that have been presented in Chapter 7. More specifically, to those findings that are concerned with a definition, dilemmas, types of behaviour and values for best practice (namely Sections 7.2 to 7.5).

For the purpose of an ethical analysis of best practice, the *Tourism for Tomorrow Awards* criteria have served as a guideline. This is appropriate as the data are conceived from the *Tourism for Tomorrow Awards* and their criteria encompass a range of ethical dimensions (refer to Table 6.1). The chapter begins with unravelling the nature of best practice by identifying the ethical strands of the definition that
has been presented in the previous chapter. Following this, Section 8.3 combines the normative aspects of an ethic for best practice by examining the dilemma-behaviour pairs and their ethical dimension. Section 8.4 adopts a descriptive ethics stance analysing the values for best practice in tourism. Combined, these deliver an applied ethics analysis of best practice in tourism. They are applied to specific cases and narratives (Werhane 1996). The chapter then concludes with a comprehensive argumentation for an ethic for best practice that is rooted in ethical pragmatism with elements of a feminist ethic. It situates best practice predominantly within the symbiotic school of thought for business ethic and calls for an adoption of an ethical prism or particularism (Lurie and Albin 2007) for studying best practice rather than a singular ethics lens. This call for action is rooted in the dialectical nature of best practice in tourism. The final purpose of this chapter is to lay the foundations for any practical and managerial implications that can be derived from this research and for proposals for future research. Both are subject to the concluding chapter of this thesis.

The discussion in this chapter uses the literature from Chapter 2 to 4 as its basis. More specifically, the literature on the differing schools of thought for business ethics is utilised (see Brenkert 2009, Davis 1975 and Friedman 1970) as is the literature on business dilemmas and the specific barriers within tourism. References are also made to different profit perspectives that have been presented in the literature review, such as Graafland’s (2002) profit versus principle perspectives. First though, this chapter commences with the meta-ethical analysis of best practice.
8.2 AN ETHICAL FOUNDATION FOR DEFINING BEST PRACTICE

The *Tourism for Tomorrow Awards* mission to promote best practice is defined by WTTC (2014a) as the responsible management of the tourism industry with a need to balance people, planet and profit. This definition is more simplistic than the one established from the empirical study of this research as it only includes the concepts of change (through growth) and balance. The definition for best practice presented in this thesis is:

*Best practice in tourism can be defined as the professional pursuit of balanced business operations in harmony with all stakeholders under the premise of reciprocity of actions in a constantly changing environment.*

(Present author)

As such, this thesis has contributed to developing a more refined definition of best practice in tourism. The following four sections will discuss each dimension from an applied ethics perspective.

8.2.1 BALANCE

As the findings have shown, the concept of balance is situated in the present moment. It is considered to be something that is attainable, feasible and measurable. As such, it is linked to the ethical dimension of the utilitarian calculus, which seeks to weigh up options according to their positivity of the impact (Mills J.S, in Hartman 2002). The call for a balanced business practice is founded in Davis’s (1975)
symbiotic school of thought regarding business responsibilities. He expressed the need for social auditing and creating balance sheets for social costs and externalities resulting from business operations (Davis 1975). Furthermore, the notion of balance is found in Graafland’s (2002) integrated profit-perspective, which aims to strike a balance between profit and principles. He purports that such an integrated approach will present a win-win situation for all stakeholders involved (Graafland 2002).

However, the notion of balance is not without problems. Davis (1975) qualifies his call for social balance sheets by admitting that because negative social costs may be difficult to measure, a danger exists that social balance sheets of companies may become skewed. Moreover, Yurie and Albin (2007) question the meaningfulness of measuring balance in business operations. In conclusion, balance alone is not sufficient to constitute best practice business conduct. Types of behaviour for achieving balance include monitoring and reporting strategies and other actions for accountability as discussed in here in Section 8.3.3.

8.2.2 Harmony

The concept of harmony has emerged as a key dimension for best practice in tourism as complementary to the rational notion of balance. Harmony is emotive and intuitive, as described by the ethical tourism entrepreneurs during the interviews. Harmony is concerned with other stakeholders. As such, harmony can be associated to the virtue ethical dimension of benevolence, which constitutes striving towards
harmony and happiness in others based on a set of moral principles (Fennell 2006). Harmony or benevolence further means making a good life (Hartman 2011).

In tourism, harmony means making good tourism. According to Jamal (2004) good tourism solidifies the purpose (or telos) of tourism. This purpose is intrinsic. Therefore, harmony is a purposeful concept and manifests itself in the motivational factors that drive best practice tourism behaviour. Brenkert (2009) argues that best practice behaviour is not defined by rules, but by portraying virtuous character traits that contribute to the flourishing of society. Harmony is thus driven by intrinsic motivational factors. Harmony is rooted in virtue ethics, whilst balance is based on a utilitarian calculus. However, the two are not mutually exclusive as MacDonald and Beck-Dudley (1994) contend. Harmony adds a humanitarian dimension to the rationality of utilitarianism.

8.2.3 Reciprocity

The notion of reciprocity of actions as expressed by the ethical tourism entrepreneurs in this study relates to the Golden Rule of ethical behaviour, namely that a person should only act in a way that they expect to be treated by others. The Golden Rule as an ethical dimension is rooted in religious ethics (Crane and Matten 2010). Religious ethics is traditionally linked to deontological or rule-based ethics theory. However, taking Christian ethics as an example, its ‘an eye for an eye’ philosophy allows putting prices on proxies (Sedlacek 2011) or types of behaviour. Arguably, the reciprocity criterion then has a utilitarian dimension. The Golden Rule is linked to the ethical dimension of reciprocal altruism (Fennell 2006), which is also
motivated by personal benefit (Jamal and Menzel 2009) and thus, supports a utilitarian ethics perspective.

Reciprocity – or reciprocal altruism – is grounded in the *Tourism for Tomorrow Awards* criterion of delivering direct benefits to host communities. It is furthermore rooted in a symbiotic school of thought on business responsibilities as it stipulates that society supports the existence of the tourism enterprise in return for business conduct that contributes to societal well-being (Davis 1975). Actions for reciprocity include actions for collaboration that are aimed at pre-empting relationship dilemmas (see discussion in Section 8.3.2), whilst motivations for reciprocity can be found in the discussion on profit versus principle in Section 8.4.4). To conclude, the reciprocity dimension – although rooted in the Golden Rule – is utilitarian in principle, and based on the notion of generating mutual good through best practice in tourism.

8.2.4 Change

Balance and reciprocity are directed towards types of behaviour of the individual for best practice in tourism. Harmony is linked to motivational factors for best practice in tourism and includes other stakeholders. The final dimension – a constantly changing environment – is concerned with the wider environment for best practice in tourism and takes into account the fluidity and growth of the industry. Change is at the heart of entrepreneurship and thus contributes to the constant emergence of ethical dilemmas (Brenkert 2009). Change is thus concerned with the environment that shapes ethical dilemmas (Jamal 2004). The notion of
change also means that best practice in tourism takes place in a dialectical world in which ethical values are subsequently changing as well (Minnaert et al. 2006).

Arguably, the change dimension is linked to the ethical dimensions of relativism and value pluralism. From a relativistic perspective, change is concerned with the variance of possibilities that can be derived from a certain situation, i.e. an ethical dilemma (Janney and Dess 2006). In best practice, these variances need to be taken into account and need to be become manoeuvrable. In practice, this requires entrepreneurs to convert imperfect knowledge into workable knowledge in order to pre-empt or solve dilemmas (Knight 1921). Relativism is thus a challenge, which plays to the advantage of entrepreneurs who are seen to be performing better at challenging tasks (McClelland 1961).

Value pluralism, on the other hand, constitutes an opportunity as Wempe (2005, p. 216) contends “Only with a pluralism of values is it possible to view conflicts of values as an area of tension able to serve as a source for new values.” It allows for the context in which decisions are made to be considered, exempt from moral superiority (Hudson and Miller 2005). A constantly changing environment is both, the source of friction for best practice in tourism and an opportunity to shape best practice in tourism. From an ethical perspective, change is teleological and contributes to a flourishing society.

To conclude best practice in tourism is rooted in teleological and traditional teleological ethics theories. A focus on harmony and value pluralism (by means of the change dimension) is situated in a virtue ethics perspective aimed at
contributing to the flourishing of society. This is also rooted in a symbiotic school of thought for business ethics. Additionally, best practice is seen as relative and associated to the notion of reciprocal altruism. Both ethical dimensions sit within a utilitarian ethics framework. While reciprocal altruism also suggests a symbiotic school of thought for business ethics, relativism is rooted in Brenkert’s (2009) Differentiation Thesis. The following section now discusses the findings relating to dilemmas and behavioural responses for best practice in tourism. A focus is set on their connection to the associated *Tourism for Tomorrow Awards* criterion as a means for interpretation of their ethical dimension.

### 8.3 An Ethical Foundation for Dilemmas and Behavioural Responses

In relation to the literature on fairness, accountability and collaboration (e.g. Colonomos 2005, Jamal and Stronza 2009, Miller and Twining-Ward 2005, Sedlacek 2011) six distinct types of behaviour for best practice in tourism have been identified as the most acute of the findings among a plethora of other types of behaviour. They correspond to the classification of ethical dilemmas in tourism as follows: fairness is associated to distribution dilemmas, accountability is related to misrepresentation dilemmas and collaboration is linked to relationship dilemmas. This part of the chapter discusses each of these dilemma-response pairs with regards to their ethical foundation.
8.3.1 **Distribution and Fairness**

The findings have revealed four distribution dilemmas for best practice in tourism, namely economic leakage, access to adequate finance, access to land and resources and problems resulting from traditional capitalism and associated business models. The former two issues are structural in nature, whilst the latter two relate to behavioural issues.

The structural issues of economic leakage and inequity of access to adequate finance are issues of distributive injustice. Distributive injustice relates to the inequitable distribution of economic benefits and/or access to resources, such as funding in the tourism system (Jamal and Camargo 2014). Justice, on the other hand, relates to the balance between what is right for the individual in the context for what is right for the group (Fennell 2006). Once more, the concept of balance is evident in the conceptualisation of best practice. Fennell (2006) argues that justice lacks sentiment, which is in accordance to the utilitarian rationale of achieving balance. The need to create direct and tangible benefits, such as avoiding economic leakage and providing access to adequate funding and finance, is based on a utilitarian calculus. In other words, issues of distributive injustice are utilitarian dilemmas.

Hannafey (2003) purports that distributive injustice in business ventures are a problem of start-up businesses as they lack the knowledge and skills to evenly distribute the economic benefits resulting out of their business activity. This, however, could not found to be true from the data here. By contrast, all *Tourism for Tomorrow Awards* applicants, without exception, are more mature businesses as
one rule for entry into the award states that applicants must have been in operation for a minimum of three years (WTTC 2014d). As such, Hannafey’s (2003) claim that distributive injustice is a problem of start-up businesses could not be substantiated.

Dawson et al. (2002) have highlighted that issues of distributive injustice, particularly with economic opportunities derive from less advantageous power relationships between SMEs doing business with larger corporations. In addition, Lashley and Rowson (2010) have identified smallness as a barrier for tourism entrepreneurship. Whilst 70% of the winning entries for the Tourism for Tomorrow Awards are organisations are indeed SMEs, the remaining 30% are large corporations, with three winners employing more than 10,000 people. As such, the smallness criterion as a barrier for best practice in tourism could not be substantiated in this data set. However, the interviews with individual entrepreneurs have revealed access to funding as a pressing dilemma of distributive injustice. Here, all entrepreneurs are founders of small or medium size images. To conclude, while size has not emerged as a contributing factor for economic leakage, it can become a barrier to gaining access for funding and finance. It can thus be assumed that these structural issues relating to distributive injustice are sensitive to firm size, yet not to the age of the firm. This finding is also in contrast to the assertion that tourism entrepreneurship is characterised by low entry barriers (see Shaw and Williams 1998, Williams et al. 1989), particularly from a financial point.

In addition to these structural issues, two predominantly behavioural concerns have emerged that are distribution dilemmas. These are access to land and their hidden spatial dimension, and the consumption and growth paradigm attached to
traditional capitalism. The growth paradigm as a problematic issue has been mirrored in the literature on business and tourism ethics (Moufakkir 2009, Payne and Dimanche 1996, Sedlacek 2011). Yet, it is Sedlacek’s (2011, p. 48) conviction that growth is automatically expected that has found the strongest resonance in the analysis of the data here.

Growth is linked to consumption – or over-consumption – as stimulated by the traditional capitalist business model. This, incidentally, includes the consumption of nature, wildlife and spaces that have created spatial distributive injustice in tourism. Ioannides and Peterson (2003) have identified a peripheral location as a barrier for tourism entrepreneurship. This barrier contributes indeed to the dilemma of overconsumption by means of creating competition for access to land and resources between tourist sending and tourist receiving countries. Davis (1975) suggests that this consumption of public or free goods needs to be priced and consumers have to be made liable for paying for their consumption. Whilst Fennell (2006) advocates the precautionary principle, which stipulates to take into account all social costs that might accrue out of a venture and account for those as well. Once more, the dilemma is addressed from a utilitarian calculus perspective. Similar approaches towards minimising this distributive dilemma include the rise of fair trade and pro-poor tourism (Fennell 2006) and the notion of profit-optimisation (Choi and Gray 2008).

Actions for fairness to pre-empt and remedy these distribution dilemmas have been more commonly seated at the grass-root level of business operations. They include the concept of profit-sharing and the creation of employment and economic opportunities for relevant stakeholders (see Section 7.4.1). These actions are above
all linked to the *Tourism for Tomorrow Awards* criterion of creating direct and tangible economic benefits. This criterion reflects the utilitarian calculus as well as the concept of reciprocal altruism (Fennell 2006). It is thus situated within a symbiotic school of thought for business ethics. Hartman (2011), however, points out that the fair distribution of economic benefits is not solely linked to utilitarian calculus as it also contributes to the overall wellbeing of society. It is thus connected to a virtue ethics perspective as well. Jamal and Camargo (2014) have supported this idea by advocating a virtuous approach towards distributive justice to complement the non-sentimental, rational and utilitarian justice approach.

The data suggests that some actions for fairness are indeed based on virtue ethics principles. As previously stated, profit-sharing initiatives etc. have not been linked to conditions, such as preferable location access or tax exemptions, rather they were rooted in the concern for the wellbeing of one’s immediate community. This is mirrored in the virtue ethics perspective of working towards a flourishing society. The notion of profit-sharing also reflects Graafland’s (2002) profit scenario of obtaining a *License to Operate*, whereby minimum standards for environmental and societal wellbeing are predetermined, which have to be met before profit can be accrued. In conclusion, it can be said that distribution dilemmas stem from a utilitarian perspective on the fair distribution of benefits and resources. However, actions for fairness have shown to be founded on principles of both – utilitarian ethics and virtue ethics. Once more, the two ethical stances here are not exclusive.
8.3.2 Relationships and Collaborations

From an ethical perspective, relationship dilemmas and collaborative behavioural responses are rooted in three ethical dimensions, all relating to the principles of virtue ethics. First, it is closely linked to the notion of procedural justice, which is defined as the “fair process and ability to participate effectively in decision-making.” (Jamal and Camargo 2014, p.15) Procedural justice considers people as social and political beings suggesting a virtue ethics perspective.

Second, this dilemma-response pair is linked to the Aristotelian virtue ethics concepts of eudemonia as it addresses the need for societal wellbeing (Hartman 2011). This wellbeing is achieved through actions that constitute good tourism (Jamal 2004), or as it is the case here, those behavioural responses that constitute best practice. Alternatively, these actions can be considered those that contribute to just tourism, i.e. tourism that is honourable and morally right (Hultsman 1995).

Finally, the relationship-collaboration pair is linked to the notion of stewardship. There is some ambiguity as to whether stewardship is rooted in virtue ethics or whether it is a utilitarian concept. Hudson and Miller (2005) argue that stewardship is utilitarian by definition as it is inherently result-orientated. Jamal (2004, p.533) equally contends that stewardship is a virtue that “enables one to achieve desired ends.” However, she also points out that this stewardship virtue is outward directed and this contributes to the flourishing of society – a virtue ethics principle (Jamal 2004). Fennell (2006) also attaches a wider societal role to the notion of stewardship, linking it closer to a virtue ethics perspective.
Actions for collaboration, however, show a higher level of benevolence attached than a utilitarian perspective would permit. The findings have shown two main actions for collaboration. These are stakeholder involvement and training and skills development. A lack of stakeholder involvement can lead to stakeholder opposition – a relationship dilemma. Ateljevic and Li (2009) have identified this as a form of collective undertaking, which characterises tourism entrepreneurship. Stakeholders recognise their power and are willing to use this (Jamal and Stronza 2009). Proactive stakeholder involvement becomes necessary ranging from information to ownership. Notably the findings have shown that the most common form of stakeholder involvement was consultation and joint-decision-making with the local community. This demonstrates a high level of procedural justice. This finding is at odds with Russell and Faulkner's (2004) assertion that tourism entrepreneurship is indicative of informality and a lack of planning. However, high levels of procedural justice require formality and planning. Participatory approaches are also pursued, linking local people directly with the development and enterprise.

Participatory approaches complement the high degree of public involvement, which has been identified as a distinguishing factor in tourism entrepreneurship (Ateljevic 2009, Koh and Hatten 2002). Such approaches combine Jamal and Camargo's (2014) concepts of procedural justice with distributive justice. Stakeholder involvement is a *Tourism for Tomorrow Awards* criterion in itself, linking both the awards and the behavioural responses to a virtue ethics perspective.
Additionally, collaborative actions address two more *Tourism for Tomorrow Awards* criteria for best practice in tourism. These are to raise awareness and to engage in transformational leadership. Both criteria are mirrored in training and skills development and are rooted in a virtue ethics perspective. While stakeholder involvement assumes that stakeholder have the ability to engage in collaborative action, training and skills development is concerned with fostering that ability to engage. This collaborative action is often directed towards the closest, internal stakeholders of the enterprise – its employees. Contrary, the literature suggests that tourism entrepreneurship is characterised by a high percentage of marginal and temporal employment with limited responsibilities for the entrepreneur (Ateljevic 2007, Koh and Hatten 2002). The findings, however, have shown that employees are seen as the most immediate community to whom responsibility exists. As such, they have a close proximity to the effects of best practice. Jamal and Stronza (2009) acknowledge that proximity is indeed a powerful dimension for procedural justice in tourism. It is possible to argue that training and skills development is inherently sympathetic towards close stakeholders as it is aimed at enabling others to participate in decision-making and business conduct (Wilson and Dixon 2006).

In conclusion, it can be said that relationship dilemmas occur when the principles of virtue ethics – namely establishing a flourishing society based in moral principle – are not fulfilled. Collaborative responses to relationship dilemmas are inherently symbiotic from a business ethics perspective (Davis 1975) and can be situated within a virtue ethics paradigm. Drake and Schlachter (2008) further contend that these collaborative responses have to be based on the pursuit of a common goal, trust and rightful communication. The first is achieved by engaging in active
stakeholder involvement and joint decision-making. The latter is achieved by empowering stakeholders to be able to engage through training and skills development. Finally, the third objective is achieved through actions for accountability, which are discussed in the final paragraphs for establishing an ethical foundation for dilemmas and types of behaviour for best practice in tourism.

8.3.3 Misrepresentation and Accountability

Brenkert (2009) argues that misrepresentation dilemmas are the most common form of ethical dilemma in business. However, he has also strongly advocated the idea that they are not typical for entrepreneurs (Brenkert 2009). The findings here have revealed the entrepreneurs themselves were unaware of any inconsistencies in communication or action that could lead to misrepresentation and it was primarily through the triangulation of sources that misrepresentation dilemmas have occurred. This finding alters Brenkert’s (2009) claim that awareness of misrepresentation, rather than actuality, is not typical for entrepreneurs. The findings thus suggest that there is a cognitive dissonance between misrepresentation awareness and actual misrepresentation behaviour. Despite the lack of awareness, plenty misrepresentation dilemmas have emerged and in four different guises: entrepreneurial plagiarism, conservation tokenism, the leadership-conservation-gap, and misperceptions about sustainability.

Entrepreneurial plagiarism is situated within the competitive context (Brenkert 2009, Connelly 2006) and often results from the desire for applause (Kuratko 2007). Both elements are symptomatic for a differentiating approach to business ethics,
which seeks to draw a dividing line between business and personal conduct (Brenkert 2009). They are furthermore rooted in a utilitarian ethic, more so in its stance of egoism, which stipulates that actions are morally right as long as they deliver the most positive outcome for oneself (Fennell 2006). Longenecker et al. (1988) have also linked this to entrepreneurial behaviour, leaving to conclude that best practice here is simply practice.

Conservation tokenism is also rooted in a utilitarian ethics perspective. The focus of conservation of flagship animals as the data has revealed befits the purpose of maintaining a status quo between nature and humankind (Holden 2003). However, a meaningful and holistic conservation ethic is presently considered unattainable for best practice in tourism (Holden 2003). Conservation tokenism is a disambiguation for Brenkert’s (2009) Pygmalion Effect, which states that truth can be gained behind white lies. In other words, even if the actual conservation activities have proven to be more tokenistic than holistic, they have the potential to raise awareness and educate, leading to further positive impacts for wildlife conservation. Conservation tokenism is thus result-orientated and utilitarian in essence. However, a word of caution is necessary here. Conversation tokenism should not be seen as something negative. It is linked to an indirect obligation of annotating nature with extrinsic rights and value (Fennell 2006).

The leadership-operations-gap as identified in the previous chapter denotes a misrepresentation dilemma, which is based on the premise of trust. Piercy and Lane (2007) call this a dilemma of implementation of the executive role and advise that information sharing partnerships, trust and keeping promises are paramount to
pre-empting this dilemma. The type of ownership of a business venture – by an external developer versus an indigenous entrepreneur – has been discussed frequently in the tourism entrepreneurship literature (Morrison and Teixeira 2004, Mottiar 2007, Pryer 1997, Shaw and Williams 1998, Williams et al. 1989), concluding that external developers have the potential to act as an entrepreneurial stimulus to a destination. However, their potential to misrepresent the sense of place is considerable according to Mottiar (2007). This was not found to be true through the analysis of the secondary and primary data. Despite a leadership-operations-gap, authenticity is valued very highly in best practice in tourism. Instead, the emerging danger from the leadership-operations-gap is situated within the locus of analysis for ethical behaviour. Malloy and Fennell (1998) contend that the further this locus of analysis is away from the locale, the more utilitarian one’s ethical reasoning becomes. Once more, the leadership-operations-gap is rooted in a utilitarian perspective for dilemmas in best practice in tourism.

Misrepresentation is a tangible challenge for best practice. This is particularly pertinent in tourism as the product itself is intangible and thereby prone to misrepresentation (Koh and Hatten 2002, Wheeler 1995). Actions for accountability have thus seen great popularity in this data set, which contradicts Russell and Faulkner’s (2004) argument, that tourism entrepreneurship is characterised by informality. Actions for accountability here are monitoring and reporting strategies as well as forming one’s own NGO. They are associated to two Tourism for Tomorrow Awards criteria. Monitoring and Reporting constitutes an awards criterion in itself, whilst the need to integrated policies and planning for sustainability in business practice denotes the second one.
Monitoring and reporting is attached to two ethical dimensions: monitoring for accountability and reporting for transparency. While the former suggests an intrinsic values, the latter is extrinsic in nature. Fennell (2006) argues that accountability is the link between ethics and responsibility. Transparency on the other hand is the precursor to ethical behaviour (Colonomos 2005, Davis 1975). Note here that monitoring and reporting in itself does not evoke actions or ends. They are simply means, albeit very important ones. The special emphasis given on monitoring and reporting suggest a deontological response to the misrepresentation dilemmas above. Monitoring and reporting strategies have in places substituted codes of ethics or conduct. These have been subject to much criticism with regards to their usefulness derived from the policy-behaviour-gap (Malloy and Fennell 1998, Payne and Dimanche 1996, Jamal 2004). In a similar fashion, monitoring for accountability initiatives are only meaningful insofar they are followed by actions. However, Anderson and Smith (2007) argue that they are means of achieving social legitimisation for one's behaviour, which is considered a necessary condition for ethical business conduct. The data has shown that monitoring strategies were strong indeed. This suggests an intrinsic motivation for actions for accountability. Meanwhile, reporting is a first step towards taking action after monitoring, yet the reporting strategies from the data lagged behind. Reporting is closely linked to transparency and trust (Colonomos 2005, Plinio 2009). It is possible to conclude then that accountability is valued higher than transparency. It is also possible to conclude that action lags behind for misrepresentation dilemmas.

Finally, creating one's own NGO was seen as a means for formalising one's best practice conduct and thus pre-empts any inconsistencies that can be construed as
misrepresentation. Forming partnerships is based on the principle of trust, which is linked to a form of moral obligation (Colonomos 2005). Once more, the type of behaviour was one of a deontological ethical grounding. The preceding paragraphs have shown that while misrepresentation dilemmas are ripe and deeply rooted in egotistical thinking, actions to pre-empt these – or actions for accountability – are embedded in deontological thinking. Yet the means become meaningless if they fall behind on delivery. This suggests a cognitive dissonance between awareness and action for this particular response pair. Finally, the chapter now turns towards developing ethical values for best practice in tourism.

8.4 Ethical values for best practice

Values for best practice denote principles that are of particular importance for an ethical framework for best practice. The data has revealed a plethora of values, needs, beliefs, virtues as well as extrinsic motivations and conceptions about responsibilities. To develop an ethical framework for best practice in tourism, five key values have emerged as particularly pertinent in this study. These are a combination of intrinsic and extrinsic values and are: belief in the right thing to do; belief in good character; repentance for sins; progress and development goals; and guest satisfaction. The following paragraphs analyse each of these from an ethical perspective with the aim of developing ethical values for best practice in tourism.
8.4.1 BELIEF IN THE RIGHT THING TO DO

The belief in doing the right thing has permeated through the *Tourism for Tomorrow Awards* reports and the entrepreneur interviews. The belief in doing the right thing is an intrinsic value. As with actions for accountability, the belief in the right thing to do is interrelated to the *Tourism for Tomorrow Awards* criterion to have sustainability principles integrated throughout each planning and policy activity within one’s company. Furthermore, it is mirrored in the awards criterion to show respect for all human being and their rights. The belief in the right thing to do builds the backbone of best practice. It is not just a value, but also an obligation and thus, is grounded in the deontological ethical foundation of the Kantian duty principle (Jamal and Camargo 2014).

Doing the right thing sets out the highest moral intention. Raiborn and Payne (1990) argue that this highest intention is a reflector of true company culture and that these principles are often grounded in the development of moral codes. However, evidence for the use of moral codes could not be found in the *Tourism for Tomorrow Awards* reports. In fact, among 64 reports and 14 interviews, only two examples of adopting a code of ethics were found. Fennell (2006) further states that this moral duty is based on reason and not emotion. All actions are done dispassionately. This reason is grounded in the principle of reciprocity, which is one of the four defining dimensions for best practice. Drake and Schlachter (2008) argue that this dispassionate reasoning is not adequate enough for understanding values for best practices. Rather, they contend that actions out of duty can never be programmatic as humans are at the centre of any business practice (Drake and Schlachter 2008).
This also suggests that the belief in the right thing to do cannot be formalised by way of developing codes of ethics or policies. This also resonated through the findings, which suggested that best practice is a philosophy, rather than a set of policies. To conclude, the belief in the right thing to do, albeit inherently deontological in nature, is closely coupled with the belief in good character.

8.4.2 Belief in Good Character

Action in accordance to doing the right thing is dependent on inner character traits that are believed to constitute good character (Drake and Schlachter 2008). Thus, the belief in good character denotes a virtue ethics perspective on values for best practice. Decisions are based on inner virtues (or qualities). However, Fennell (2006) criticises this virtue perspective as being too vague. The question he poses is what should this good character be (Fennell 2006)? Good character according to the findings from this study includes virtues such as creativity, discipline, humility, to be inspiring and empowering, have integrity, loyalty, openness, perseverance, and solidarity. Further, they include the needs for long-term commitment, self-determination and achievement, as well as values of stewardship and authenticity. The most prominent virtues of good character that have emerged are the virtues of humility, perseverance and integrity.

Much has been said about which virtues constitute good character. The natural virtues – prudence, justice, courage and temperance – according to Aristotle’s virtue ethics remain dominant (Fennell 2006, Hartman 2011, Macdonald and Beck-Dudley 1994, Megone 2002). Colonomos (2005) adds trustworthiness and transparency to
this list. Lurie and Albin (2007) add wisdom, patience, courtesy and persistence to this list of inner qualities. It can be argued that humility, perseverance and integrity can be reflected among all of these above. The conclusion is that the key to having a good character is to act in accordance to these virtues by means of regular practice (Plinio 2009). As such, the belief in good character is linked to the Tourism for Tomorrow Awards criterion of having principles of sustainability reflected in day-to-day practice. This means that best practice is achieved by doing best practice on a daily basis. In other words, best practice denotes Phronesis or practical wisdom, a value that builds the fundamental basis for an Aristotelian virtue ethics (Jamal 2004).

8.4.3 Repentance for sins

While the former two beliefs are intrinsic values, repentance for sins is both intrinsic and extrinsic in nature. It is linked to the notion of responsibility, which is the sum of accountability and ethical behaviour (Fennell 2006). In other words, repentance of sins is necessary in order to account for one’s ethical behaviour. The extrinsic element results from a wish to avoid punishment, while the intrinsic element is mirrored in the accountability dimension. It is thus interrelated with the Tourism for Tomorrow Awards criterion of monitoring and reporting. Repentance for sins is a motivating factor for actions for accountability.

It is important to note that repentance for sins as a responsibility is rooted in two principles: determinism and free will (Fennell 2006). The former means that external forces influence our actions. This is mirrored in the dimension of change
for defining best practices. In other words, the responsibility to repent for sins may
derive from a constantly changing environment. Free will, on the other hand, means
that repentance for sins is necessary as a motive for action in order to avoid negative
consequences (Fennell 2006). This motive has emerged as particularly strong in this
research; with respondents stating that actions that are directed towards rectifying
misbehaviour – even if conducted by others – are crucial for avoiding damages to
one’s own business. Repentance of sins as a value for best practice is driven by the
notion of positive unfairness (Sedlacek 2011) and avoidance of pain (Fennell 2006).
It is thus, utilitarian in nature.

8.4.4 Progress and development goals

Progress and development goals are extrinsic values for best practice in tourism.
They have also emerged as very strong values. They are reward orientated, albeit
the reward often is directed towards someone else, for example the local
community. On a social continuum, they relate to a notion of social responsibility
and go beyond actions that are focused only on social obligation (Walle 1995). This
mirrors the awards criterion to bring direct benefits to local people and host
communities. It indicates the existence of reciprocal altruism, which is found in a
utilitarian ethical perspective (Fennell 2006). By rewarding the local community
with specific benefits, the business venture hopes in turn for continued support for
the business venture. Progress and development goals are thus goals for a symbiotic
school of business ethics.
Progress and development goals are agents for change. This highlights the awards criterion of transformational leadership. Transformational leadership is once more associated to contributing towards the flourishing of society. Transformational leadership is also considered to be an entrepreneurial function (Gartner 2008, Johannisson 2011). As previously discussed, benevolence is striving towards bringing happiness to others (Fennell 2006) and constitutes a virtue ethics perspective. As such, progress and development goals are multi-dimensional in their ethical orientation and subscribe to a symbiotic school of thought for business ethics.

8.4.5 Guest satisfaction

Finally, guest satisfaction stipulates the final key value for best practice in tourism. It is possible to conclude that this is an important value because tourism is a service industry and aims to serve best quality tourism to its guests. The following paragraphs will show that guest satisfaction is largely rooted in a utilitarian ethics perspective. Different forms of guest satisfaction have been identified in this empirical study (see Section 7.5.2). These have been called hedonistic, normative, opportunistic and superlative guest satisfaction.

Hedonistic guest satisfaction is concerned with the guests' wellbeing and comfort. These become the company's highest responsibilities – a view that Cadbury (2005) contends. Its aim is to ensure maximum pleasure for guests. Fennell (2006) argues that tourism is by nature a hedonistic phenomenon as it aims to ensure maximum pleasure for a small number of people. Culture and nature become commoditised
and instrumentalised. It needs market dynamics to decide whether the relationship between tourism and the environment will be symbiotic or destructive (Holden 2009). The associated Tourism for Tomorrow Awards criterion is that of ensuring maximum benefits to stakeholders. The stakeholders here are the guests.

Normative guest satisfaction is also concerned with the wellbeing of the customer. However, it is not through the instrumentalisation of nature and culture that the maximisation of pleasure is achieved, but rather through the process of learning. In so doing, normative guest satisfaction is linked to the awards criterion of raising awareness. It can be understood as a form of personal development and cultivating a sense of stewardship. This denotes a virtue ethics approach and concludes that internal motivations matter (Plinio 2009). Doing good is be complemented with doing good for the right reasons, i.e. developing a sense of stewardship (Jamal 2004). To conclude, normative guest education reflects a virtue ethics perspective.

More commonly, however, guest satisfaction is also sometimes rooted in opportunism. Guest interest is replaced by self-interest. A focus on self-interest is by definition linked to the ethics perspective of egoism (Fennell 2006, Longenecker et al. 1988). However, in line with the dimensions of balance and harmony that define best practice, even opportunistic guest satisfaction is morally bound. As such, it can be argued that in accordance to the principles of best practice, this self-interest is inherently linked to benevolence, and thus has a virtuous dimension too (Sedlacek 2011).
Finally, when self-interest and pleasure outweigh the sustainability principle, guest satisfaction becomes a pursuit of superlatives as the data has shown. It constitutes a need for achievement and efficiency. “For utilitarians this essentially amounts to efficiency in allocating resources to maximally satisfy preferences.” (Macdonald and Beck-Dudley 1994, p.621) To conclude, guest satisfaction is predominantly utilitarian in nature, albeit with virtuous tendencies relating to stewardship and principles of sustainability.

8.5 Conclusion

This discussion has shown that best practice in tourism is ethically complex and incorporates elements of all three leading ethical lenses – deontology, traditional teleology (or virtue ethics) and teleology. This is the most notable finding from this research and suggests a form of ethical pragmatism (Crane and Matten 2010) with best practice as the goal. A pragmatic ethic for best practice is also underpinned by its emphasis of value pluralism and relativism as was shown in the discussion about change as a dimension for best practice (see Section 8.2.4). As such, this thesis recommends that applying a singular ethics lens to the complexity of business and tourism should be avoided. Rather this thesis advocates the use of particularism (see Lurie and Albin 2007) and the adoption of an ethical prism (Crane and Matten 2010) for understanding business ethics in this context. Table 8.1 overleaf depicts the ethical foundation of best practice in tourism for each of its core elements that have been subject to the discussion here: definition, dilemmas, types of behaviour and values. The table leans on a continuum from the maximisation of good towards the maximisation of utility (Sedlacek 2011, p. 253). He calls it MaxG and MaxU. Good
here was replaced with principle. Therefore, the table is ordered along a continuum from a principle-based ethic (top row of the table) towards one of utility maximisation (bottom row of the table). Column two shows the associated ethics theories that sit along this continuum. These are not exhaustive, but rather those for which evidence in the empirical research was found.

A definition for best practice is situated within teleological ethics theories. While reciprocity is traditionally a deontological concept, here it was rooted in reciprocal altruism, which is considered to be teleological. The boundaries for teleology and traditional teleology (virtue ethics) are blurred for the dimension of change due to its dialectical nature. Harmony is clearly a virtue ethics dimension, while balance is utilitarian at heart.

The applied ethics analysis for dilemma-response-pairs shows that two out of three pairs are ethically balanced. This means that the dilemma and the response are situated within the same ethical perspective. This is the case for relationship dilemmas and collaborative actions – situated within a virtue ethics perspective – and distribution dilemmas and actions for fairness – situated in utilitarianism. Elements of fairness such as those pertaining to procedural justice can be situated within a virtue ethics paradigm. Once more, the boundaries between these two ethical stances are slightly blurred.
# TABLE 8.1:
An ethical framework for best practice in tourism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethical lens</th>
<th>Ethics theory</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Dilemmas</th>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principle</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>The right thing to do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deontology</td>
<td>Kantian Duty Ethics</td>
<td>Reciprocity (traditional interpretation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Golden Rule</td>
<td>Harmony</td>
<td>Relationship dilemmas</td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>Good character</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Change (value pluralism)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fairness (procedural justice)</td>
<td>Progress &amp; development goals (transformational leadership)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traditional teleology</td>
<td>Virtue Ethics</td>
<td>Progress &amp; development goals (value pluralism)</td>
<td>Fairness (distributive justice)</td>
<td>Progress &amp; development goals (maximisation of benefits)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Utilitarianism</td>
<td>Reciprocity (reciprocal altruism)</td>
<td>Distribution dilemmas</td>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunistic guest satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hedonism</td>
<td>Balance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Repentance for sins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaology</td>
<td>Egoism</td>
<td>Misrepresentation dilemmas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hedonistic guest satisfaction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: present author
Interestingly, however, the misrepresentation dilemma and actions for accountability pairing is situated at opposite ends of the ethical foundation continuum. Misrepresentation dilemmas are rooted in egoism, while their corresponding responses are deontological in nature. This divergence between the two pairing elements is rooted in a cognitive dissonance between awareness and action. The triangulation of sources and methods has enabled this finding to emerge. This thesis thus recommends that there is a need to raise awareness among practitioners and their effects of behaviour before strategies; plans and actions are put in place.

Values for best practice spread across the entire ethical foundation continuum. Intrinsic values are situated towards the principle-based end, whereas extrinsic motivations can be found along the utility-maximisation end of the continuum. This suggests high levels of value pluralism for best practice in tourism. This thesis questions the usefulness of rigid value paradigms for best practice that are often associated to codes of conduct and behavioural policies. Instead, this thesis recommends adopting a more pluralistic view when developing strategies and actions for ethical business conduct. Once more, an ethical prism seems more appropriate than an ethical lens for solving ethical dilemmas in business.

It is also interesting to consider a dimension of time for best practice in tourism. While the literature has shown that ethical dilemmas are specific points in time, albeit they can be recurring (Lurie and Albin 2007), this is not the case for best practice overall. It encompasses the past, the present and the future. The past is evident in dilemmas, but also in actions for accountability such as monitoring and
reporting. As previously stated, these actions are past orientated and do not in themselves evoke behaviour. Furthermore, the motivational factor of repentance of sins is also rooted in types of behaviour that have taken place in the past. A perspective of the present is mirrored in the concept of balance, but also in actions for fairness as well as extrinsic motivations for best practice. A future-orientation becomes evident in the other three key dimensions for best practice, namely harmony, change and reciprocity. Furthermore, actions for collaboration are future-orientated and so are intrinsic motivational factors.

As a final point, to answer the question about the different schools of thought on business ethics, it has become evident that best practice is to a very large extent situated within the symbiotic school of thought for business ethics. Evidence for this school of thought can be found in the relationship-collaboration and distribution-fairness pairs; all four dimensions of the best practice definition; and in all intrinsic and extrinsic values bar repentance of sins. Notions of a differentiating school of thought for business ethics are found in the misrepresentation-accountability response pair, repentance of sins and in the superlative form of the guest satisfaction value. No evidence was discovered that would allow concluding a separate school of thought on business ethics, which seeks to separate business from social responsibility. This suggests that best practice in tourism emphasises relationships and responsibilities that are rooted in a symbiotic school of business ethics. This focus is mirrored in a feminist ethic (Crane and Matten 2010). This thesis therefore recommends the adoption of a feminist ethic paradigm for further analysis. The next discussion chapter focuses on the individual entrepreneur.
9 UNDERSTANDING ETHICAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP IN TOURISM

*On the whole human beings want to be good, but not too good, and not quite all the time.*

(Orwell 1941, p. 30)

9.1 INTRODUCTION

George Orwell’s quote about human morality assumes three things: a motivation to be ethical, a relativist approach to ethics and a differentiation of ethics under changing circumstances. It is the aim of this chapter to inspect these aspects of human ethics, particularly for tourism entrepreneurs, and to discuss the findings that have been presented in Chapter 7, specifically those in Sections 7.6 and 7.7. In essence, the aim of this chapter is to unpack the notion of ethical entrepreneurship in tourism. As such, this part of the thesis contributes to the scant literature at this academic juncture.

While the previous chapter has answered the first research problem of a wider outlook on best practice in tourism, this chapter’s purpose is to tighten the focus on the individual entrepreneur. Personal Construct Theory was used as suggested by Denicolo (2003) and Kelly (2003) to elicit higher order constructs pertaining to entrepreneurial role behaviour and an entrepreneurial ethic. The findings have been grounded in the Psychological Characteristics School of Entrepreneurship as advocated by Cunningham and Lischeron (1991). As such, the discussion in this chapter refers back to the core elements of this school of thought, namely
entrepreneurial risk taking, the need for achievement and an entrepreneurial ethic. The literature on these topics (see Table 4.1 for examples) will guide this discussion.

The chapter commences by discussing the ontological aspects of an ethical entrepreneurship (Section 9.2). This is important as entrepreneurship has been likened to a form of existences (Schumpeter 1934, Weber 1930) and to a process of becoming (Gartner 2008, Johannisson 2011). The literature on entrepreneurial risk-taking forms part of this discussion. Moving on, Section 9.3 looks closer at a mission, motivation and priorities for an ethical entrepreneurship and incorporates much of the literature on the achievement and profit motivations that has been reviewed in Chapters 3 and 4 respectively as well as making reference to the literature on business responsibilities in Chapter 2 of this thesis. Finally, an entrepreneurial ethic is further analysed in Section 9.4 by examining the judgement approaches used by the entrepreneurs in this study when they were asked to argue for a solution to three hypothetical conundrums. The findings for this can be found in Section 7.7 in Chapter 7.

The chapter concludes with developing a deeper understanding of ethical entrepreneurship in tourism. This is significant as it has the potential to evoke change in current entrepreneurship practice and further the academic debate on the subject. The conclusion lays the foundation for practical and managerial implications as well as directions for future research that are presented in the final concluding chapter of this thesis.
9.2 AN ONTOLOGY FOR ETHICAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP

The findings from the entrepreneur interviews have shown that an ontology for ethical entrepreneurship is based on five key principles: intuition, belongingness, fluidity, learning and awakening. The following sections discuss these dimensions in more detail, both from the perspective of the Psychological Characteristics School of Entrepreneurship as well as from an ethical perspective.

9.2.1 INTUITION

Intuition here means that ethical entrepreneurship is a philosophy and not attainable through a set of policies. This finding questions the usefulness of codes of ethics or policies and planning for ethical business conduct. Intuition has also emerged strongly as a key dimension for an entrepreneurial ontology regardless of the years of experience in the industry that the entrepreneurs have had. For Schumpeter (1934, p. 85) intuition is the key entrepreneurial quality for success. He states “… the success of everything depends on intuition.”

From the perspective of the Psychological Characteristics School of Entrepreneurship, intuition is linked to the attitude of risk-taking. Knight (1921) insists that an entrepreneurial environment is one of uncertainty, which differs from measurable risk. As such, entrepreneurial judgements in uncertain situations are intuitive. In tourism, this plays a crucial role, as the tourism product is often an intangible experience (Koh and Hatten 2002). The data indeed suggests that the emphasis of experience and intuitive judgement making becomes a fundamental
part of an entrepreneurial ontology. This emphasis increases the psychological risk for entrepreneurs due to a lack of rationale.

From an ethical perspective, Chonko et al. (2003) suggest that judgements based on intuition are high in relativism and denote a form of ‘Craft Ethics’. Such a form of intuitionism suggests that judgements are based on feelings and experiences, which sits comfortably with Personal Construct Theory (Kelly 2003). Intuitionism is premised on the notion of the good life and can thus be situated within the traditional teleology ethics spectrum. However, Fennell (2006) warns that intuitionism is problematic in as much as it allows scope for disagreements between parties, and as with other virtue perspectives is too vague (Fennell 2006). To counteract the ethical shortcomings of intuitionism, collectivism and consensus are required. Both can be found in the second dimension of an ontology for ethical entrepreneurship, namely belongingness.

9.2.2 Belongingness

The findings have shown that belongingness in ethical entrepreneurship relates to a form of identification among best practice or ethical entrepreneurs. It denotes a form of being part of a bigger collective that shares a similar outlook or goals. As such, belongingness is the psychogenic element of the entrepreneurial ontology. A psychogenic dimension assumes the need to become part of a group (Solomon et al. 2002).
From the perspective of the Psychological Characteristics School of Entrepreneurship, belongingness reduces the social risks involved in ethical entrepreneurship in tourism. Belongingness creates social legitimisation, which Anderson and Smith (2007) see as a pre-requisite for ethical entrepreneurship. In tourism, this legitimisation and shared belief in a common cause has been identified in the realm of lifestyle entrepreneurship (Hall and Rusher 2004). Further, Ateljevic and Li (2009) contend that lifestyle entrepreneurship is characterised by a sense of collectivism, which reduces social risk. This suggests that ethical entrepreneurship in tourism operates under the same belongingness paradigm as lifestyle entrepreneurship does, and in so doing reduces social risks involved with entrepreneurial ventures.

The ethical dimension of belongingness is based on the premise of peer commitment. Plinio (2009) argues that such peer commitment is a pre-requisite for any ethical leadership or entrepreneurship. Peer commitment is mirrored in Social Contract Theory, a deontological ethical perspective. Social Contract Theory is premised on the voluntaristic participation in society with a common goal. It is based on the individual adherence to collective objectives (Fennell 2006). For best practice in tourism, such collective objectives are often those set out in global norms, such as the UN Millennium Goals or the UNWTO Global Code of Ethics. This, however, suggests that belongingness requires a rationale, which is at odds with the dimension of intuition. This is where a third dimension for an ontology for ethical entrepreneurship becomes evident: learning.
The findings have shown that continuous learning is part of any entrepreneurial existence, regardless of the years of experiences that an entrepreneurs has. If intuition is an innate condition and belongingness a psychogenic condition, learning becomes a practical condition for an entrepreneurial ontology. Continuous learning is deeply rooted in the entrepreneurial environment. Knight (1921) argues that entrepreneurs are able to generate workable knowledge out of imperfect knowledge under conditions of uncertainty. Such is the case for ethical entrepreneurship, which operates in an environment of constant change as the previous chapter has already discussed.

The risk dimension of the Psychological Characteristics School of Entrepreneurship manifests itself twofold in the element of continuous learning. First, continuous learning reduces a functional risk for entrepreneurs as it allows them to make decisions based on knowledge (Shaw 2004). This increases a locus of control for the entrepreneur, which denotes a form of functional risk (Brandstätter 2011). Second, learning also enhances one’s self-efficacy (Brandstätter 2011) and thus reduces the psychological risk involved with entrepreneurship.

Knowledge is gained from previous experiences (Kirzner 1973). This notion is also mirrored in Personal Construct Theory (Kelly 2003). As such, intuition and learning are not contradictory, but rather mutually beneficial. From an ethical perspective, knowledge retention through continuous learning is rooted in the virtue ethics principle of *Phronesis* – gaining practical wisdom through practice (Johannisson
2011). It can thus be argued, that both intuition and learning are elements of a traditional teleology ethic an ontology for ethical entrepreneurship. *Phronesis* is process-orientated as a principle as it requires daily practice. It is thus linked to the fourth dimension for an ontology for ethical entrepreneurship: fluidity.

9.2.4 Fluidity

The notion of fluidity is closely linked to the dimension of change that has emerged as a key dimension for a definition for best practice (see Chapter 7, Section 7.2). Fluidity as a feature of ethical entrepreneurship requires that being an ethical entrepreneur is not the correct viewpoint, but rather that becoming an ethical entrepreneur describes the phenomenon in a more accurate way. This is in line with Gartner (2008) and Johannisson (2011), who purport that entrepreneurship is based on an ontology of becoming. Fluidity is also mirrored in Schumpeter’s (1934) assertion that entrepreneurship is a dynamic process. This process orientation once more suggests the ethical principle of *Phronesis* as a foundation for fluidity, and thus places it within the virtue ethics paradigm.

Fluidity, or adaptability, is a pre-requisite to navigate uncertainty as the findings have shown. As such, it denotes a functional risk for the entrepreneur, who could beat risk of losing control (Brandstätter 2011). Furthermore, fluidity complements the notion of informality, which characterises tourism entrepreneurship (Dawson *et al.* 2011), and thus increases the functional risk. The data has further shown that fluidity is associated with a cycle of discovery, arbitration and commitment. As such, it denotes a social risk for the ethical entrepreneur, who requires social
legitimisation in order to perform in an ethical venture (Anderson and Smith 2007). This suggests that the notion of fluidity increases risk for ethical entrepreneurship. Lastly, while the last two dimensions have been process-orientated, the final element of an ontology for ethical entrepreneurship is rooted in a specific point in time: awakening.

9.2.5 Awakening

Awakening, as the findings have shown, refers to an event which occurred during the entrepreneur's life which triggered a shift in thinking within the entrepreneur. It is thus deeply rooted in Personal Construct Theory, which emphasises the relationship between personal constructs and human experiences (Botterill 1989). These human experiences change personal constructs and thus trigger a shift in behaviour – in this instance towards more ethical, entrepreneurial role behaviour. The findings also suggest that this is not in contrast to the intuitive element of ethical entrepreneurship, but rather denote a form of value pluralism, which is seen to be a pre-requisite for ethical entrepreneurship (Wempe 2005).

From the perspective of the Psychological Characteristics School of Entrepreneurship, a moment of awakening can cause social, functional and psychological risks to the individual. Miller and Collier (2010) call this the emergence of a holistic approach of entrepreneurship, which disrupts the current status quo. Gartner (2008) emphasises the transformational nature of entrepreneurship and its associated risks, which can be triggered by a moment of awakening.
Value pluralism and transformational leadership are both principles rooted in a virtue ethics perspective as has been shown in the previous chapter (see Table 8.1). To conclude, an ontology for ethical entrepreneurship is deeply immersed in a traditional teleological ethics lens. This is to a large part seated within virtue ethics combined with elements of intuitionism. The main emphasis is on Phronesis and the good life through a process-orientated ontology. Only the element of belongingness emphasises communal goals, and thus depicts characteristics of a Social Contract Theory for ethical entrepreneurship. Following this analysis of the entrepreneurial ontology, the next section delves deeper into the mission, motivations and priorities behind an ethical entrepreneurship.

9.3 MISSION, MOTIVATION AND PRIORITIES BEHIND ETHICAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP

The opening quote by George Orwell suggests a motivation to be good. Furthermore, the Psychological Characteristics School of Entrepreneurship emphasises that entrepreneurs distinguish themselves through their need for achievement as a motivational factor (Cunningham and Lischeron 1991, McClelland 1961). It can thus be argued that for ethical entrepreneurship, being good becomes a goal that has to be achieved. The following three sections analyse in greater detail the mission, motivation and priorities behind an ethical entrepreneurship in tourism.
In Section 7.6.2 of this thesis, the mission for an ethical entrepreneurship as derived from the findings has been summarised as the pursuit of an entrepreneurial activity with the aim of leaving behind a legacy in accordance to one's own integrity, driven by virtues of benevolence and humility, and an appreciation of a wider spiritual existence.

This mission situates ethical entrepreneurship within the Psychological Characteristics School of Entrepreneurship as a form of behaviour (Drucker 1985), which, however, is ethically bound to motives that surpass the profit motive by means of leaving behind a legacy. Although the moral obligation to surpass profit has been recognised as a lifestyle entrepreneurship motive by Ateljevic and Doorne (2002), the same cannot be said about leaving a legacy. While lifestyle motives are bound to the present motive of the simultaneous consumption and production of the tourism product (Williams et al. 1989), leaving behind a legacy is future-orientated. From an ethical perspective, both elements of entrepreneurial activity and leaving behind a legacy are rooted in a virtue ethics lens. While entrepreneurship as a form of behaviour suggests a degree of daily practice, i.e. Phronesis, leaving behind a legacy is concerned with contributing towards the flourishing of society, and in a sense intergenerational equity as a premise for virtue ethics (Crane and Matten 2010).

The findings also stress the need for integrity as part of a mission for ethical entrepreneurship in tourism. Raiborn and Payne (1990) confirm this need by
stating that individual integrity is the backbone of any ethical business conduct. Bryant (2009), however, emphasises that integrity is usually stronger among self-regulating groups, such as entrepreneurs. This suggests that a stronger locus of control increases integrity among entrepreneurs. High levels of integrity were indeed emphasised by the entrepreneurs in this data set, who are highly self-regulatory as the founders and owners of their own businesses. From an ethical perspective, integrity suggests that there is evidence of *Phronesis* (Johannisson 2011), which again is an ethical dimension of virtue ethics. High levels of integrity for ethical entrepreneurship also suggest that there is no need for codes of conduct to guide behaviour.

Integrity here should not be confused with self-efficacy. It is coupled with the virtue of humility as the findings have suggested. Humility can be seen as a psychogenic virtue that requires the entrepreneur to set aside individualistic tendencies and become part of a group. It is linked to Kant’s Practical Imperative, which states that humans must always be treated as ends in themselves and not be instrumentalised for another one’s benefit (I. Kant, in Hartman 2002). Humility is thus a deontological virtue.

The other virtue advocated for a mission for ethical entrepreneurship as the findings suggest is that of benevolence. Benevolence is linked to an ethic of care (Upchurch 1998), but also forms a fundamental value of Aristotle’s virtue ethics (Fennell 2006). Both are situated within traditional teleology. This finding contradicts Cordeiro’s (2008) and Longenecker *et al.*’s (1988) assertion that entrepreneurship is in essence egoistical in nature. Instead the data has suggested that ethical
entrepreneurs indeed strive towards happiness for others based on moral concern. This finding is in line with the recognition of a greater concern for stakeholders among lifestyle entrepreneurs too (Dawson et al. 2002).

Finally, the mission for ethical entrepreneurship as derived from the findings calls for an appreciation of a higher spiritual order. This pursuit of a higher good has been acknowledged by Choi and Gray (2008) as a premise for ethical entrepreneurship. Furthermore, a belief in a higher order of things has been found to be true for individuals with high levels of n(Ach) (Hagen 1964). This spiritual pursuit is rooted in a form of non-religious idealism, which has been found to be high among a study of small-business entrepreneurs (Dawson et al. 2002). To conclude, a mission for ethical entrepreneurship is largely based on the premises of virtue ethics, with the addition of a deontological dimension in the form of humility and spirituality. The following section looks more closely at motivational factors behind an ethical entrepreneurship.

9.3.2 Motivation

While a mission for ethical entrepreneurship denotes a goal-orientated framework, motivations behind ethical entrepreneurship are those psychological factors that trigger types of behaviours for achieving this mission. This section discusses the motivations that are associated with ethical entrepreneurship in more detail. In Chapter 7, Section 7.6.3 these have been identified from the findings as: the need for supererogation, non-identificational atonement, existential responsibility, transformational entrepreneurship and individualistic altruism.
Non-identificational atonement is the individual perspective of the repentance of sins – value for best practice. This has already been discussed in detail in Chapter 8, Section 8.4.3 and will thus not be repeated here. Suffice to say that from an ethical perspective, non-identificational atonement is driven by the avoidance of punishment and a sense of positive unfairness (Sedlacek 2011), both of which have been situated within the utilitarian ethics spectrum. Equally, transformational entrepreneurship has been discussed as part of the overarching progress and development goals for best practice in tourism (see Section 8.4.4). It is an extrinsic motivation that leads the entrepreneur to become an agent for change (Gartner 2008), and thus contributes to the flourishing of society. Transformational entrepreneurship can therefore be situated within a virtue ethics perspective. The remaining three motivations behind ethical entrepreneurship are discussed in more detail in the following paragraphs.

The need for supererogation is an intrinsic motivation that has emerged very strongly among the group of tourism entrepreneurs that have been interviewed in this research. It simply means to do more than is required and is inherently duty-bound (Fennell 2006). Jamal and Camargo (2014) argue that this duty-bound motivation has the potential to create a rationale for ethical behaviour, which otherwise can be seen as irrational by peers. From an entrepreneurial perspective, this addresses the social risks involved with entrepreneurship, which require legitimations of the good deed (Anderson and Smith 2007). The need for supererogation is thus a process-motivation, which results in the reduction of social risk (Arthur and Hisrich 2011). This, however, does not make it an extrinsic motivation because the need to do more than is required is based on a sake of duty,
not just in accordance with principles (Macdonald and Beck-Dudley 1994). This duty-bound motivation is thus inherently deontological and situated within a Kantian duty ethics perspective.

While the need for supererogation addresses social risks for ethical entrepreneurs, the existential responsibility motivation relates to psychological risks encountered by ethical entrepreneurs. To develop an existential responsibility is driven by an anxiety of not having done enough (Hagen 1964). Acting out of an existential responsibility motivation is a way of placing authenticity on one’s values (Fennell 2009) as well as a means for authenticating one’s behaviour (Anderson and Smith 2007). Such authentication of values and behaviours has been linked to the ethical stance of social intuitionism (Fennel 2006) and is based on the principle of free will (Hodgkinson 1983). However, it can be argued that the motivational factor of acting out of a sense of existential responsibility is linked to the darker side of entrepreneurship as Kets de Vries (1985) describes. The authentication of values and behaviour suggests a need for control and sense of distrust and increases the psychological risk for ethical entrepreneurship.

Finally, individualistic altruism has appeared as a motivational factor for ethical entrepreneurship. The key aspect of this motivation lies with the sense of achievement that is perceived by the individual (McClelland 1961). Individual altruism is thus linked to the entrepreneurial motivation of n(Ach). The achievement comes in the form of having helped others. However, only as McClelland (1961) points out if the decisions were made by the individual entrepreneur. Individualistic altruism is seen to be strong among self-regulatory
groups, such as entrepreneurs (Bryant 2009) and differs from reciprocal altruism in a way that no reciprocity for good deeds is required (Fennell 2006). As Sedlacek (2011, p. 215) explains, “The goodness of an act lies in its result of the deed itself – in the utility it brings. In addition, its utility is judged from the personal point of view of the actor.” Individualistic altruism is thus a hedonistic motive for ethical entrepreneurship as it seeks to gain achievement (pleasure) from doing good deeds for others. This does not require public recognition (McClelland 1961).

To conclude, while a mission for ethical entrepreneurship is bound to an ethic of care and virtue as well as deontological perspectives, the motivational drivers behind ethical entrepreneurship are leaning towards teleological ethical perspectives. A mission for ethical entrepreneurship emphasises relationships. The motivations are much more individualistic in nature. The latter has been identified as typical for entrepreneurial role behaviour by Lashley and Rowson (2010) and Mottiar (2007) among others. The next section broadens the individual orientation of the ethical entrepreneur (ontology, mission, motivation) by including priorities for ethical entrepreneurship that go beyond the individual personality.

9.3.3 Priorities for ethical entrepreneurship

The findings on responsibilities and priorities for ethical entrepreneurship have identified three areas of concern for ethical entrepreneurship over and above the many actions for best practice that have been discussed in Chapter 8 of this thesis. These prioritised areas of concern for ethical entrepreneurship are: profit for survival, an integrated business ethics and employee welfare.
The notion of profit making is intrinsic to human nature as it guarantees survival (Fennell 2006). It is thus not surprising that making profit for a purpose of survival is high on the list of priorities for ethical entrepreneurship in tourism. This priority stands in contrast to those identified for lifestyle entrepreneurship in tourism, which emphasises control and location (Lashley and Rowson 2010, Mottiar 2007). The profit for survival priority posits a monetary risk for the entrepreneur, which is in contrast to Schumpeter’s (1934) assertion that true entrepreneurs do not possess any monetary risks. However, profit as a means for survival is not a new notion in itself. Rather it was identified by Aristotle (in Hardie 1968) as a precursor for pleasure, as mutually supportive for social wellbeing (Hartman 2011) and as a companion to development (Schumpeter 1934).

In addition, the profit for survival priority suggests a psychological risk factor for ethical entrepreneurship. While Hagen (1964) identifies anxiety as driver for innovative and entrepreneurial behaviour, Newman (2007) points out the hazards of entrepreneurship related to survival. As such, making profit it tantamount for any successful venture, ethical or not. However, Choi and Gray (2008) emphasise that for ethical entrepreneurship profit making is linked to the pursuit of a higher purpose. In this instance, profit for survival is closely linked to the second priority for ethical entrepreneurship, namely adopting an integrated ethics perspective.

An integrated ethics perspective suggests that ethics are intrinsic values to the entrepreneurial venture. Ethical entrepreneurship exists for its own sake. This is in contrast to Fennell’s (2006) argument that often business ethics becomes instrumentalised as a Unique Selling Proposition (USP) or a status enhancer. This is
not the case for ethical entrepreneurship. Relating back to the literature on profit and principle, the integrated ethics priority in combination with the profit for survival priority suggests that ethical entrepreneurs in tourism adopt an integrated profit perspective (Graafland 2002). This perspective attaches intrinsic values to both, profit and principle, which is indeed the case here. The intrinsic value for profit stems from its interrelationship with survival, pleasure, development and social well-being as one does not exist without the other (Aristotle in Hardie 1968, Hartmann 2011, Schumpeter 1934). The intrinsic value for ethics – or principles – is evident in the second priority for ethical entrepreneurship.

Such a perspective on priorities also suggests high levels of idealism that are rooted in non-religious beliefs (Dawson et al. 2002). The integrated ethics perspective cannot be relativist in nature as it is based on intrinsic principles. As such, it would not allow for exceptions and thus cannot be linked to relativism as an approach to ethical entrepreneurship (Chonko et al. 2003). Finally, the integrated ethics priority also suggests an ethical concern that extends beyond that of social obligation. Instead, an integrated ethics priority shows evidence for the notion of social responsiveness. Walle (1995) includes a symbiotic view on business ethics as well as concern for future issues into this notion. Both elements can be found in the first and second priority for ethical entrepreneurship.

The third priority that was identified as characteristic of ethical entrepreneurship is the concern for employee welfare. Although there was no agreement among the entrepreneurs as to whether job creation is a fundamental responsibility of ethical entrepreneurs; sustaining employment and caring for one's employees’ welfare
emerged strongly as a priority. This priority is based on the fundamental and intrinsic belief in the care for others (Chonko et al. 2003). Once more this suggests high levels of idealism within ethical entrepreneurship. This priority for ethical entrepreneurship is mirrored in Dawson et al’s (2002) finding that entrepreneurs rate concern for employees higher than that for any other groups of stakeholders. In this research, employees are considered as the most immediate community of the ethical tourism entrepreneur.

This finding is perhaps indicative of the barrier for tourism entrepreneurship relating to employment. Ateljevic (2007) has found that tourism entrepreneurship suffers from lack of skilled personnel and draws mainly from the second labour market. Additionally, employment in tourism entrepreneurship is often informal and marginal (Koh and Hatten 2002). By prioritising one’s employees’ welfare, as the entrepreneurs in this study do, conditions can be created to overcome the above stated barrier. Finally, a view on ethical judgement making is discussed in the next section of this chapter.

9.4 Making Ethical Judgements

The analysis of the responses to the three conundrums that entrepreneurs have been asked to make ethical judgement on has revealed that for each one a different path for ethical judgement making was pursued. There are similarities between the three cases, but there are also interesting differences, which allow to make conclusions for ethical judgement making under differing circumstances. Dixon and Wilson argue (2006) that making ethical judgement is always context specific, and
Knight (1921) contends that entrepreneurs make ethical judgements based on common sense and intuition rather than logical reasoning. Evidence for both premises was found in all three attempts at solving the ethical conundrum that was posed to the entrepreneurs. However, the evidence took on slightly different forms across the three dilemmas.

9.4.1 Judging Distribution Dilemmas

The growth conundrum was situated within the context of distributive justice and as such was used as a proxy for studying judgements made by entrepreneurs about a distribution dilemma. Figure 7.2 in this thesis shows the exact line of argumentation that took place. The thread began with principle, followed by the acceptance of responsibility, considering the context of reality, then looking at individual cases by means of particularism (Lurie and Albin 2007), followed by applying a relativistic approach to judgement, and finally after a process of self-reflection bundling cases as a form of casuistry for judgement making (Lurie and Albin 2007). The result was that there was no consensus about the conundrum, but a process of self-reflection has led the individual entrepreneur to make a judgement. This is mirrored in the notion that judgement lies within the entrepreneurial and creative personality (Hagen 1964) and is not driven by policies and codes of conduct. The self-negotiation process for the growth conundrum is evidence for a dialogical judgement making approach (Dixon and Wilson 2006), coupled with the need for authenticating one's values and judgements (Anderson and Smith 2007). This allows the conclusion that for dilemmas surrounding issues of distributive justice, ethical judgement was made based on high relativism (case-specific),
coupled with low idealism (dialogical, self-reflective judgement). Using Yaman and Gurel’s (2006) adaptation of Forsyth’s (1980) model for moral philosophies, this places ethical judgement making for distribution dilemmas in a subjectivist view (see Figure 9.1).

9.4.2 JUDGING MISREPRESENTATION DILEMMAS

The flying conundrum was discussed as a proxy for dealing with misrepresentation and the responses revealed three notable aspects to ethical judgement in this realm of business ethics. First, the judgement was based on a consequentialist view of weighing up cost and benefits for sustainable tourism. From an entrepreneurial attitude perspective, such judgement making suggests that risks are seen as variances – or spreads of possible outcomes by the entrepreneurs (Janney and Dess 2007). These variances come in the form of two stakes. First, survival of the entrepreneurial venture and the tourism industry at large vis-à-vis the probability of experiencing the effects of climate change. The former is valued higher, which supports Faragó et al.’s (2008) conclusion that entrepreneurs value stakes higher than probabilities. This ethical judgement for flying despite its effects on climate change is also mirrored in the first priority for ethical entrepreneurship: survival of the business.

However, it has to be noted here that this consequentialist view is not based on logical reasoning, but rather on intuition as the data has shown. The ontological dimension of intuition for ethical entrepreneurship takes a strong hold for ethical judgement making and asserts Knight’s (1921) argument that entrepreneurial
behaviour is fundamentally based on intuition. Such a judgement approach is low in relativism because of the high stakes relating to the entrepreneurial priorities. This denotes a monological style of judgement making (Dixon and Wilson 2006). The arguments brought forward by the entrepreneurs in this study also revealed a high level of idealism with regards to their own positive impacts on sustainable development and ethical best practice, which in their opinion outweigh the probable, negative effects of climate change. This suggest a high level of self-efficacy, a typical characteristic for entrepreneurial role behaviour (Brandstätter 2011) and builds a barrier against the psychological risk of making a wrong ethical judgement.

To conclude, dilemmas surrounding issues of misrepresentation and weighing up stakes are influenced by an ethical judgement that was made based on low relativism (high stakes), coupled with high idealism (monological judgement, high self-efficacy). Once more, by using the model for moral philosophies, this ethical judgement making for misrepresentation dilemmas in can be placed in an absolutist view (see Figure 9.1).

9.4.3 Judging relationship dilemmas

The third and final conundrum that the entrepreneurs in this study were asked to discuss and judge from an ethical perspective was the experience conundrum. It was used as a proxy for studying relationship dilemmas, more specifically, role conflicts resulting from the need to satisfy one’s guests on the one hand and the aim to be an ethical and sustainable tourism entrepreneur on the other hand. As with the flying conundrum, the style of argumentation was monological, in as such that there was
no inner negotiation evident in the responses. Such a monological style of argument suggests a form of principlism (Dixon and Wilson 2006) and negates the situation specific view of casuistry (Lurie and Albin 2007) that was found in earlier forms of judgement making.

The principle in question here is that of whether a commitment to sustainability and ethics is negotiable. The answer to this was a resounding no, which directly mirrors the integrated ethics priority for ethical entrepreneurship as discussed in section 9.3.3 of this chapter. Principlism in entrepreneurship is linked to high levels of idealism (Dawson et al. 2002). Principlism is also based on trust (Colonomos 2005), which is an important requirement for overcoming relationship dilemmas. Lurie and Albin (2007) suggest that such a form of principlism attaches itself to common values across different groups of stakeholders, but also warn that such a judgement approach can lead to the recurrence of such dilemmas.

To solve these ethical dilemmas, the entrepreneurs have acknowledged a form of relativism too. This is not at odds with the idealism behind their integrated ethics perspective. Rather, in order to axiologically evaluate the conundrum, a relative view was attached to the audience in question. They spoke of a threshold and a specific audience that will be targeted. As such, the integrated ethics are based on high idealism, while the stakeholders (or audience) for their integrated ethics are seen as relative. Concluding from the moral philosophy framework, an approach of ethical judgement making that is based both on high idealism and high relativism, is placed within a situationist view.
To summarise, ethical judgement for distribution dilemmas follows a subjective, self-reflective and dialogical judgement approach. They are low in idealism, which suggest that distributive justice is negotiable and takes different perspectives into account. From an ethics theoretical perspective, this suggests a form of virtue ethics, based on experience, practice and intuitive judgement. Meanwhile, ethical judgement for misrepresentation and relationship dilemmas are monological in nature and high in idealism. They resonate through the integrated ethics priority for ethical entrepreneurship, high levels of self-efficacy for ethical judgement making and the acknowledgement of high stakes, i.e. the business’s survival. Both suggest deontological tendencies of ethical judgement making with less room for negotiation. From a management-applied perspective, this finding and discussion calls for a more effective alignment between dilemmas that tourism entrepreneurs encounter, their individual judgement approaches with regards to decision-making and the actions that follow these judgements.

9.5 Conclusion

The purpose of this chapter was to develop a deeper understanding of ethical entrepreneurship, specifically with regards to role behaviour and an individual entrepreneurial ethic. In so doing, the second overarching research aim has been addressed. Elements of investigation for an ethical entrepreneurship in tourism included an ontology for ethical entrepreneurship, a mission, motivations and priorities behind and for ethical entrepreneurship and an evaluation of ethical judgement making. In this chapter, the Psychological Characteristics School of Entrepreneurship was applied in line with the research framework. Furthermore,
the chapter presents an applied ethics analysis of ethical entrepreneurship in tourism. To begin with, this Section outlines the conclusions derived from the application of the Psychological Characteristics School of Entrepreneurship.

The three core elements of the above school of thought are risk, need for achievement and an individual ethic for entrepreneurship (Cunningham and Lischeron 1991). Risk has been distinguished from uncertainty and other constructs, such as challenge or variance (Janney and Dess 2007, Knight 1921). The innate ontological dimension of intuition enables the ethical entrepreneur to navigate uncertainty, while the dimension of fluidity proposes that risk is considered to be variance, rather than loss or opportunism as Janney and Dess (2007) suggest.

Four types of risk were identified as part of the entrepreneurial risk-attitude: monetary, functional, social and psychological. Monetary risk increases for the ethical entrepreneur, due to their emphasis on the profit for survival priority. This is in contrast to the current state of knowledge as presented in the literature review (see Section 3.5). Functional risk is concerned with the locus of control and considered to be problematic for tourism entrepreneurship due to a plethora of stakeholders involved (Gartner et al. 1994). This research has shown that through the processes of awakening and learning, functional risk is reduced as the power to make knowledge decisions is increased. The notion of fluidity, however, increases functional risk due to the arousing need to adapt to changing circumstances.
Social risks are concerned with social legitimisation and are considered to be high among entrepreneurs (Schumpeter 1934, Weber 1930). Engaging in ethical entrepreneurship has been found to reduce social risks for entrepreneurs. The ontological dimension of belongingness counteracts social risks, as does the motive for supererogation, which pushes the entrepreneur to do more than is expected by societal standards. Awakening, however, can increase social risks if this moment of awakening is met with public ridicule.

Finally, psychological risks for entrepreneurs have been associated with anxiety (Hagen 1964, Newman 2007). Yet, high levels of self-efficacy is also seen to reduce psychological risks for entrepreneurs (Brandstätter 2011). This research has shown that the ontological aspects of intuition and learning increase self-efficacy and thus have a positive effect on psychological risk. However, overall, ethical entrepreneurs are more prone to psychological risks, due to the priority for business survival against the background of an integrated ethics perspective and the motive of existential responsibility. To conclude, engaging in ethical entrepreneurship overall increases monetary and psychological risks, but decreases social and functional risk.

The second element of the Psychological Characteristics School of Entrepreneurship is the entrepreneurial motivation on n(Ach), or need for achievement. This motivation includes a profit-as-means dimension, higher-order societal motives as well as individualistic motives (McClelland 1961). The research has found that ethical entrepreneurs are indeed high in levels of n(Ach). The priorities of profit for survival and the integrated ethics perspective show evidence of high n(Ach). The mission element of being entrepreneurial corroborates this conclusion too. For
individualistic motives, high levels of \( n(Ach) \) are manifest in the mission element of individual integrity and the motive of individualistic altruism. Higher-societal motives for ethical entrepreneurship include benevolence and the belief in spirituality, both of whom are evidence for high levels of \( n(Ach) \). Only the virtue dimension of humility has a negative effect of \( n(Ach) \). Besides this, showing high levels of \( n(Ach) \) has been found to be true among ethical entrepreneurs as much as it has been for traditional entrepreneurs.

Finally, the Psychological Characteristics School of Entrepreneurship considers an individual ethic as pertinent for entrepreneurial role behaviour. Egoism has been associated with an individual entrepreneurial ethic (Cordeiro 2008, Longenecker et al. 1988). High levels of relativism have also been associated with an entrepreneurial ethic (Brenkert 2009). There has been no evidence for egoism in this research about ethical entrepreneurship. However, high relativism was found to be true for making judgements relating to distributive justice (case specificity) and acknowledging value pluralism amongst ones stakeholders (relationship judgements). Low relativism has been found when the stakes of making a judgement were considered to be very high.

Interestingly, high levels of idealism were found to be very prominent among ethical entrepreneurs. The integrated ethics and employee welfare priorities demonstrate high levels of idealism. From an ethical judgement making perspective, the same was found to be true for making judgements about cases of misrepresentation and relationship issues. Both have shown a monological reasoning structure, which indicate high idealism and high self-efficacy. Low idealism was only found for issues
of distributive justice, which have been judged using self-reflective, dialogical reasoning. Figure 9.1 below visualises the individual entrepreneurial ethic for the three discussed conundrums using a moral philosophy framework.

**FIGURE 9.1: An individual ethical judgement making framework**
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Lastly, an applied ethics analysis for ethical entrepreneurship in tourism was carried out (see Table 9.1).
TABLE 9.1: An applied ethics framework for ethical entrepreneurship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethical lens</th>
<th>Ethics theory</th>
<th>Ontology</th>
<th>Mission</th>
<th>Motivations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deontology</td>
<td>Idealism</td>
<td></td>
<td>Spirituality (non-religious beliefs)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kantian Duty Ethics</td>
<td>Humility (Practical imperative)</td>
<td>Need for supererogation (Duty-bound)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Contract Theory</td>
<td>Belongingness (Consensus)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional teleology</td>
<td>Ethics of Care</td>
<td>Benevolence (Care for others)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Virtue Ethics</td>
<td>Learning (Phronesis)</td>
<td>Legacy (Flourishing society)</td>
<td>Transformational entrepreneurship (Agents of change)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Awakening (Value pluralism)</td>
<td>Entrepreneurialism (Phronesis)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intuitionism</td>
<td>Intuition (Craft Ethics)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Existential responsibility (Authentic behaviour)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Utilitarianism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-identificational atonement (repentance of sins)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hedonism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Individualistic altruism (Need for achievement)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: present author
Table 9.1 shows the results from this applied ethics analysis. As with the analysis for best practice in tourism (Chapter 8, Table 8.1), the three main ethical lenses were applied, using traditional ethics theories. The table also sits along the continuum from the maximisation of principle towards the maximisation of utility (Sedlacek 2011) that was used in Table 8.1. The analysis shows that four out of five dimensions of an ontology for ethical entrepreneurship are rooted in traditional teleology, most dominantly in the virtue ethics paradigm. The notion of belongingness in ethical entrepreneurship suggests a deontological perspective, rooted in Social Contract Theory. The mission for ethical entrepreneurship is also strongly founded within a virtue ethics perspective. However, as with the ontology, deontological tendencies are found. Motivations range across the entire ethics theory spectrum, taking into account teleological (or consequentialist) motivations. Although no evidence for egoism could be found.

Overall, an individual ethic for ethical entrepreneurship is for the most part shaped by the quest for individual good character and societal wellbeing. The former is evident in the dimensions of integrity, intuition and spirituality, while the latter can be seen in the need for supererogation and non-identificational atonement. Elements such as belongingness, benevolence, humility, employee welfare and existential responsibility suggest an emphasis on relationships and a symbiotic view on business ethics. Other dimensions, such as legacy, transformational entrepreneurship, profit for survival, and entrepreneurialism propose an orientation to future issues and thus sit within a social responsiveness paradigm (Walle 1995). The elements of awakening, learning and fluidity reflect the uncertainty paradigm within which entrepreneurship is rooted.
10 Conclusion

The entire history of ethics has been ruled by an effort to create a formula for the ethical rules of behaviour.

(Sedlacek 2011, p. 13)

10.1 Introduction

The purpose if this final chapter is to bring together all ends of this research and tie the thesis into one complete piece of work. This is achieved by focusing on the contributions this research has provided and the implications this research has for future practice and research. The opening quote by Sedlacek sums up the entity of ethics theory and much of this view is reflected in literature that seeks to apply a singular ethical lens on to complex phenomena, such as entrepreneurship of best practice in tourism. In contrast, this thesis has sought to unravel the ethical underpinning of best practice and entrepreneurship in tourism without prescribing any rules of behaviour or value paradigms onto it. As such, this thesis is non-judgemental about what is right or wrong for best practice and ethical entrepreneurship.

Any attempt of creating a formula or ethical framework as it is the case in this thesis is guided by the belief that one ethical lens is not sufficient for understanding values and behaviours. The applied ethics analysis of best practice tourism entrepreneurs is thus as multi-ethical as the complexity of the phenomenon itself.
This final chapter begins by answering all ten research questions that have built the premise for the investigation. These are linked to the two overarching research aims, namely to develop an ethical framework for best practice in tourism and to understand the notion of ethical entrepreneurship. Section 10.2 provides summaries of the findings that answer each of these questions. The methodological rigour of this research is also highlighted as part of the answers to the research questions. Following this, Section 10.3 is dedicated to establishing the significance and originality of this research. The significance lies within the three key research findings and their implications for future best practice and ethical entrepreneurship. The originality of the research becomes evident by looking at the specific theoretical and methodological contributions this research has made and by further implicating management potential. Finally, Section 10.4 concludes this thesis and provides recommendations for future research as well as a final note on my own researcher reflexivity.

10.2 Answers to the research questions

This part of the conclusion chapter summarises the findings and the methods through which these have been derived. These summaries follow the specific research questions that have been asked in the introduction chapter of this thesis and related to the two overarching research aims. Finally, the key findings of this research are highlighted separately at the end of this section.
10.2.1 Best practice in tourism

The overarching aim was to develop an ethical framework for best practice in tourism. To do so, five specific research questions have been asked. The paragraphs below summarise the findings for these five questions.

What is the nature of best practice?

During a series of interviews with tourism entrepreneurs using methods from the PCT spectrum, the question was asked, what best practice in tourism means to the individual entrepreneur. From the thematic analysis of the data, the following definition for best practice in tourism has been developed:

*Best practice in tourism is the professional pursuit of balanced business operations in harmony with all stakeholders under the premise of reciprocity of actions in a constantly changing environment.*

(Present author)

Using an interview guide that was rooted in the findings of the first phase of the research and the literature has increased the dependability of this definition.

How is best practice in tourism being challenged?

This question was answered using a categorisation for ethical business dilemmas that was grounded in the literature as the basis for analysis. This categorisation
includes distribution, relationship and misrepresentation dilemmas. The findings were derived by using method triangulation, which included the template analysis of archival data and conducting semi-structured interviews. Furthermore, source triangulation contributed to a corroboration and refinement of the findings. The multiple sources include Tourism for Tomorrow Awards applications, Tourism for Tomorrow Awards judges’ reports as well as the narratives of tourism entrepreneurs. Method and source triangulation have increased the confirmability, credibility, dependability and transferability of the findings. The process of iteration has led to an increased accountability of the research.

The following dilemmas/challenges for best practice in tourism have been identified: (1) access to land and resources, economic leakage, the international money market and the notion of traditional capitalism contribute to distribution dilemmas. (2) Inconsistencies in the running of the business, industry complacency, stakeholder opposition and political ill-will constitute relationship dilemmas. (3) The leadership-operations-gap, entrepreneurial plagiarism and tokenistic conservation lead to misperceptions and misrepresentation dilemmas for best practice in tourism.

**Which behavioural responses to these challenges exist?**

As with the previous findings, the analysis for these ones is rooted in the current literature on business ethics, using themes of accountability, fairness and collaboration as a starting point. The findings are derived from the template analysis of the archival data. Once more, source triangulation was used to add rigour to the
findings. The template analysis and subsequent interpretation has shown that actions for accountability include creating one’s own NGO and developing monitoring and reporting strategies. These actions are designed to pre-empt misrepresentation dilemmas. Actions for collaboration include training and skills development as well as engaging in active stakeholder involvement. This counteracts relationship dilemmas. Finally, actions for fairness are designed to prevent distribution dilemmas. These include creating employment and profit-sharing initiatives.

**Which values underpin best practice?**

To answer this research question, the same steps have been undertaken as for the previous one and will not be repeated here. The analysis and interpretation has revealed a number of intrinsic and extrinsic motivations (profit versus principle) and those across both spectrums (responsibilities). Intrinsic motivation that have been identified are divided into beliefs, virtues and needs and include: the belief in empowerment, the belief in good character, the belief in the right thing to do. Virtues identified for best practice are humility, perseverance and integrity. Whilst needs include the need for achievement long-term commitment and self-determination. Extrinsic motivations falling under the profit versus principle debate are progress and development goals that override the profit motive as well as guest satisfaction. The latter has shown four variations: hedonistic, normative, opportunistic and superlative guest satisfaction. Finally, responsibilities and other values have been identified as repentance for sins, the need for achievement again and valuing stewardship and authenticity.
What is the ethical foundation for best practice in tourism?

To investigate the ethical foundation of best practice in tourism an applied ethics analysis of the previous four elements was conducted using traditional ethics theories on a continuum from the maximisation of principles towards the maximisation of utility. It was found that best practice in tourism is ethically complex and does not adhere to one particular ethics theory. This suggests a form of ethical pragmatism. Furthermore, best practice in tourism emphasises relationships and responsibilities and is mainly situated within the symbiotic school of thought for business ethics. This suggests that best practice is linked to an ethics of care, which has been associated with feminist ethics, which lies outside of traditional ethics theories.

Dilemmas and their behaviour responses are levelled from an ethical perspective for the distribution – fairness pair and the relationship – collaboration pair. However, the misrepresentation – accountability pair is situated at opposing ends of the ethics theory spectrum. This suggests a cognitive dissonance between admittance/awareness and actions for this particular response pair. The managerial implications of this are presented later in this chapter. Finally, the values that underpin best practice in tourism spread across the entire range of ethics theories. This suggests a form of value pluralism and is indicative of the ethical complexity of sustainability, which has built the premise for the research problem.
The second overarching aim of this research was to gain a deeper understanding of the role behaviour and individual ethic for so-called ethical tourism entrepreneurs. In so doing, this research turns into an ideographic study and the notion of ethical entrepreneurship has been unpacked. The findings have been derived from a series of interviews with tourism entrepreneurs who have been commended by their peers for their ethical business conduct. Method triangulation by means of using narrative and thematic analysis was used to enhance the credibility and dependability of the findings. Rooting the research strategy of Personal Construct Theory and the sampling strategy into the theoretical framework has increased the accountability and transferability of the findings. Being reflexive as a researcher and establishing a good rapport with the interviewees has helped establish confirmability of the findings. As with the previous research aim, five specific research questions were asked.

What is the nature of ethical entrepreneurship in tourism?

This questions relates to the ontology that underpins ethical entrepreneurship in tourism and has been developed using narrative analysis of the interview data. An ontology for ethical entrepreneurship is process-orientated and emphasis the Greek principle of *Phronesis* – practical wisdom. As such it is deeply rooted in traditional teleology theories, such as virtue ethics, an ethic of care and intuitionism. This differs slightly from the nature of best practice in tourism from an applied ethics perspective. The nature of wider best practices showed more utilitarian tendencies
than the nature of the individual, entrepreneurial ethic. This suggests that individual ethical entrepreneurs are more principle-orientated than wider best practice in tourism is seen. The managerial implications of this are presented later in this chapter.

The elements of an ontology for ethical entrepreneurship include intuition, belongingness, learning, fluidity and awakening. Intuition has been widely acknowledged as an entrepreneurial quality (Knight 1921, Schumpeter 1934) and enables the entrepreneur to navigate uncertainty. The element of belongingness asserts communal goals and depicts characteristics of a voluntaristic Social Contract Theory for ethics. Learning demonstrates the process-orientation of the ontological philosophy behind ethical entrepreneurship. Whilst fluidity is mirrored in the dimension of change that has been seen in the definition for best practice. Awakening indicates the moment that triggers an orientation towards ethical entrepreneurship. This moment can be one of the many ethical dilemmas for best practice that have been identified earlier.

**Which motives drive actions for ethical entrepreneurship?**

This question is rooted in the Psychological Characteristics School of Entrepreneurship, which emphasises the need for achievement as the distinguishing entrepreneurial motivation. The need for achievement has already been identified as a value for best practice in tourism. The motives presented here are those pertaining to ethical entrepreneurship in particular. These are: the need for supererogation, non-identificational atonement, a feeling of existential
responsibility, engaging in transformational entrepreneurship and individualistic altruism. It has been found that the above motives are indicative of individuals with high levels of n(Ach) who pursue profit-as-means, higher-order societal and individualistic goals by engaging in ethical entrepreneurship.

From an applied ethics perspective, the motives for ethical entrepreneurship range across the entire spectrum of ethics theories, similar to the values for best practice. Once more, this suggests a form of value pluralism that is strong among ethical entrepreneurs. This has implications on management that will be presented later in this chapter.

**Which risks are associated with ethical entrepreneurship in tourism?**

This question considers the individual risks taken by ethical tourism entrepreneurs that go beyond the wider dilemmas for best practice. In contrast to the literature it has been found that monetary risk increases when engaging in ethical entrepreneurship, due to the barrier of access for funding and the need to combine the profit for survival priority with an integrated business ethics. Functional risks are seen to be reduced when engaging in ethical entrepreneurship, which is also in contrast to traditional entrepreneurship. This is due to the dimensions of learning and awakening. Social risks are also reduced for ethical entrepreneurship due to the dimension of belongingness and the need for supererogation. Finally, psychological risks are increased for ethical entrepreneurs with rising anxiety, stemming from an existential responsibility and an integrated ethics perspective. Psychological risks
can, however, also be decreased with rising self-efficacy derived from a strong intuition.

**What mission and priorities exist for ethical entrepreneurship?**

This question considers the goal-orientation for an ethical entrepreneurship and its relation responsibilities. A mission for ethical entrepreneurship can be defined as the pursuit of an entrepreneurial activity with the aim of leaving behind a legacy in accordance to one’s own integrity, driven by virtues of humility and benevolence, and an appreciation of a wider spiritual existence. From an applied ethical perspective, such a mission is largely situated within a virtue ethics lens, but also denotes aspects of deontological thinking. As with the ontology for ethical entrepreneurship, this mission is more principle-orientated than a wider nature for best practice is seen.

Priorities for ethical entrepreneurship are three-fold: to make profit for survival, to have an integrated ethics in the business, and to emphasise employee welfare. These priorities suggest a symbiotic view on business ethics with a future-orientation. This is considered to be a form of social responsiveness on the social concern continuum (Walle 1995) and goes beyond traditional corporate social responsibility activities. The priorities also show an emphasis for responsibility and relationship. As with wider best practice, this suggests an ethic of care, situated within a feminist ethics spectrum.
How are ethical judgement made in this context?

To answer this questions, entrepreneurs were asked to make a judgement and explain their response to three hypothetical dilemmas that arise in tourism. These dilemmas denote a distribution-, a relationship- and a misrepresentation dilemma each and have thus been rooted in the theoretical framework of the research. This has increased the rigour of this research. The specific details for each dilemma have been developed from the findings of the template analysis of archival research, which increases the accountability of this research.

In contrast to the literature, evidence of egoism could not be found in the judgement making approaches of ethical entrepreneurs. Yet, corroborating the literature relativism in ethical judgement making was high for issues of distributive justice and relationship dilemmas. It was low, however, for judgements made about misrepresentation dilemmas. This suggests an absolutist view for the latter. As with the ethical analysis of wider best practice, the misrepresentation-accountability response or judgement stands out of the norm. Once more, this suggests issues of admittance and / or awareness and has practical implications that are discussed later in this chapter.

The judgement making processes overall showed signs of a monological reasoning structure with high levels of idealism. This suggests that ethical entrepreneurs are indeed principle-orientated and very confident in their own judgements. A slight difference was noted for issues pertaining to distributive injustice, where a deeper form of self-reflection and a dialogical reasoning structure was evident. This denotes
a lower form of idealism. However, the confidence in their own judgement became apparent once more through the use of casuistry – or bundling of ethical cases – for the purpose of resolving the dilemma. This principle-orientation is mirrored in the types of behaviour that illustrate best practice in tourism, which also tend to emphasise principle and societal wellbeing over utility. However, the judgements are not aligned to the motivational factors for ethical entrepreneurship, which have been shown to be spread across the entire ethics theory spectrum. As motivations usually come first, followed by judgements and then actions, it is important that this dissonance is further investigated. After presenting a summary of the findings and the rigour with which the research was conducted, the significance and originality of this research are demonstrated next.

10.3 Significance and Originality

Significance and originality are those qualities of any research that determine its importance and distinctness (Le Voi and Potter 2010). The significance is mirrored in the three key findings that have resulted from this research and their implications for management. Originality, on the other hand is reflected in the theoretical and methodological contributions to knowledge that have resulted from this thesis. The following sections showcase these in more detail.

10.3.1 Significance of the Research

The significance of this research is determined by its key findings and their implications. This thesis aimed to apply ethics theory to best practice and entrepreneurship in
tourism. In so doing, its aims were to develop a better understanding and ethical framework for best practice in tourism and to unpack the notion of ethical entrepreneurship. This was important because to date, there has been a lack of research at the academic juncture of business ethics, entrepreneurship and tourism. However, entrepreneurs form an important group in the tourism industry. Understanding their role behaviour and individual ethic is crucial for a sustainable tourism future based on ethical best practices.

1st key finding: ethical pragmatism characterises best practice in tourism

It was purported that sustainability is the key goal for business ethics (Crane and Matten 2010). Sustainable tourism was thus used as a proxy for studying business ethics in this research. It was shown that both, sustainability and best practice are ethically very complex phenomena, incorporating a wide range of ethics theories across the entire ethics spectrum. This ethical complexity suggests a form of ethical pragmatism for best practice and sustainability in tourism. Herein lies the first significant key finding of this research.

The practical implications for this are two-fold. First, if ethical pragmatism defines the ethical foundation for best practice in tourism, then this questions the suitability of global standards and reporting systems that are used to monitor best practices and sustainability in tourism. Second, ethical pragmatism demands a renewed focus on context specificity for best practice. This suggests that best practices can never be universal. For companies that operate across international borders, this will pose a particular challenge. It also sets challenges for companies whose leadership is based
away from the area of operations – a dilemma for best practice that has been identified in this research. It is advisable to use casuistry – or the bundling of cases (Lurie and Albin 2007) – for developing ethically sound best practices in tourism.

2\textsuperscript{nd} key finding: a dissonance exists between motivations (value pluralistic) and judgements (principle-based) for best practice entrepreneurs

In this thesis, a value-behavioural lens was also applied to best practices and ethical entrepreneurship in tourism. This was important because to date, much of the literature on business ethics and sustainability in tourism has focused on impacts and consequences, rather than on those phenomena that take place before an event takes place. Personal Construct Theory and the Psychological Characteristics School of Entrepreneurship have built the theoretical foundations for the subsequent analysis. Elements of investigations were values, motivations and judgements from a value perspective and actions for best practice from a behavioural perspective.

The value perspective has shown that motivations for ethical entrepreneurship and values for best practice range across the entire ethics theory spectrum. This suggests a form of value pluralism. While this was the case for the individual entrepreneurial ethic and a wider ethic for best practice, individual judgement approaches took a different approach. Judgement making, which usually comes after a motivation arouses a need for action, was shown to be much more principle-based for the individual tourism entrepreneur. This dissonance between motivation (value pluralistic) and judgement (idealistic) constitutes a second key finding of this research.
This has serious practical implications. While motivations are psychological factors that arouse needs and trigger actions (Solomon et al. 2002), judgements are cognitive processes. The goal is to align these in order to develop an integrated ethics, as was shown to be a priority for ethical entrepreneurship. From an internalised standpoint, alignment can happen if the capacity for self-reflection is strengthened. From an external standpoint, alignment can happen if the capacity for self-determination is strengthened. Managers or entrepreneurs in tourism, who aim to engage in ethical entrepreneurship or best practices in tourism, thus have to develop strategies that strengthen these two capacities. Such strategies include training and education, empowerment and stakeholder involvement, all of which have been identified as types of behaviour that foster best practice in tourism.

3rd key findings: a dissonance exists between admittance/awareness and actions for issues of misrepresentation

This leads to the behavioural focus of this research. Three dilemma-action-pairs have been identified and analysed using applied ethics theory. They have also been revisited in the second part of the research for individual, ethical judgement making approaches. The distribution-fairness pair as well as the relationship-collaboration pair have shown to be ethically levelled. In other words, the dilemma and appropriate responses followed the same axiological reasoning and were situated within the same ethics theory lenses. This was not the case for the final pair: misrepresentation-accountability. This is significant, because this pair has also only emerged due to source and method triangulation. It shows that although misrepresentation is seen as the most common form of unethical behaviour amongst entrepreneurs (Brenkert 2009), it is the least
acknowledged. Yet, the entrepreneurs in this study all engage inadvertently in actions to prevent misrepresentation. This suggests an emphasis of accountability, with a lack of transparency.

From a management applied perspective, this poses challenges for internal and external communication with stakeholders as well as for monitoring and reporting strategies. It is recommended, that much more emphasis needs to be put on transparent reporting. Furthermore, (un)willing distortions of the truth have to be acknowledged and pre-empted if best practice in tourism is to exist. The informality of much of the tourism entrepreneurship sector can pose challenges for addressing this dissonance. Voluntaristic agreements amongst stakeholders can help address this challenge. However, these are not to be designed as global standards, but rather need to be context specific. Finally, open reporting generates a culture of trust, which builds the premise of any ethical entrepreneurship (Colonomos 2005).

10.3.2 Originality of the Research

The originality of this research is determined by both its theoretical contributions to original knowledge as well as its methodological implications for advancing tourism research. In addition, this thesis has also contributed to management. Specific managerial implications have been presented in the previous section about this research’s significance.

From a theoretical perspective, this thesis has intended to contribute to the scant literature at the academic juncture of entrepreneurship, ethics and tourism. It has
done so by combining these three strands and focusing within each on a particular area, namely entrepreneurial role behaviour, business ethics and sustainable tourism. This makes this research unique from a theoretical framework point of view. A search among 28,000 peer reviewed academic journal articles conducted in September 2014 using the above key words has returned no records of research at this specific juncture (EBSCOHOST 2014). In addition to this overarching contribution to academia, a number of sub-ordinate theoretical contributions have been derived from this research.

First, this thesis has advanced the ambiguous nature of best practice research, particularly for tourism studies, by providing an original definition for the term ‘best practice’ in tourism. Second, a detailed analysis of best practice in tourism has provided a categorisation for dilemmas-response-pairs that surpass the traditional sustainability triumvirate of economic, social and environmental aspects of best practice in tourism. Although the analysis was rooted in existing literature, the specific response-pairs are original. These have applied management contributions by way of providing learning opportunities for practitioners about the plethora of ethical dilemmas in sustainable tourism and equipping them with appropriate behavioural responses. Third, the thesis has also provided an ethical framework for best practice in tourism that is rooted in ethical pragmatism and value pluralism. The applied ethical analysis constitutes an original contribution to knowledge and provides guidance for tourism practitioners about the values associated with best practice.
Besides the contributions to wider best practice, specific contributions to theory were made concerning entrepreneurial role behaviour and an individual entrepreneurial ethic in tourism entrepreneurship. To date, there is a lack of research linking the Psychological Characteristics School of Entrepreneurship to tourism literature. This thesis has done so and thus, helped develop thinking about entrepreneurial role behaviour that goes beyond the lifestyle entrepreneurship void. A focus on business ethics in this context has contributed to unpacking the notion of ethical entrepreneurship in tourism. From an applied management perspective, this contribution has the potential to create awareness among tourism entrepreneurs and stimulate actions for change towards a more ethical tourism entrepreneurship.

In addition to these theoretical contributions with their managerial implications, this thesis has provided original contributions to methodology and research praxis in tourism academia. At its core, this thesis has accessed and used a set of truly unique secondary data, which is to date not available to the public. The use of the Tourism for Tomorrow Awards applications of the winners from the years 2005-2012 and their corresponding judges’ reports significantly contributes to the originality of this research. This data has thus far never been used for academic research due to strict data ownership regulations. Access was successfully negotiated and the suitability of the data proven as part of this research. Beyond that, this thesis has produced a number of additional methodological contributions.

First, this research has demonstrated the usefulness of archival research in qualitative tourism studies. To date, only few studies have been conducted using
archival research as a research strategy. This is largely due to two factors: problematic access to archival data and the quality of archival data. Both obstacles have been overcome in this research and the benefits of archival research have been shown. These are that it minimises respondent bias, that the data depicts truths outside of a research context and that it has the potential to gain a very comprehensive insight into certain phenomena, such as best practice in tourism. This comprehensive insight was gained by using template analysis, which is a qualitative form of content analysis and has the benefit of enabling researchers to handle large sets of qualitative data. Template analysis has seen use in business studies, yet in tourism studies, only one study has been found to date. This research thus contributes to advocating the use of template analysis.

Second, this research has demonstrated the use of Personal Construct Theory in qualitative tourism research. Personal Construct Theory has its origins in clinical psychology and is only starting to become more popular in management research. There are only very few studies using Personal Construct Theory in tourism research to date. However, there is great potential for a greater update as the benefits for using methods from the Personal Construct Theory spectrum are great. These include being able to elicit higher-order constructs, the ability to situate an ideographic study within a grounded research philosophy and the creative spectrum of methods that can be employed. In this thesis, the main method used was ‘laddering’ technique and the research has demonstrated the benefits of using this for the elicitation of individual judgements on sensitive subjects, such as an individual ethics.
Third, this research has demonstrated a range of methods that add rigour and increase transparency of tourism research and has the potential to serve as a guideline for future research projects by focusing specifically on the key dimensions for rigour in qualitative research. Finally, and most notable, by combining the two aforementioned research strategies of archival research and Personal Construct Theory a unique and original research methodology was created for this thesis that has not been used before.

10.4 Conclusion and directions for future research

This thesis has sought to address the nature of best practice and ethical entrepreneurship in tourism and in so doing, provides guidance for practitioners on how to engage in best practice and ethical entrepreneurship, but also fills gaps in the existing literature at the juncture of these research areas. The fundamental objective of this research journey, was to understand why it is that some people do ‘good’ in business, and not just do well. And how these people do ‘good’ in business. The thesis has adopted a value-behavioural lens from the view of the do-gooder. This premise was very personal resulting from my previous professional experience in the world of sustainable tourism awards. It is my belief that learning from those who do ‘good’ provides better learning opportunities and an environment that can stimulate change towards a more ethical tourism entrepreneurship.

However, a natural question that follows the basic premise of this research is to ask, why is it that other people do ‘bad’ in business and how does doing ‘bad’ or ‘wrong’ manifest itself? While this research was situated within best practice research, a
recommendation for future research would be to investigate worst practice for the same elements, i.e. their nature, their challenges, their values and motives, and their types of behaviour. This would require access to more archival data, which can be potentially difficult to obtain and potentially creates the need or search for whistle-blowers. However, comparing best and worst cases would bring plentiful benefits for the advancement of tourism practice and contribute greatly to tourism academia.

Equally, this thesis has set out to develop a greater understanding for ethical entrepreneurship in tourism, looking in particular at role behaviour and an individual entrepreneurial ethic. A framework for ethical entrepreneurship including an ontology, mission, motivations and priorities was developed and ethical judgement approaches examined. A second recommendation for future research would be to apply and compare this framework to other classifications of tourism entrepreneurs, e.g. the lifestyle entrepreneur, the small-business owner, or the traditional entrepreneur – even to employed managers in tourism. It would be interesting to investigate if and how their ethical foundations differ. This would contribute to developing an ethical entrepreneurial practice framework that is inclusive of a wider audience beyond those outstanding individuals who have been commended by their peers as it is the case in this research.

The following three recommendations for future research stem from the three key research findings. To begin with, if ethical pragmatism is the basis for an ethical foundation for best practice in tourism, it would be advisable to research how ethical pragmatism can be incorporated into a wider sustainability agenda and translated into concrete managerial actions. Moreover, if a cognitive dissonance exists between
motivations and judgements for a best practice ethical entrepreneurship, questions to be asked include which factors influence this dissonance and which conditions can be created to align these motivations and judgements from an ethical perspective. Finally, the dissonance between admittance/awareness and actions concerning cases of misrepresentation is worthy of further investigation as it denotes common practice that can be improved.

On a final note, an optimistic and positive view of the world and of tourism in particular has influenced the direction of this research, my own interpretations of the findings and any recommendations for future managerial practice and research. I hope that with the help of this thesis and other future research in this direction, best practice becomes simply practice and ethical entrepreneurship just entrepreneurship.
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APPENDIX A: ETHICS APPROVAL

Miss Susann Kruegel
School of Hospitality & Tourism Management
FBEL

13 March 2013

Dear Miss Kruegel

Entrepreneurial Role Behaviour and Judgement Approaches Concerning Ethical Dilemmas in the Context of Tourism EC/2013/10/FBEL

On behalf of the Ethics Committee, I am pleased to confirm a favourable ethical opinion for the above research on the basis described in the submitted protocol and supporting documentation.

Date of confirmation of ethical opinion: 13 March 2013.

The final list of documents reviewed by the Committee is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detailed protocol for the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant information sheet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consent form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview Schedule &amp; Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTTC agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zurich Municipal Certificate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment emails</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This opinion is given on the understanding that you will comply with the University’s Ethical Guidelines for Teaching and Research. If the project includes distribution of a survey or questionnaire to members of the University community, researchers are asked to include a statement advising that the project has been reviewed by the University’s Ethics Committee.

If you wish to make any amendments to your protocol please address your request to the Secretary of the Ethics Committee and attach any revised documentation.

The Committee will need to be notified of adverse reactions suffered by research participants, and if the study is terminated earlier than expected with reasons. Please be advised that the Ethics Committee is able to audit research to ensure that researchers are abiding by the University requirements and guidelines.

You are asked to note that a further submission to the Ethics Committee will be required in the event that the study is not completed within five years of the above date.

Please inform me when the research has been completed.

Yours sincerely

Alison Cummings
Secretary, University Ethics Committee
Quality Enhancement
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consideration</th>
<th>Person at risk</th>
<th>Scale of risk</th>
<th>Existing protocols</th>
<th>Additional mechanisms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Right to choice and self-determination</td>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Participants have the right to withdraw from the research at any time without the need to give a reason and without penalty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymity at all stages</td>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>All data and back-up copies will be anonymised and stored securely Pseudonyms will be used throughout</td>
<td>All document and transcript record will remove any reference to names, businesses and addresses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication/diss -emination of results will not harm the research participant</td>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>All data will anonymised</td>
<td>The researcher will refrain from the use of case studies to illustrate the results, rather conceptual frameworks will be used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misrepresentation of views / experience</td>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>The data is constructed by dialogue. If views are unclear to the researcher, the researcher will try to rephrase and let the participant explain to ensure views are correctly understood</td>
<td>The research participant may at any time when (s)he feels they are misunderstood leave the research process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of confidentiality</td>
<td>Participant / researcher</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Informed consent given prior to the interviews Information sheet sent to participants All data will be anonymised Confidentiality on both sides will be agreed before the interview and will be reiterated throughout</td>
<td>Data is safely stored on the researcher’s own university computer home drive, which is password and username protected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data storage</td>
<td>Participant / researcher</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Data is stored on secure university server with password and username protection</td>
<td>All data is anonymised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deletion of data from electronic equipment</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Data is stored on secure university server with password and username protection</td>
<td>Researcher is well-versed in the use of electronic equipment Back-up files will be made on DVD and safely locked in the researcher’s office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk of attack or allegations</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Interviews will be conducted in offices during working hours</td>
<td>The researcher will follow the safe practice guidelines of the University of Surrey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participant Information Sheet

Entrepreneurial role behaviour and judgement approaches concerning ethical dilemmas in the context of tourism

I hope this letter finds you well. My name is Susann Power and I am a PhD researcher in tourism at the University of Surrey, School of Hospitality and Tourism Management. I am currently undertaking research into ethics and entrepreneurship in tourism.

I am pleased to invite you to participate in this research project. Before you decide I will explain why the research is being done and what it will involve for you. Please take the time to read the following information carefully. You may of course seek information from others about this research, including my supervisor Prof Graham Miller, Head of School of Hospitality and Tourism Management, University of Surrey.

What is the purpose of the study?

This research seeks to develop a conceptual framework for ethics in tourism that is based on behaviour and values. The research also seeks to gain a deeper understanding of motivations and judgement approaches of entrepreneurs in tourism when faced with ethical dilemmas. The aim is to foster learning opportunities for students and practitioners as well as generate knowledge transfer within the industry in order to advocate more ethical business conduct in tourism.
Appendix C: continued

**Why have you been invited to take part in the study?**

You are invited to participate because you are an entrepreneur, who has founded their own company and more importantly, work in the field of sustainable tourism. You possess great knowledge and expertise in the subject, which enhances the credibility of your contributions to practice and this research. As a researcher I feel that you are most suited to answer the complex questions surrounding ethics and sustainability in tourism.

**Do I have to take part?**

No, you do not have to participate. There will be no adverse consequences in terms of your business or other if you decide not to participate. You may also withdraw from the research at any time without giving a reason.

**What will happen to me if I take part and what will I have to do?**

You will be asked to participate in an interview of about 1 hour length with me. This will either be conducted in person, if possible, or alternatively using Internet telephone service Skype. No costs will be incurred on your side. The interview will be in two parts. First I would like to hear your story as a sustainable tourism entrepreneur, i.e. how you started, why you started, what has changed since you began working in the field of sustainable tourism. The second part of the interview is dedicated to discussing some ethical dilemmas. These will not relate directly to your business. They are hypothetical scenario. We will then discuss these dilemmas in detail together and see how they could be solved. Below, you will find some examples of the kind of ethical scenarios to be discussed. Please note that these are not the finalised scenarios, nor is this list exhaustive. Most importantly, all scenarios are completely hypothetical and make no reference to your company.
The interview will be recorded and you will be asked to give written consent to participating in the interview prior to it taking place. Each recording will be stored at a secured location at the University of Surrey and only I will have access to the recordings. The recordings will be destroyed once transcribed and only electronic text documents will be stored at a secure location in line with the University of Surrey regulations. All transcripts will be completely anonymised.

There are no conditions attached to this interview and there is no offer of remuneration.

Examples of ethical dilemmas:

1) Misrepresentation dilemma: Imagine the following scenario: In order to gain a competitive advantage and secure investment into the business, an entrepreneur does not disclose the full risks involved with his/her business to potential investors. Despite the lack of transparency, the investment goes ahead.

2) Fiduciary responsibilities: Imagine the following scenario: A safari tour operator agrees with the local authority to lease land for a new luxury lodge. As a condition, the operator agrees to fund wildlife conservation in the area and to hire a certain percentage of locals as staff in the lodge. Despite the obvious benefits, the deal means that by establishing the lodge, access to a water hole for local tribesmen will be restricted.

3) Role conflicts: Imagine the following scenario: A bed and breakfast owner has the role of being a good host to his or her guests and provide them with a satisfying guest experience. Meanwhile, his or her family also lives in the same premises. His or her home becomes a commercial home.

4) Fairness and forgiveness: Imagine the following scenario: An entrepreneur decides to give parts of his/her profits away to charity. However, as a side effect, this dramatically reduces his/her taxes to be paid to the local municipality.
Appendix C: continued

What are the possible disadvantages or risks of taking part?

There is no risk or harm attached to this research for you. All data will be anonymised and coded, so it will be impossible to refer back to you as an individual or to your company. The only risk is that we might disagree on some of the ethical issues to be discussed or that you find some topics too sensitive to be discussed. It is of course your right not to answer any questions.

What are the possible benefits of taking part?

It is unlikely that you will see any direct or material benefits from this research. However, you will be contributing to a wider knowledge transfer goal that hopefully will permeate the tourism industry and you will benefit from more like minded business people.

You will receive a copy of the findings for your own use after the degree has been received. The findings must be referenced to me if used in any publication. Once the degree has been obtained, the research discontinues and you will not be asked to participate again in this research.

What if there is a problem?

Any complaint or concern about any aspect of the way you have been dealt with during the course of the study will be addressed; please contact Prof Graham Miller, Head of School of Hospitality and Tourism Management, University of Surrey by email at gmiller@surrey.ac.uk or via telephone on +44 (0) 1483 683095.
Will my taking part in the study be kept confidential?

Yes. All of the information you give will be anonymised so that those reading reports from the research will not know who has contributed to it.

Data will be stored securely in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998.

Contact details

Susann Power
PhD Researcher in Tourism
School of Hospitality and Tourism Management
University of Surrey
Email: s.power@surrey.ac.uk
Tel: +44 (0) 78 4047 1955

This research is organised and funded by the University of Surrey and has been reviewed and has received a favourable opinion from the University of Surrey Ethics Committee.

Thank you for taking the time to read this Information Sheet.

Yours truly,

Susann Power
Consent Form

I, the undersigned, voluntarily agree to take part in the study on 'Entrepreneurial role behaviour and judgment approaches concerning ethical dilemmas in a tourism-specific context'.

I have read and understood the information Sheet provided. I have been given a full explanation by the investigators of the nature, purpose, location and likely duration of the study, and of what I will be expected to do. I have been advised about any discomfort and possible ill-effects on my health and well-being which may result. I have been given the opportunity to ask questions on all aspects of the study and have understood the advice and information given as a result.

I agree to comply with any instruction given to me during the study and to co-operate fully with the investigators. I shall inform them immediately if I suffer any deterioration of any kind in my health or wellbeing or experience any unexpected or unusual symptoms.

I consent to my personal data, as outlined in the accompanying information sheet being used for this study and other research. I understand that all personal data relating to volunteers is held and processed in the strictest confidence, and in accordance with the Data Protection Act (1998).

I understand that I am free to withdraw from the study at any time without needing to justify my decision and without prejudice.

I confirm that I have read and understood the above and freely consent to participating in this study. I have been given adequate time to consider my participation and agree to comply with the instructions and restrictions of the study.

Volunteer | Researcher
---|---
Name | Susann Power
Signed | 
Date | 

[Signature]

[Stamp]
APPENDIX E: RECRUITMENT MESSAGE FOR POTENTIAL INTERVIEW PARTICIPANTS

Message sent via social networks Facebook and LinkedIn to potential interview participants on 24 June 2013

Dear all

For my doctoral research, I am looking for founder/entrepreneurs in the field of sustainable tourism who would be happy to have a purposeful conversation, i.e. an interview with me about tourism, entrepreneurial motivation and how to solve ethical dilemmas in tourism. I am aiming to conduct interviews between September and November 2013, ideally in person, but via Skype conference call is also possible.

The research has received a favourable ethical opinion from the University of Surrey Ethics Committee.

If you would like to know more about it or know someone who might, please do get in touch. Your support and participation is much appreciated. The aim is to enhance learning opportunities for future entrepreneur by learning from those who demonstrate best practice in sustainable tourism.

My contact details outside of Facebook are:

Email: s.kruegel@surrey.ac.uk

Phone: +44 (0) 78 4047 1955

Skype: susi2502

With kindest regards and many thanks,

Susi

Susann Kruegel
PhD Researcher in Tourism
School of Hospitality and Tourism Management
Faculty of Business, Economics and Law
University of Surrey
APPENDIX F: WRITTEN PERMISSION FROM WTTC TO USE TOURISM FOR TOMORROW AWARDS DATA

Email message received on 15 May 2012 at 12:18pm from anja.eckervogt@wttc.org

Dear Susann,

Thank you for your email and for approaching me. The proposal sounds very interesting.

Providing all material is handled in a confidential and anonymous way, the World Travel & Tourism Council is more than happy to give you access to the application forms and on-site evaluation forms of the Tourism for Tomorrow Awards for the years you have stated.

I also believe that the summary of the material could be very useful for WTTC's future sustainability position.

I'm looking forward to receiving this in due course.

If you are free, I'll contact you tomorrow on the below phone number to discuss the next steps.

Best wishes,

Anja

Anja Eckervogt

Tourism for Tomorrow Awards Manager

World Travel & Tourism Council

+44 20 7481 6484
APPLICATION FORM, 2012

Please always refer to the Rules & Guidelines document.

SECTION 1

CURRENT DETAILS

Organization

Job Title

Address

City

State

Country

Telephone (include country code)

Fax (including country code)

Email

Name of person submitting entry if other than above

Email of person submitting entry

Telephone of person submitting the entry

CATEGORY

Please indicate for which category you are entering your project: (tick one or more)

1. Conservation Bureauresque Award

2. Conservation Award

3. Global Tourism Business Award

4. Tourist Attraction Award

WHERE DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE TOURISM FOR TOMORROW AWARDS?

(please tick box)

Through an advertisement (name of newspaper or magazine)

Through a trade fair or exhibition

Through an article (name of publication)

Through a magazine on which the organization appears (name of publication)

Other (please specify)

SPACE WITHIN THE PROJECT YOU ARE SUBMITTING BID FOR IN OPERATION

Insert date in grey box (if applicable)

SECTION 2

APPLICATION FORM, 2012

PROJECT SUMMARY

Please give an overview of your project including:

- A brief description of your project
- The area of your project
- The size of your project
- The location of your project

You may include a diagram of your project.

GENERAL CRITERIA

Please describe how your project meets the criteria for this award:

- The project must be in operation for at least 1 year.
- The project must be in operation for at least 3 years.

You may include a diagram of your project.

GENERAL RECOMMENDATION

Please sign the award agreement and return it to the Tourism for Tomorrow office. The award will be presented at the Awards ceremony.

SECTION 3

APPLICATION FORM, 2012

GENERAL CRITERIA

Please describe how your project meets the criteria for this award:

- The project must be in operation for at least 1 year.
- The project must be in operation for at least 3 years.

You may include a diagram of your project.

GENERAL RECOMMENDATION

Please sign the award agreement and return it to the Tourism for Tomorrow office. The award will be presented at the Awards ceremony.
ON-SITE VISIT EVALUATION

Assessor:

Applicant:

Date of submission:

OVERVIEW
Insert text below:

EVALUATION CRITERIA

1. How do you rate the applicant's project summary, including aims, mission, and financial viability of the project?

   Poor  Fair  Good  Very good  Excellent  Outstanding

   Insert text below:

2. How do you rate the applicant for their direct contribution to conservation and protection of the natural environment in their area of operation?

   Poor  Fair  Good  Very good  Excellent  Outstanding

   Insert text below:

3. How do you rate the applicant in their ability to integrate nature conservation in supporting the well-being of local communities in tangible ways?

   Poor  Fair  Good  Very good  Excellent  Outstanding

   Insert text below:

4. How do you rate the applicant in their ability to engage and educate tourists and other local stakeholders on responsible tourism practices?

   Poor  Fair  Good  Very good  Excellent  Outstanding

   Insert text below:

5. How do you rate the applicant as a successful model for best practices in responsible tourism? (Indicators may include how the applicant benchmarks performance, promotes Best Practices, is recognized by media or has received recognition from others for responsible tourism practices, provides an excellent tourism product, etc.)

   Poor  Fair  Good  Very good  Excellent  Outstanding

   Insert text below:

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

Insert text below:
## APPENDIX I: TEMPLATE ANALYSIS AUDIT TRAIL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A priori themes</td>
<td>By applying a psychological-behavioural lens it became clear that behaviours and motivations will need to be examined. Furthermore, the literature review has prioritised looking at ethical dilemmas, which will also be the basis for subsequent interviews. As such, the three a priori themes for coding are: dilemmas (challenges), motivations (values), actions (types of behaviour).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample sub-set</td>
<td>To develop an initial template a sub-set of the sample data has to be coded according thematically within the a priori themes. The sample set was chosen to be representative of the entire data set, i.e. 8 APP (2 per year and category) and the 8 corresponding AUD served as the sample set.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thematic coding</td>
<td>Both sub-sets (8 APP and 8 AUD) have been coded thematically and separately from one another in order to triangulate the findings. This has led to two separate code templates with 42 individual codes for APP, and 45 individual codes respectively for AUD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merging both templates</td>
<td>Codes that were identical in both templates, even if not placed in the same section were kept. All other codes, so called left-over codes appeared in either one or the other data set and need further attendance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with left-over codes</td>
<td>8 codes were classified as 'left-over’. Each code was considered individually with its relevant in-text references. Based on this analysis, each code was then discarded, merged with an existing code or considered to be a stand-alone code in itself and included in the template. 37 individual codes remained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validity check</td>
<td>Of these 37 codes, those with three or less in-text references were then again considered for their validity. Based on this analysis, they were discarded, merged or left as they were. An initial coding tree of 28 individual codes emerged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External code check</td>
<td>Before applying this template to all 64 reports (32 APP and 32 AUD), am external, leading academic in sustainable tourism development was tasked with manually coding 4 of the reports to check the validity of the template. His assessment did not reveal any new levels or types of codes or uncovered any inconsistencies in the coding template. Rather the template was validated by developing the same codes, albeit different wording was chosen at times. The external assessor has not identified the same number of codes, but was only asked to code 4 transcripts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APP coding</td>
<td>Following the external code check all 32 APP reports were coded according to the template. Coding memos were made on an on-going basis and newly emerging codes earmarked for future consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUD coding</td>
<td>Subsequently all 32 AUD reports were coded with the same initial template. Coding memos were made on an on-going basis and newly emerging codes were earmarked.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Template V2</td>
<td>7 newly emerged codes were integrated into the new version of the coding template, or coding tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data retrieval for manual coding</td>
<td>After finishing an initial and a full round of computer-assisted coding, and an external code check, all data was retrieved as print versions, separated for each individual code.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual coding dilemmas</td>
<td>12 individual dilemma codes were analysed, reflexive notes were written and codes were discarded, merged or amended if appropriate. 6 individual codes, grouped into 3 categories (distribution, relationship and misrepresentation) and a total of 265 in-text references remained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual coding motivations</td>
<td>9 individual motivation codes were analysed, reflexive notes were written and codes were discarded, merged or amended if appropriate. Only 7 individual codes remained, whilst most were merged. 3 categories were established – intrinsic motivation, profit versus principle and responsibility, which together have a total of 456 in-text references.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual coding actions</td>
<td>14 individual action codes were analysed, reflexive notes were written and codes were discarded, merged or amended if appropriate. 6 individual codes in 3 categories (actions for fairness, collaboration and accountability) and 505 in-text references remained.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX J: INTERVIEW EMAIL INVITATION

Example of email invitation sent to TE14 on 4 December 2013 at 12:58pm

Dear [name of person]

It has been a very long time since we last spoke and I hope you are very well and are enjoying the festive season. Since leaving WTTC and the Tourism for Tomorrow Awards, I have embarked on undertaking a doctorate degree and am now in the process of collecting data for my research.

I am writing today because I would like to invite you to participate in an interview for my PhD research. The interview would take place in person and I would come and travel to you. It is aimed to last for approximately 1 hour. Your contribution would be very valuable to my research.

The research has received a favourable ethical opinion from the University’s Ethics Committee and in accordance to their guidelines, I am attaching a rather lengthy participant information sheet and a consent form. In one sentence, I am interested to hear your story as a sustainable tourism entrepreneur and also pick your brain on some hypothetical, ethical issues relating to tourism and how you would suggest they’d be best approached. All is done in good faith, all answers are anonymised and there is no risk for you to be had from participating in the interview.

I would be very grateful for your participation. If you agree, then please indicate your availability for a 1 hour conversation anytime between the following dates: 2-9 January OR 20-31 January. Please advise and I would be happy to arrange everything else.

With very best wishes
Susi

Susann Power
PhD Researcher in Tourism
School of Hospitality and Tourism Management
Faculty of Business, Economics and Law
University of Surrey
s.power@surrey.ac.uk
**APPENDIX K: QUOTES FROM TRANSCRIPTS**

**Quotations for a definition of best practice in tourism**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Verbatim quote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Balance    | “So for me best practice means that you get all these three components – people, planet and profit – balanced.” (TE01)  
“Best practice means that there is an industry standard there that everyone is trying to position themselves ideally above, but hopefully in conjunction with.” (TE02)  
“Best practice means when the decision-making process takes into consideration all the different elements.” (TE03)  
“Best practice is the balance between conservation and community development, broadly speaking.” (TE08)  
“I am very much in favour of globally accepted criteria for best practice and we very much have to tie in with the scientific community to achieve these.” (TE13) |
| Harmony    | “So, when you are in harmony, then you have best practice.” (TE01)  
“When you find yourself blazing the path on your own, then best practice becomes more of a gut-check in an innovative, entrepreneurial pursuit of CSR.” (TE02)  
“It means to be thoughtful and connected with the local community and the environment.” (TE06)  
“It’s running a good business and doing everything right. And that everyone in their heart knows what the right thing to do is.” (TE09)  
“So, when you ask yourself what best practice really means, then it is really about respecting the place and the people you work in. The rest should come naturally.” (TE10)  
“So, basically consider all your stakeholders and treat them fairly and then it shouldn’t go wrong.” (TE14) |
| Change     | “I think that best practice is probably the best way someone operates in the conditions they are given in their local community. The parameters are always different.” (TE01)  
“It’s about modification and also about guidance on how to do modifications relevant to each destination because each destination is definitely different.” (TE11) |
| Reversibility | “I think that the employment criteria in the Third World, or in tourist receiving countries, should be of the same level as they are in those countries that are producing tourists. That would be an example of best practice.” (TE07)  
“I think that best practice is to ensure that you are doing by others as you would have done by yourself.” (TE14) |
### Quotations for dilemmas for best practice in tourism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dilemma</th>
<th>Verbatim quote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic leakage</td>
<td>“Those who did arrive with foreign-owned tour companies that brought in their own food, supplies and guides…” (APP38)                                                                                   “Currently, nearly all of the arts and crafts sold to tourists in the [region] come from outside the islands.” (AUD27) “It seems most inappropriate for a country that has an existing tourism infrastructure but where the profits are drained out of the region.” (AUD17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to land and resources</td>
<td>“This in the past has reflected in a form of anarchy that made impossible a proper management of the land. As a result bush fires and overgrazing did increase. We have been heavily involved through regular meetings with the key community leaders, in appointing the game scouts as patroller of the ranch, to control and limit overgrazing, bush fires, poaching, destruction of the forest.” (APP23) “The desert with its flora and fauna has suffered greatly in [country] due to hundreds of years of overgrazing through little managed and free-roaming camel populations, through excessive pollution and littering and through extensive development schemes expanding the city’s boundaries at a rapid, almost frightful speed.” (AUD61) Prior to the beginning of the project, most community members didn’t realize that traditional activities like the burning of grasslands, the hunting of animals for sport, and deforestation were bad for the environment until ecotourism was offered as an alternative. (AUD38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International money market</td>
<td>“The point I am trying to make is that we have picked the low hanging fruits and now in order to drive the sustainability agenda forward we require an investment on part of the companies. And that is where the financial folks are coming in and saying: wait a minute, that’s costing us too much. So that’s an issue.” (TE05) “I think the biggest barrier is probably the way in which many companies’ finances are structured. I think the problem is the source of investment and the sort of financiers for sustainability is looking very short-term. That’s why I have a problem with the international money market. I didn’t buy any money to launch [company]. It cost us an absolute fortune! But we financed it from another part of our company.” (TE07) “Really when you try to get investors for ecologdes or sustainability, they all yawn and shuffle papers and let you off with bits and bops and say, no thanks, off you go.” (TE09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional capitalism</td>
<td>“Our economic system focused on growth and consumption is broken. And this has to shift.” (TE04) “I refuse to believe in competition in sustainability. I know we are victim to it sometimes because we are perceived as a competitor, but there is a world of opportunities for sustainability out there. And if you’re truly into it, you’re going to find these opportunities and create services that are complementary to others, and then there is always going to be resources available for good work.” (TE04) “I think that there are macro challenges with the underlying assumption that it is really hard to do good whilst making money, which I think is incorrect.” (TE14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dilemma</td>
<td>Verbatim quote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stakeholder opposition</strong></td>
<td>“In 1998, several environmental groups tried to block them in court from building an extension to [property]. It was not a question of environmental impact; the groups just didn’t want to see an extension at all to a heritage property.” (AUD19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Traditionally, [region] and [region] have been arch-rivals; and in the past all the towns have worked individually, and highly competitively, to market tourism.” (AUD07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“We recognise that not all guests are receptive to reduce their comfort while enjoying the comforts of a higher price point.” (APP64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business inconsistencies and industry complacency</strong></td>
<td>“The airlines have been dragging their feet in coming to the table. The majority of the global airline industry has fought against any kind of carbon tax or other measure that would hold their feet to the fire on this. That's a real issue.” (TE05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Complacency of others</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“You know, I am a little bit sheltered myself having focused so much of my time in this particular industry, but I am often told that we as an industry are really behind in terms of sustainability compared to other industries.” (TE04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Own complacency</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I think that we as an industry need to up our business acumen and incorporate this with sustainability.” (TE02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I am not sure about other industries, but I would certainly say that in [country] we are lagging behind in terms of our sustainable operations.” (TE13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political ill-will</strong></td>
<td>“Although, I am generally positive about development in [country] and corruption is reducing, at the same time it is sometimes like bashing your head against a brick wall. And it is still very hard to operate and avoid bribery.” (TE03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We came about a lot of bureaucratic stumbling blocks and indeed corruption. However, we try to do whatever is possible.” (TE07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“And often there are changes in administration within political parties. You may have made a lot of progress with one group, and then the next thing you know the other group comes in and they want to put their stamp on everything. So, everything changes.” (TE04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dilemma</td>
<td>Verbatim quote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurial</td>
<td>&quot;Whilst there is widespread public perception that the whole of the reserve is protected, this is not in fact the case.&quot; (AUD31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plagiarism</td>
<td>&quot;Despite their claims that their camp has led to the protection of the reserve, the truth is that it [the land] would have been proclaimed anyway, without the development of the camp.&quot; (AUD10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;I am obliged to note that the conspicuous success of some ranches camouflages political tensions, contested resources, conflicts over management and questions about long-term sustainability.&quot; (AUD23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation</td>
<td>&quot;The hotel was deliberately set back from the beach to ensure the preservation of the hawksbill turtle nesting habitat and marine ecosystem.&quot; (APP01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tokenism</td>
<td>&quot;The black rhino was one of the species that had recently disappeared in the area, and it was a prime candidate for reintroduction.&quot; (APP69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;After successful habitat regeneration, [company] and its Conservation Managers felt confident to reintroduce indigenous fauna. Its flagship animal is the Arabian Orxy, a species until recently extinct in the wild.&quot; (AUD61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership-</td>
<td>&quot;I think that one of the biggest dilemmas is that people think they are having an impact, but they are not. But they are too far away in the distance to see it. And it is frustrating me. You can't claim to be responsible in travel if you are not actually on the ground looking at your impact.&quot; (TE06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>operations-gap</td>
<td>&quot;Yes, when you are not there you don't actually have the level of oversight and control and you have to hope that you have hired well and that they perform well.&quot; (TE08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;You are from far, far away, and I am actually going to play devil's advocate here, how can you tell the people there what to do and what not when is about creating jobs?&quot; (TE10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misperception</td>
<td>&quot;Starting a business is hard. It is really hard and it will take you to the biggest highs and the lowest lows. And then adding another level of complexity to that by way of trying to do good things just makes it harder and more painful. I know this now.&quot; (TE14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;To begin with it was quite hard because the communities heard about NGOs who come in and throw lots of money around and they thought that is what we were going to do too.&quot; (TE03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;The problem is the messages that are out there. People don't want to choose it because they think they are entering in some sort of sect that they don't want to be part of. I think the barrier is to convince people that it is smarter and more aspirational to travel in a sustainable way.&quot; (TE12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Quotes for types of behaviour for best practice in tourism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Verbatim quote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Profit-sharing              | "44% of all profit shares are entrusted to the conservancy." (APP10)  
"A total of 82% of all the money generated from the project goes directly to the communities involved, with individual community members receiving economic benefits that are directly commensurate with the amount of time they work and the specific services they provide on a community by community, tour by tour basis." (AUD38)  
"Also realising that the people of the Reserve depend on the forest for their economic livelihoods, one ‘Bolsa Floresta’ stored value card is distributed to each of the local families. The cards are credited with about US$25 per month as payment for ‘ecosystem services’, i.e. protecting the rainforest by not harvesting it." (AUD49) |
| Employment opportunities    | "The camp only employs local people." (APP01)  
"Over 90% of employees were raised in the nearby communities." (APP17)  
The resort is committed to employing at least 95% of its staff from the local villages. (APP25)  
... 100% of the alliance's 150 members, staff and management are local indigenous community members. (APP38)  
The company employs well over 1,700 people, 99% of which are of regional origin. (APP55) |
| Training and skills development | "Through the [hotel] the local employees have the opportunity to develop a career in the hotel business. The training department of the hotel identifies potential candidates for better positions in the same hotel or in other properties of the company." (APP23)  
"To illustrate this commitment to local capacity building, in 2004 alone, the hotels provided 30,562 hours of training to local community members to work at the hotels and own, operate and manage their own businesses in partnership." (AUD08)  
"The community identifies its needs and the project provides the training and capacity building and helps secure funding to achieve community-set goals." (AUD75) |
| Creating an NGO            | "Further, [company’s] commitment to contribute back to the communities we visit was formalised in 2002, when our founders began the [foundation] with a donation of $200,000." (APP13)  
"And lastly, in 2009 [company] spun off its sustainability department into its own company, [foundation name], as a step to further formalise sustainability and provide enhanced transparency and governance of allocation of guests funds”. (APP64)  
"Establishing a non-profit foundation helped elicit and channel private sector donations." (APP17)  
"The [foundation] was started by [company] in 1997 as an opportunity for guests to contribute directly to local conservation projects." (APP27) |
**TABLE K.6:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job characteristic</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upward mobility</td>
<td>“The lodge employs 80 local people with no previous work or tourism experience. Two long-term employees have reached management positions.” (APP75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job benefits</td>
<td>“All of our staff has health coverage, two weeks of paid holiday leave and a month salary bonus at the end of the year. Our staff receives what amounts to about six months of salaries in tips and service charges from guests. [...] We have set up a retirement fund for our long-term employees.” (APP25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>“Our hotels favour recruitment and training of local personnel. In addition, complementary schemes allow employees to improve their skills outside work.” (APP67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair wages</td>
<td>“With a commitment to fair wages and employment, the average daily wage per hotel employee (excluding management or sales department) is 150 [currency units] per day, or more than three times the average daily wage of [country].” (AUD08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job security</td>
<td>“Jobs are becoming more sustainable as the tourist season extends and in the same way local businesses benefit from all-year round trade.” (AUD07)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE K.7:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not formalised</td>
<td>&quot;The subject of stakeholder and local community involvement in the establishment of [company] has to be understood in the local context. What would be expected measures such as workshops, consultations with locals etc are perhaps formalised Western approaches to stakeholder involvement. Here, this is done by so-called ‘open Majlis boardroom discussions’. Meaning that anyone at any time has the right to visit the Majlis, or assembly rooms of the ruling family and express their concerns – an opportunity which is frequently picked up on by locals and is a well-established procedure.” (AUD61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>A well-informed host community is paramount to the success of any sustainable tourism destination, and we keep our members and partners informed of developments and strive to increase standards to those worthy of a world-class destination.” (APP07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>“Over the course of the first 10 years of project implementation, the applicant conducted more than 150 multi-stakeholder consensus meetings in communities throughout the region.” (AUD16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>“[Company] is based on total involvement of the local population in an enterprise of ecotourism. The local community have participated in all stages, from the building to the management to running the camp.” (APP23) “There are 11 local marine advisory committees based along the coast. These allow local community members to formally participate in marine park management decisions on local issues.” (APP31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>“The collaboratively paid for signage on the island was also community driven and another way in which the community assisted in the conservation of this special location.” (AUD31) “...an alliance of five communities owned and operated tourism enterprises.” (APP38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very weak</td>
<td>Internal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Internal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>External</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very strong</td>
<td>External</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>Verbatim quotes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Need for achievement              | “Her enthusiasm was a great as ever and her resolve to make a difference to the local people even stronger. And the most important thing is that she is always striving to do better.” (AUD01)  
|                                   | “The [owners] knew that running a sustainably-minded airline was not a walk in the park.” (APP51)                                                                                                               |
|                                   | “What State leaders and community members use to laugh at – the idea that the region could be a tourism destination – changed after more than 20 years of hard work by the [company].” (APP45) |
| Need for long-term commitment     | “These two perspectives set the framework for what can be considered both the cycle of improvement as well as the never-ending journey which is a commitment to sustainability.” (APP64)  
|                                   | “…in it for the long haul, and their vision is far reaching.” (AUD17)                                                                                                                                                  |
|                                   | “Negotiations with these communities have created partnerships that will have the same long-term benefits for all concerned.” (APP10)                                                                                   |
| Need for self-determination       | “It is often forgotten that many people are born entrepreneurs and don’t want to work for someone else, no matter how munificent that company would be.” (AUD17)                                                                 |
|                                   | “…the impetus for taking out a loan has to come from the entrepreneur.” (AUD53)                                                                                                                                 |
|                                   | “In addition to being an excellent case study of responsible tourism it is an outstanding example of an indigenous community achieving self-determination, cultural determination and economic determination.” (AUD63) |
| Belief in the right thing to do   | “We are a company that believes in doing the right thing…” (APP13)                                                                                                                                               |
|                                   | “…it is the responsibility of every tour operator, large and small, to step forward and take action.” (APP19)                                                                                                                                 |
|                                   | “…because it is the right way to do business.” (APP83)                                                                                                                                                             |
|                                   | “It’s just the right thing to do.” (AUD83)                                                                                                                                                                           |
| Virtues / Good character          | “We do not want to claim universal role model status for the [name] project. Nor can we claim sole propriety for the model.” (APP59)                                                                                   |
|                                   | “If asked, the leadership of the [company] would most likely say it is not worthy of an award; that nothing they are doing is noteworthy or out of the ordinary.” (AUD83)                                                  |
| Value of authenticity             | “A large part of our mission is to preserve the [local tribe] culture.” (APP25)                                                                                                                                 |
|                                   | “Our motivation is to conform the village’s simple infrastructure in a bold outdoor display of identity and self-validation.” (APP17)                                                                                  |
|                                   | “…resort has been likened to the Garden of Eden.” (APP01)                                                                                                                                                         |
| Value of stewardship              | “By that time a group of dreamers fell in love with the area, the people, the architecture, and the potential of giving a new life to these magnificent communities.” (APP08)                                                 |
|                                   | “As a global player in the hotel and service industry, [company] has a responsibility towards its customers, employees, shareholders, and the local communities where the Group bases its activities.” (APP67) |
## Quotes for extrinsic motivations for best practice in tourism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Verbatim quote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Progress and development goals** | “We do not measure success purely on our own achievements but on the ability of others to improve their properties, the lifestyles of their staff and local communities through our assistance.” (APP01)  
“The objective of the rural tourism program is to improve the standards of living of the rural population by helping them in to establish a sustainable, respectful activity of the local environment, as well as of the local social culture and historical patrimony.” (APP53)  
“Founded with the core value of driving sustainable development, the company seeks to continue being an agent of social and economic development through responsible tourism.” (APP64) |
| **Generating profit and/or income for others motivates tourism entrepreneurs** | “Our economic initiatives are aimed at creating income for the many people who are not qualified to work and the resort. We did this to ensure that the families who owned the land will have a reliable cash income for their ancestors.” (APP25) |
| **Profit is used as a means to arouse cooperation from stakeholders** | “We are trying to show the […] community that there is a direct link of economic revenue with the presence of lions in their territory.” (APP23) |
| **Profit has to be achieved in order to fulfil one’s best practice principles and stay in business** | “Our self-financed environmental programme was created with the objective of reducing our environmental impact so we can be in business forever.” (APP33) |
| **Profit equals cost saving – doing good has paid off** | “The programme has not only been good for the environment, but it has also been good for business as it increases brand awareness and market share and also saves the company money.” (APP19) |
| **Superlative guest satisfaction** | “We aim to exceed expectations.” (APP08)  
“… great service in first-class installations.” (APP16)  
“… be a world class responsible tourism destination.” (APP17)  
“… offering visitors world class vacation experiences.” (APP55)  
“… ensure that guests can be part of a world class lodge.” (APP69) |
## Quotes for an ontology for ethical entrepreneurship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE K.11: Five dimensions for an entrepreneurial ontology of ‘becoming’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dimension</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Intuition | “We opened our first hotel 32 years ago and that probably hits the sweet spot. We didn’t know at this time that this was sustainable tourism. I mean how would anyone really have known anything about sustainable tourism 32 years ago?” (TE09)  
“Policies are not best practices. Rather they are tools that lead to best practices and ethical conduct.” (TE06) |
| Belongingness | So working in sustainable tourism, I mean, this little pack that we know…” (TE11)  
“But when I really look around the room, from my perspective, my tribe is sustainable travel. I like the people and I relate to the people and I think they are good people.” (TE02)  
“Well, it’s easy to say sustainability. But I don’t really mean that. I mean our shared values and mutual benefits that we give each other.” (TE08) |
| Fluidity | “At first it was only for fun, but then we thought we could do something similar and fundraise. So, it was a sort of step-by-step process.” (TE06)  
“And then I suppose you go and seek adventure in your life where more is better and bigger is better and we grew our hotel from one to seven.” (TE09)  
“And I have always said that I would not start this business as anything other than a limited company because I wanted to compete with the core industry and disrupt it from the inside. So, having a green mission simply wasn’t enough, so we learned through trying out all sorts of different business models.” (TE14) |
| Learning | “I mean, I have spent six years there and I realised that at the beginning we were doing so much wrong. Fostering moral imperialism for example, giving money to the wrong people.” (TE06)  
“We knew zero-zip-nothing. But we re-built this little hotel at the edge of [continent]. It just seemed like a really good idea.” (TE09)  
“So, I went in, not knowing very much about what ecotourism was, but I thought that nonetheless, this is a good unique selling point. So I went into it and started learning. From day one!” (TE01)  
“It’s very quiet, very low key and very below the radar. Not any of this huffery-puffery and saying that we are saving the world and all that. That’s another lesson we have learned, I must tell you, at great cost.” (TE09) |
| Awakening | “Because in 2003, I read in the Wall Street Journal an article about greenhouse gas emissions and how aviation was a major contributor to that. And it struck me as somewhat hypocritical and ignorant that we as an airline had no idea what our carbon footprint was!” (TE02)  
“I went to Borneo to the first worldwide ecotourism conference that was organised by TIES. And this really opened my eyes about the possibilities for a better kind of tourism.” (TE12)  
“I think it has a lot to do with our upbringing, our own spirituality and sometimes in life, we encounter certain crisis moments that awaken us up, such as our own mortality. And we realise that we cannot bring all this money with us when we die, but we can leave a legacy behind. So I think how we run our business is basically a reflection of our own value system.” (TE01) |
Quotes for a mission for ethical entrepreneurship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Verbatim quotes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Integrity        | “You know, I would rather have a good group of people working on a marginal product than a marginal group of people working on a fantastic product.” (TE02)  
                   | belief in human integrity  
                   | “I mean, it always felt like that if we gave in and paid the bribes and got everything done a lot quicker and easier and potentially cheaper, we were going to defeat the objective of being there.” (TE03)  
                   | belief in the integrity of one’s mission  
                   | “I think that first and foremost we have to practice what we preach. We try wherever possible as a business to be sustainable. And sometimes that means making very, very difficult decisions.” (TE07)  
                   | belief in one’s own integrity |
| Humility         | “I think humility is quite important. Of course you have to have a lot of confidence, but at the same time you need to be humble enough to accept advice and to be able to adapt and change.” (TE03)  
                   | “And I personally think you need to make it a habit of never bringing Western baggage to the table. You need to be able to bring people together as equals.” (TE04) |
| Being entrepreneurial | “I hesitate to say it, but entrepreneurial. You have to have that entrepreneurial spirit. You have to track trends and you have to like numbers from a financial end of things.” (TE04) |
| Spirituality     | “And the last part, not to get too groovy on you, is spiritual intelligence. And I am not talking religion. There’s got to be a pursuit of aligning your organisation’s higher purpose, or just purpose, with your moral ethics. And that’s that grey area where it’s really hard to nail down, where it’s really hard to quantify. But if you are not aligning your business purpose with your moral purpose, your ethics with the organisation’s higher purpose, you are constantly going to be searching for the right versus wrong.” (TE02)  
                   | “And I’d like to think that most folks when they stop and pause would like to highlight at least a couple of things that they believe they are doing. And those people who pause a little bit longer might realise a few other things that they could do more. That’s why we have all these best practice entrepreneurs who are all a bit dreamy because they have all been pausing and reflecting too much. You have to be entrepreneurial too.” (TE08) |
| Legacy           | “Fundamentally, we do believe that education can change the world. So for any of our projects, we want to leave a legacy.” (TE04)  
                   | “With the changing technologies and trends, you have to stay in touch with the environment, you have to stay in profit that you can stay in business and leave a legacy behind, it’s a lot of buckets to juggle, and definitely you have to be persistent and always want to improve.” (TE01)  
                   | “I’ll die when I am 80 and I am 70 now and I want to leave this forest protected and that will be my legacy. That’s why I am doing what I do. And I think that’s really important. You’ve got to have a heart.” (TE07) |
| Benevolence      | “An enlightened entrepreneur, an entrepreneur that does good, is an entrepreneur that understand that’s without a healthy environment and without a diversity of cultural heritage, they don’t have an industry anymore.” (TE05)  
                   | “You need to have a good moral code of ethics quite instilled within you.” (TE03) |
### TABLE K.13: Quotes for motivational factors for ethical entrepreneurship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Verbatim quote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Supererogation** | “If I was to do something, it had to be a little bit more than just a tour company.” (TE01)  
“We were sort of going at it on our own, trying to deal with an issue for which we had no legal or regulatory requirements to do so and nor did we have a framework which we could follow for that.” (TE02)  
“We wanted to do something good and leave something good behind. So the idea was to leave something behind. At first it was supposed to be something tangible. Later it became more intangible like creating opportunities. So I guess my definition of leaving something behind has changed.” (TE06)  
“I was looking for something greener. My wife and I wanted to do something and dial up the sustainability and giving-back proportion of things. We wanted to have something that was more directly involved.” (TE11) |
| **Non-identificational atonement** | “I had already some scepticism about volunteering trips because I didn’t really think I was leaving something behind.” (TE06)  
“So, when I finally moved to [country] I ended up working for a tour operator. I got to see the dark side. I think that a lot of people who work in sustainable tourism should all work for a big tour operator for a year or so, just to get a real idea about how bad it actually is.” (TE10)  
“I think I always had a preoccupation with these sorts of issues and thought here was so much wrong in this space. My father had hotels and I think I had really been brought up seeing really good examples of tourism and also very bad ones.” (TE14)  
“And in these personal adventurous pursuits I began to learn much more about the negative environmental and socio-cultural impacts of the industry and also gained affinity for travel and tourism. So I just happened to marry the two then professionally and founded [company].” (TE04) |
| **Existential responsibility and the desire to affect change** | “By creating this brand, we almost set ourselves up for being responsible.” (TE02)  
“I do think that we are at a monumental time where individual ideas and opportunities can come together to fashion leading programmes of change. And I have always felt that one plus one is three and that my philanthropic desires are to play a role actively wherever that might be.” (TE13) |
| **Individualistic altruism** | “So, you had to be a bit altruistic about it and take on this outsider perspective and see the whole thing as a whole. Instead of you being the focus and doing it for gratitude, you had to look at it from the outside and see what you can do to try and develop and grow existing projects and people. […] And that can be quite hard because we realised we could never do what we wanted to do for any form of acknowledgement or gratitude because otherwise you’re just going to get into a deep depression very quickly.” (TE03)  
“I mean, this kind of job is better than the kind of job that I might have been doing every day, but I surely didn’t make an impact on anyone. People call this altruistic because you are at least intentionally trying to help people. But actually, it’s more that we benefit from doing the stuff we care about.” (TE06)  
“But in a practical setting, I really want to drive home the fact that especially economics are important in altruistic measures because you need your place at the table.” (TE11) |
Quotes on priorities and responsibilities for an ethical entrepreneurship

TABLE K.14: Entrepreneurial priorities and responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Verbatim quote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Priorities | "Well, I don’t think our priorities have changed. But I think our understanding of them has changed. You know, if we had asked someone and really understood the situation, the priorities probably would have been the same for the people in those communities. But for us their meaning would have changed completely." (TE07)  
"So, the core of the vision hasn’t changed much, but it had to take a backseat sometimes so we could keep the organisation going. Because if we didn’t keep the organisation going, we wouldn’t have achieved our mission anyway." (TE14)  
“You have to make sure that it’s not just a deep-valued view as an individual – some people can afford to do that – but for most folks it’s pretty careful calculation to go out and do good." (TE08)  
“I believe that today this sort of work has become daily and as mundane as giving your guest breakfast. I think doing the right thing is falling into the same category. It’s just becoming part of running your business. And I am glad it is this way.” (TE10) |
| Responsibilities | "I genuinely believe that companies that are doing well by their staff, you can sense the spirit, the esprit, and the positive attitude. And I think that this translates into a good guest experience. So, your first responsibility is your staff.” (TE8)  
“The first thing you do, immediately, is to establish your immediate community. And that is your staff. And you do the best you can do on every level for them. And then you can take it from there. But the main thing is to run a good business and treat your staff well.” (TE09) |

Quotes for the questions whether creating employment is an entrepreneurial responsibility

TABLE K.15: Is creating jobs a business’s responsibility?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“I think it should be. They do have a responsibility to see and understand what existing opportunities there are for local community members to provide alternative livelihoods, more sustainable livelihoods. I think that this is very important.” (TE03)</td>
<td>“I think it is a company’s responsibility to sustain the people it employs. You know, we’ve got women working there for us for 4-5 years now in housekeeping. I mean, if you’re not worried about your employees’ wellbeing then you’re probably not worried about anything related to the bigger picture.” (TE08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Well, absolutely. I think that without a job, without an economic opportunity, you could almost attribute every single issue, negative issue that we have occurring in the world today, whether it be from terrorism to poverty to pollution.” (TE02)</td>
<td>“No. I think it’s about creating opportunities for people. I mean there are a lot of tech companies that have only very few employees. But they’ve created very interesting opportunities for people.” (TE06)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix L: Index of Ethical Framework Core Elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core element</th>
<th>Overarching concept, see Table 4.1, p. 115</th>
<th>Findings chapter section # and page #</th>
<th>Discussion chapter section # and page #</th>
<th>Verbatim quote table # and page #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocity</td>
<td>Definition</td>
<td>7.2, pp. 180-181</td>
<td>8.2.3, p. 223</td>
<td>K.1, p. 337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmony</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.2, pp. 180-181</td>
<td>8.2.2, p. 222</td>
<td>K.1, p. 337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.2, pp. 180-181</td>
<td>8.2.4, p. 224</td>
<td>K.1, p. 337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.2, pp. 180-181</td>
<td>8.2.1, p. 221</td>
<td>K.1, p. 337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>Dilemmas</td>
<td>7.3.2, p. 184</td>
<td>8.3.2, p. 231</td>
<td>K.3, p. 339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.3.1, p. 181</td>
<td>8.3.1, p. 227</td>
<td>K.2, p. 338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misrepresentation</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.3.3, p. 187</td>
<td>8.3.3, p. 234</td>
<td>K.4, p. 340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.4.2, p. 194</td>
<td>8.3.2, p. 223</td>
<td>K.5, p. 341, K.7, p. 342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.4.3, p. 194</td>
<td>8.3.3, p. 234</td>
<td>K.5, p. 341, K.8, p. 343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.4.1, p. 191</td>
<td>8.3.1, p. 226</td>
<td>K.5, p. 341, K.6, p. 342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The right thing to do</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.5.1, p. 198</td>
<td>8.4.1, p. 239</td>
<td>K.9, p. 344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good character</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.5.2, p. 200</td>
<td>8.4.2, p. 240</td>
<td>K.9, p. 344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress &amp; development goals</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.5.2, p. 201</td>
<td>8.4.4, p. 242</td>
<td>K.10, p. 345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guest satisfaction (normative, superlative, opportunistic and hedonistic)</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.5.3, p. 202</td>
<td>8.4.5, p. 241</td>
<td>K.10, p. 345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repentance for sins</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.5.3, p. 202</td>
<td>8.4.5, p. 242</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belongingness</td>
<td>Ontology</td>
<td>7.6.1, pp. 204-205</td>
<td>9.2.2, p. 253</td>
<td>K.11, p. 346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.6.1, pp. 204-205</td>
<td>9.2.3, p. 255</td>
<td>K.11, p. 346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awakening</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.6.1, pp. 204-205</td>
<td>9.2.4, p. 257</td>
<td>K.11, p. 346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluidity</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.6.1, pp. 204-205</td>
<td>9.2.1, p. 252</td>
<td>K.11, p. 346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intuition</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.6.1, pp. 204-205</td>
<td>9.2.1, p. 252</td>
<td>K.11, p. 346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrity</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.6.2, pp. 205-207</td>
<td>9.3.1, pp. 259-261</td>
<td>K.12, p. 347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for supererogation</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.6.3, pp. 207-208</td>
<td>9.3.2, pp. 261-264</td>
<td>K.13, p. 348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational entrepreneurship</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.6.3, pp. 207-208</td>
<td>9.3.2, pp. 261-264</td>
<td>K.13, p. 348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-identificational atonement</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.6.3, pp. 207-208</td>
<td>9.3.2, pp. 261-264</td>
<td>K.13, p. 348</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>