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ABSTRACT
This article examines ethical entrepreneurship in tourism by developing a Weberian Ideal-Type Construct for an ethical tourism entrepreneur, and thereby deeper understanding of ethical tourism entrepreneurship. This research contributes to the extremely scarce literature at the academic juncture of ethics, tourism and entrepreneurship, which is significant as tourism is characterised by entrepreneurial idiosyncrasies with ethical challenges. The study is methodologically rooted in Personal Construct Theory. The qualitative findings from 15 semi-structured interviews with entrepreneurs, who have been commended for their ethical business conduct, show that ethical entrepreneurship in tourism is based on intuitionism, care and relationships, future-orientation, humility and benevolence as key virtues. These findings challenge the more traditional views of entrepreneurial attributes, such as egoism, risk-taking and opportunism.

Key words: entrepreneurial ethic, tourism entrepreneur, Weber’s Ideal-Type, Personal Construct Theory

Word count: 8723, incl. Figure 1, Figure 2, Table 1, excl. reference list.

1 INTRODUCTION
The research purpose is to develop a deeper understanding of ethical entrepreneurship in tourism through examining narratives of individual tourism entrepreneurs commended for their ethical business conduct. This research contributes to the scant literature at the academic juncture of ethics, tourism and entrepreneurship. Walle (1995) contends that mainstream business ethics do not meet the ‘special needs’ demands of the tourism sector. He argues that the tourism industry’s “…economic power and its impact create moral and ethical responsibilities” (Walle, 1995, p.264). Additionally, Williams, Shaw & Greenwood (1989) seminal work on tourism entrepreneurship
highlights the peculiarities of the symbiosis of consumption and production. The idiosyncratic nature of tourism entrepreneurship thus demands a tailored lens for examining ethics. This highlights the theoretical significance of this research.

De Nisi (2015, p.4) questions, “What is the practical usefulness of studying the role of personality in the choice of pursuing an entrepreneurial career?” In response, this research’s practical importance lies in the need to raise awareness about the opportunities and nature of ethical entrepreneurship in tourism to stimulate actions for change. Furthermore, this paper contributes to Miller’s (2015, p.5) call for research on the nature of “ethical and healthy entrepreneurs”, providing opportunities to learn from role models. The aims of this research are furthermore to address the significant gap in literature and provide transformational opportunities for tourism entrepreneurs to engage in more self-reflective and ethical practices. This research thus seeks to meet the following three objectives: 1) to understand the ontology of ethical entrepreneurship in tourism; 2); to explore the mission behind ethical tourism entrepreneurship; and 3) to examine the motives underpinning ethical entrepreneurship in tourism.

The research is idiographic in nature, looking at the personality and ethics of individual entrepreneurs. An idiographic study does not aim to develop general laws; but instead to compose meaningful descriptions of unique events (Rychlak, 1981). Therefore, a Weberian Ideal-Type construct of an ethical tourism entrepreneur is developed. In a Weberian sense, this constitutes what is objectively possible, rather than representative (Rogers, 1969). This establishes a distinguishing ontological perspective with personal constructs and human experiences as its central tenets (Botterill, 1989). Weber’s Ideal-Type emphasises the individual actor in
interpretivist research (Rogers, 1969). The Ideal-Type is mirrored in Personal Construct Theory, which sees the individual person as a unique event (Kelly, 2003). Personal Construct Theory (or PCT hereafter) thus forms this research’s methodological foundation.

The actors in this research are individual tourism entrepreneurs, with entrepreneurship being understood as a form of behaviour (Drucker, 1985), and entrepreneurs’ actions as based on a unique moral compass (Cunningham & Lischeron, 1991). Their primary focus is to found and run a for-profit, commercial business in an ethical and responsible way (Wempe, 2005). The business itself is the centre of operations. This is unlike social entrepreneurs, whose primary focus is to pursue a social mission using a commercial entity as a conduit to achieve this social mission. This marks a crucial selection criterion for this research.

2 KEY CONCEPTS

The review of key concepts is divided into three sections: the ethical entrepreneur; the tourism entrepreneur; and tourism ethics. This structure mirrors the three overlapping fields of research upon which this paper is based. The review concludes that, while there is some research within certain areas of the overlap, there is a distinct lack of research at the juncture of all three academic fields. This needs addressing for two main reasons: first, tourism is a substantial, global industry with many ethical issues and challenges, and second, entrepreneurship is a key tourism industry driver and thus deserves greater academic attention. The tourism industry’s size yields potential for many positive effects, such as large-scale job creation and foreign investment. However, it also provides potential for lasting damages (pollution and global warming, exploitation and human rights abuses, wildlife and biodiversity destruction), which need to be addressed by entrepreneurial
players in the industry. Understanding a healthier and more ethical entrepreneurship (Miller, 2015) is thus crucial for tackling the potential damages tourism can cause. For research purposes, the entrepreneurs are defined by their values and behaviour, subsequently explored through the focus on entrepreneurship as a form of behaviour (Drucker, 1985)

2.1 The Ethical Entrepreneur

The discussion on ethics in relation to entrepreneurship is often concerned with the nexus between means and ends, or resources and targets of entrepreneurial activity (Wempe, 2005). Cunningham & Lischeron (1991) purport that entrepreneurs are more ethical and socially responsible than most of the population. This bold claim demands further substantiating evidence. Hannafey’s (2003) comprehensive literature review on ethics and entrepreneurship concludes that two perspectives dominate current research: first, the individual entrepreneur and their ethical foundation; and second, the effects of entrepreneurial activity on society. This research focuses on the individual’s personally constructed entrepreneurial ethic.

To understand this ontology better one must review the work of Max Weber who, by using casuistry – case-based reasoning in relation to moral problems – as a form of theoretical differentiation (Weber, 1922), created an Ideal-Type construct for the capitalist entrepreneur. Weber (1930) builds his casuistry on the Protestant ethics of 19th century Europe, setting out to rationalise the peculiarities of Western capitalism to develop a baseline ethic for capitalistic entrepreneurship. It is situated within the deontological ethical paradigm. According to Weber (1930), it is the individual’s duty to participate in economic development to increase profit and capital. Making profit thus becomes economic activity’s highest virtue and “is above all
completely devoid of any eudemonistic, not to say hedonistic, admixture.” (Weber, 1930, p.53)

This, in essence, is the spirit of capitalism, with making profit being the highest virtue. Profit becomes the manifestation of the primary achievement motive for entrepreneurial behaviour (McClelland, 1961). In Weber’s (1930) view, when profit is achieved by earning it, reinvesting it, and not consuming it, the Protestant ethic motivating the capitalist spirit of Weber’s Ideal-Type capitalist entrepreneur is manifested.

The aim of this research is to develop a Weberian Ideal-Type for the ethical tourism entrepreneur. The examination of motives beyond achievement and profit play a vital part in developing a similar Weberian-style Ideal-Type for ethical tourism entrepreneurs. Furthermore, for Weber (1930, p.75) entrepreneurship is a calling “toward which the individual feels himself to have an ethical obligation.” This calling, or mission, behind ethical entrepreneurship is investigated here. 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.

In addition to motivations and mission, virtues must be examined for a comprehensive understanding of ethical entrepreneurship in tourism. A virtue approach to entrepreneurial ethics surpasses rules and consequences and puts emphasis on individual character (Dawson, Breen & Satyen, 2002; Plinio, 2009). Jamal (2004) contends that virtues must be cultivated to achieve desirable objectives. Colonomos (2005) similarly defines entrepreneurial 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. Efficiency is also a manifestation of need for achievement, McClelland’s (1961) distinguishing entrepreneurial motive. Second, virtuous entrepreneurs operate within a rational capitalist framework, being subject to internal and external forces influencing the ontology of the ethical entrepreneur. Third, the general good relates to notions around bettering society as a mission for ethical entrepreneurs. Fourth, the ethical entrepreneur’s work is legitimised financially by shareholders and socially by stakeholders. Virtuous behaviour is connected to reward, whereas unethical behaviour is linked to punishment (Colonomos, 2005). Lastly, by speaking of consent, Colonomos acknowledges the element of choice (Jamal, 2004) in the cultivation of entrepreneurial virtues that ultimately benefit society.

Virtuous behaviour manifests itself through prudence, justice, courage and temperance (Miller & Collier, 2010). Entrepreneurs act prudently when not taking exacerbated risks in conducting business (McClelland, 1961). Entrepreneurial justice expresses itself as individualistic altruism, meaning entrepreneurs strive towards achievement by helping people and believing in a higher order (Hagen, 1964; McClelland, 1961). They show courage by breaking with traditionalism, creating new combinations (Schumpeter, 1934; Weber, 1930). Entrepreneurial temperance
manifests itself in the entrepreneur’s satisfaction through achievement, and wish to make profit for reinvestment rather than consumption (McClelland, 1961; Weber, 1930).

Entrepreneurship has been also linked to a utilitarian perspective. This should be seen as the prioritisation of the good for society – or the maximisation of utility (Sedlacek, 2011). Shifting the focus from the societal good to the personal good, it is often referred to as hedonism, or its more extreme variation of egoism. Longenecker, McKinney & Moore (1988) argue that entrepreneurship is an individual activity, focussing on self-enhancement. Cordeiro (2008) agrees that individualism is the underlying characteristic of entrepreneurship with every entrepreneur at core being an egoist. Contrasting the notion of self-interest, Plinio’s (2009) work on ethical leadership suggests that ethical behaviour involves societal expectations. Weber (1930) emphasises that duty to perform well is an ethical obligation for entrepreneurs. These arguments are founded in deontological ethics. However, as Plinio (2009) contends, entrepreneurship is too pluralistic to be deontological in nature. Such value pluralism stems from constantly changing circumstances, which is an underlying criterion for entrepreneurship.

2.2 **The Tourism Entrepreneur**

The entrepreneur is the *persona causa* of tourism development (Koh and Hatten, 2002); Kirzner (1973) asserted this earlier in his study of entrepreneurship. Yet, tourism entrepreneurship did not receive much academic attention until Williams et al. (1989) discovered the peculiarity of coupling production with consumption. In addition, tourism entrepreneurship is characterised by distinguishing features, which are important to understand before analysing the nature of ethical entrepreneurship in tourism.
The tourism industry is largely made up of small and medium size enterprises (Lashley & Rowson, 2010). Yet there is a discrepancy between the number 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.” Andriotis (2002) purports that smaller firms harbour stronger economic linkages to local businesses and this has a preventative effect on economic leakages.

This dichotomy between small businesses and large multinational corporations creates a dilemma of distributive injustice for smaller businesses (Jamal & Camargo, 2014; Piercy & Lane, 2007), and this brings them face-to-face with many ethical challenges. Jamal & Camargo (2014) emphasise procedural injustice in the tourism system, such as denied or inadequate access to decision-making procedures, and Ateljevic & Li (2009) highlight the collective nature of tourism entrepreneurship as potentially falling victim to such procedural injustice. The informal, flexible and often unregulated nature of tourism entrepreneurship also opens avenues for rogue behaviour that might lead to misrepresentation, which according to Brenkert (2009) is not the most complex, but the most common ethical digression amongst entrepreneurs.

However, small enterprises can also act as an interface between the host community and the tourism industry and foster the development of strong social capital (Shaw & Williams, 1998). In addition, small tourism enterprises tend to add to a greater sense of place and authenticity in the touristscape (Cooper & Hall, 2008). Yet small tourism enterprises may have a constraining effect on regional development as often they are run sub-optimally and suffer from under-management.
(Cooper & Hall, 2008; Shaw & Williams, 1998). This is seen as a direct consequence of non-economic motivations and aspirations, a precursor to smallness (Morrison & Teixeira, 2004), as a distinguishing feature of tourism entrepreneurship.

Smallness inadvertently leads to informality, another distinguishing feature of tourism entrepreneurship expressed in numerous ways. From an inter-organisational perspective, cooperative structures of enterprises within tourism destinations are often based on family and/or friendship ties (Mottiar 2007). On an intra-organisational level, this informality is often practised without formal business planning (Ateljevic, 2007, Morrison & Teixeira, 2004). However, as Ateljevic (2007) stresses, informality does not necessarily mean lack of knowledge or management expertise, although formal business planning can be deemed unnecessary.

This form of management thinking encompasses what Russell & Faulkner (2004) call ‘serendipitous entrepreneurship’, with entrepreneurial behaviour resulting out of an unregulated, often chaotic environment, characteristic of the tourism industry. Due to the tourism industry’s flexibility and differentiated products, there is scope for entrepreneurial opportunities (Cooper & Hall, 2008), especially in the niche-market arena, resulting from the experience industry’s growth and increasingly postmodernist consumption patterns (Shaw, 2004).

Tourism entrepreneurship is shaped by smallness, informality and flexibility, distinguishing features derived from several conditions specific to, and shaping, the entrepreneurial tourism environment. One is seasonality, a barrier to running tourism enterprises, affecting planning processes (Ateljevic, 2007; Koh & Hatten, 2002). Seasonality coupled with tourism destinations’
peripheral locations can be unconducive to competitive environments where entrepreneurship thrives (Ioannides & Petersen, 2003), creating ‘smallness’ lifecycles for tourism enterprises.

Another barrier faced by tourism entrepreneurs is government ownership of tourism products, such as national parks or public museums (Koh & 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), with many stakeholders’ differing motivations. Ateljevic & Li (2009) speak of a collective form of entrepreneurship with many different actors contributing to one or more tourism innovations decreasing the locus of control for tourism entrepreneurs.

When product innovation is intangible, it is another significant barrier that it cannot be tested before consumption. Tourism entrepreneurs are therefore exposed to much greater risk than entrepreneurs in other industries (Koh & Hatten, 2002). Lastly, tourism entrepreneurship largely relies on the second labour market (Ateljevic, 2007) or part-time and seasonal employment. Under such circumstances, entrepreneurial growth is often stalled by lack of skilled personnel and wider human and financial poverty (Morrison & Teixeira, 2004). The tourism environment provides many such barriers to ethical entrepreneurship, and we must address this context.

2.3 Tourism Ethics and Entrepreneurship

The beginning of the sustainable tourism paradigm coincided with the emergence of research into ethics in tourism. Shaw (2004) attributes this emergence to a shift in entrepreneurial cultural towards ethical considerations and corporate social responsibility in tourism. While ethics is a recognised study of what is morally right and wrong (Hudson & Miller, 2005), Hultsman (1995)
argues it is not just a philosophical framework, but also involves studying its practical application. This interpretation is more aligned to its Greek origin, which translates *ethikos* into habitual mode of conduct (Fennell, 2006) – or simply ethical behaviour. Considering ethics as a form of behaviour links it closely to the study of entrepreneurship, which Drucker (1985) also considers a form of behaviour. Anderson & Smith (2007) argue that entrepreneurial behaviour must be socially legitimised. However, the peculiarities of entrepreneurship in tourism stem from coupling tourism production and consumption (Williams et al., 1989), making legitimisation problematic, as consumer and producer are often the same people, thus causing role conflicts in tourism entrepreneurship. The commerce and leisure binary becomes blurred with tourism entrepreneur roles becoming entangled (Wempe, 2005). This contrasts with Weber’s (1930) assertion that the capitalist entrepreneur divides business and household. Such role conflicts can be internalised and originate from the serendipitous nature of tourism entrepreneurship (Russell & Faulkner, 2004). A lack of formalisation and planning dissolves role responsibilities and may lead to conflicting responsibilities (Cadbury, 2002). These may co-exist pluralistically for the entrepreneur in keeping with tourism entrepreneurship’s pluralist endeavours (Plinio, 2009).

Although there has been research into ethics and tourism, no focus on tourism entrepreneurs and their ethical standpoints is evident in the academic literature on tourism entrepreneurship. The closest research into tourism entrepreneurial ethics relates to applied business ethics and decision-making. However, studies focus on employees (Lovelock, 2008), students (Hudson & Miller, 2005) or consumers (Malone, McCabe & Smith, 2014). The work of Garay & Font (2012), Kensbock & Jennings (2011), and Lahdesmaki (2005) briefly touches on ethical dispositions of
entrepreneurs in sustainable tourism. Yet, an ethic for tourism entrepreneurs is not well-understood. It is this research’s foremost aim to address this gap.

This review of key concepts guides our study of ethical entrepreneurship in tourism. First, entrepreneurship is a form of behaviour, which is the direct manifestation of an individual’s own interpretations of events (Drucker, 1985; Kelly, 2003). This informs a research philosophy under the epistemological premise of personal constructivism. Second, ethical entrepreneurs are those considered business founders (Cunningham & Lischeron, 1991), contributing to the betterment of society (Wempe, 2005). This informed the research sampling strategy. Third, the Weberian Ideal-Type construct derives from a process of casuistry and theoretical differentiation (Weber, 1922). This supports using Personal Construct Theory as a research strategy. Finally, the analysis of virtues and vices calls for a value approach to ethical entrepreneurship in tourism. As such, the findings present the ontology, motivations and mission for ethical entrepreneurship in tourism.

3 METHODS

The ethical foundation of an individual is based on their axiological judgement of what is morally right or wrong (Lurie & Albin, 2007). These moral values are personal constructs super-ordinate to other values, and to understand the personal construction of these super-ordinate values and to link them to an entrepreneurial ethic, a research strategy is required, enabling an insight deep into the world of individual personal constructions. This strategy can be found in the theoretical foundations of Personal Construct Theory (PCT). PCT is a psychological theory developed by George Kelly in the 1950s, premised on the belief that “a person’s processes are psychologically channelled by ways in which he anticipates events” (Kelly, 2003, p.7). It concerns the behaviour
of people resulting out of construing and anticipating events (Kelly, 2003). Thus, our actions are triggered by motivations derived from our personal interpretations.

Employing a variety of strategies ensures this empirical research’s rigour. First, a rigorous sampling strategy based on homogenous-purpose sampling establishes the findings’ transferability (Decrop, 2004). Data analysis triangulation, i.e. combining qualitative content analysis with constant comparison analysis, adds credibility to the findings (Baxter & Eyles, 1997; Decrop, 2004; Leech & Onwuegbuzie, 2011). Finally, the findings’ dependability is ensured by developing an interview guide (Bryman & Bell, 2011) and employing the PCT method of laddering (Denicolo, 2003). As laddering requires the skills of an experienced interlocutor, it is important to state that the author who conducted the interviews is a seasoned interviewer with ten years of interviewing experience. In addition, and in preparation for these interviews, the author also completed a 3-day intensive training workshop on the method.

The primary data in this research comes from interviews with ethical tourism entrepreneurs. As previously stated, an ethical entrepreneur 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. A personal judgment needs to be made about the appropriateness of potential interview candidates (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2015). The key selection criteria are: (1) an individual, (2) who founded a (3) commercial entity in (4) tourism and (5) has been commended for their support for environmental and societal wellbeing (see Table 1). The first four criteria are relatively easy to check. However, the fifth criterion requires desktop research to find evidence of this support for ethical business
conduct. Evidence can be found in the form of the person having 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., 2015). The selection criteria are designed to achieve homogeneity in the sample population, whilst purposiveness is achieved by designing criteria that are theoretically central to the study. The 15 research participants are all geographically dispersed and their business sizes vary from 1 to 230 employees. However, geographical location and company size are not objects of investigation in this research. The focus lies on the 5 key selection criteria as presented in Table 1. It is noteworthy to say that the selected participants have received prestigious prizes for their responsible business conduct and are considered change-makers in this industry. Thus, interviewees in this research fall under the category of professional elites.

**TABLE 1: FINAL SAMPLING FRAME**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Criteria 1 and 2: Individual Founder</th>
<th>Criteria 3 and 4: Commercial Tourism Business</th>
<th>Criterion 5: Ethics Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes, tour operator</td>
<td>Ethics policy and ethics / sustainability award judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes, airline</td>
<td>Ethics / sustainability award winner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes, accommodation</td>
<td>Ethics / sustainability award winner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes, consultancy</td>
<td>Media story and ethics / sustainability award judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes, consultancy</td>
<td>Media story and ethics / sustainability award judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes, tour operator</td>
<td>Ethics policy and ethics / sustainability award judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes, travel media</td>
<td>Ethics policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes, accommodation</td>
<td>Ethics policy and ethics / sustainability award judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes, accommodation</td>
<td>Ethics / sustainability award winner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes, tour operator</td>
<td>Ethics / sustainability award winner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes, tour operator</td>
<td>Media story and ethics / sustainability award winner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes, travel media</td>
<td>Ethics policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes, consultancy</td>
<td>Ethics policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes, tour operator</td>
<td>Media story</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes, tour operator</td>
<td>Ethics / sustainability award judge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Saunders & Townsend (2015) advise for homogenous sample populations, as in this research, a sample size of 15 recruits is sufficient for qualitative interview research. 15 interviewees were selected on the basis of fitting the above sampling criteria. Denicolo (2003) adds that in PCT smaller sample sizes are the norm due to the prolonged nature and in-depth structure of the laddering interviews. The interviews took place over a period of six weeks using Skype video-calling facility or during face-to-face meetings where possible. All interviews were audio-recorded, transcribed and then analysed using NVivo10 computer software as a coding support. An external code check was conducted to ensure inter-researcher reliability and a favourable ethical opinion was received for this research. Interviews were semi-structured, allowing plenty of room for individual reflection. This is of particular importance when enquiring about sensitive subjects such as one’s ethical foundation, a challenge that Miller (2015) has highlighted.

The main 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). This makes the use of laddering an appropriate technique for gaining a deeper understanding of an entrepreneurial ethic. Laddering is done by asking similar questions about the same subject, while creating higher levels of abstraction (Fransella, 1981). In so doing, the interviewee can be guided from expressing subordinate to super-ordinate – highly value-laden constructs (Fransella, 2005). Biographical references to the respondent’s past are also part of the laddering method (Denicolo, 2003). In essence, it means moving from the personal to the abstract. Thus, personal narratives develop and higher-order constructs can be elicited. Following this technique, the interviewees began by telling their own story and journey as an entrepreneur. This personal reflection was then gradually widened to
include more abstract concepts, for example discussing best practices in sustainable tourism, and finally discussing hypothetical ethical dilemmas in tourism. This allowed entrepreneurs to develop their thinking about wider ethical issues in a gradual way throughout the interview.

The data analysis followed a two-pronged approach: building on an interpretivist research strategy, qualitative content analysis was combined with constant comparison analysis of the individual entrepreneurial narratives. This form of method triangulation adds rigour to qualitative tourism research as it strengthens the credibility of findings (Baxter & Eyles, 1997). Qualitative content analysis involves the process of entititation, by which the data is fragmented into themes or entities (Leech & Onwuegbuzie, 2011). These themes building the basis for any subsequent interpretation can be *a priori* or *a posteriori*. *A priori* themes in this data analysis included the different elements as outlined in the interview guide (Figure 1). *A posteriori* themes constitute the inductive codes that emerged during the interpretative phase of the data analysis. They are presented in the findings and discussion.

Content analysis alone can be considered as a form of data reduction (Saunders et al., 2015). It should be triangulated with another form of analysis to enhance the credibility of the findings. In this instance constant comparison analysis was used. Each interview is analysed as one element in itself and then compared to the previous. In PCT, this means that the respondents’ lives and events are seen as a process that Bryman & Bell (2011) endorse as a form of sense making through storytelling. The following findings and discussion section tells this story along the lines of the three aforementioned research objectives: ontology, mission and motivations. In so doing, this research makes sense of the nature of ethical entrepreneurship in tourism.
4 FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 AN ONTOLOGY FOR ETHICAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP IN TOURISM

An entrepreneurial ontology is centred on the process of becoming an entrepreneur, rather than being one (Weber, 1930). The ontological premise of becoming is mirrored in the view that entrepreneurship is a form of behaviour (Drucker, 1985) and role-performance (Weber, 1930)
following a process (Gartner, 2008; Johannisson, 2011). This process-ontology was reflected in this data set’s entrepreneurial narratives. Five key dimensions of this ontology of becoming emerged from the interviews: intuition; belongingness; fluidity; learning; awakening.

The dimension of intuition is manifest in the belief that being an ethical entrepreneur is a philosophy, not a set of policies. Entrepreneur06 contends that “Policies are not best practices. Rather they are tools that lead to best practices.” This belief permeated through all interviews, regardless of entrepreneurs’ years of business experience. Entrepreneur09 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” Meanwhile Entrepreneur02 describes this intuitive form of entrepreneurial behaviour as follows: “When you find yourself blazing the path on your own, then ethics becomes more of a gut-check in an innovative, entrepreneurial pursuit of CSR.”

Intuition is key for entrepreneurial success, both in traditional entrepreneurship as well as ethical entrepreneurship. Intuition, according to Weber (1930) is the spark that sets off the entrepreneur’s creation and, for Weber, this Ideal-Type entrepreneur must be an ethical being. As such, intuition becomes an ethical quality. Schumpeter (1934, p.85) concludes “…the success of everything depends on intuition.” The data indeed suggests that the emphasis on experience and intuitive judgement-making becomes a fundamental part of an entrepreneurial ontology. From an ethical perspective, an ontology based on intuition and experience is high in pluralism. This form of intuitionism suggests that judgements are based on intuition, feelings and experiences rather than reflection. Fennell (2006) warns that intuitionism is problematic, offering scope for disagreements between relevant stakeholders. To counteract the ethical shortcomings of intuitionism,
collectivism and consensus are required, as found in the second dimension of an ontology for ethical tourism entrepreneurship, namely *belongingness*.  

Entrepreneur02 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. Entrepreneur08 agrees in saying that “Well, it’s easy to say sustainability or ethics. But I don’t really mean that. I mean our shared values and mutual benefits that we give each other.” This constitutes a form of being part of a bigger collective that shares similar goals. As such, belongingness is the psychogenic element of the entrepreneurial ontology. A psychogenic need can be defined in terms of affiliation and the desire to become part of a specific culture (Solomon, Bamossy & Askegaard, 2002). Belongingness creates this affiliation, and thus provides social legitimisation of one’s actions, which Anderson & Smith (2007) see as a pre-requisite for ethical entrepreneurship.

The ethical dimension of belongingness is based on the premise of peer commitment. Peer commitment can be defined as ethical actions in support of the group that an individual belongs to (Plinio, 2009). Peer commitment is mirrored in Social Contract Theory, a deontological ethical perspective. Social Contract Theory is grounded in the voluntary participation in society with a common goal. It is based on the individual adherence to collective objectives (Fennell, 2006). Rousseau’s (1993) social contract here should be seen as an analogy for broader requirements for societal wellbeing. For ethical entrepreneurship 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 showed that continuous learning is part of any entrepreneurial practice, regardless of an entrepreneur’s years of experience. Entrepreneur11 describes their learning towards a more ethical entrepreneurial practice. “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.” In addition, Entrepreneurs01 explains, “I went in, not knowing very much about what ecotourism was, but I thought that nonetheless, this is a good thing to do. So I went into it and started learning. From day one!”

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. Learning is the process by which the Weberian Ideal-Type is constructed (Rogers, 1969). In Weber’s view (1922), this should be through the process of theoretical differentiation. In practice, this is done through continuous trial and error. Such is the case for ethical entrepreneurship, which operates in an environment of constant change (Brenkert, 2009). 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. The practical dimension of learning is process-orientated, linked to the fourth dimension for an ontology for ethical entrepreneurship: fluidity.
Fluidity, a feature of ethical entrepreneurship, requires that ‘becoming’ an ethical entrepreneur describes the phenomenon more accurately than ‘being’ an ethical entrepreneur. Entrepreneur05 reminisces “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.” This reflects Weber’s (1930) notion of a ‘calling’ for entrepreneurship, rather than a static state of ‘being’. Fluidity is also mirrored in Schumpeter’s (1934) assertion that entrepreneurship is a dynamic process.

The data also show fluidity is associated with a cycle of discovery, arbitration and commitment. Entrepreneur06 stated, “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.” This cycle requires social legitimisation to perform in an ethical venture (Anderson & Smith, 2007). Lastly, while the last two dimensions are process-orientated, the final element of an ontology for ethical entrepreneurship is rooted in a specific point in time: awakening.

Some entrepreneurs expressed an awakening that led them to engage in ethical entrepreneurship. “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” (Entrepreneur12). This is not contradictory to the intuition dimension. Rather, a moment of awakening can trigger the development of a new ethical entrepreneurship business philosophy.

Awakening, as the findings have shown, refers to an event which occurred during the entrepreneur’s life which triggered a shift in the entrepreneur’s thinking. It is thus deeply-rooted in PCT, emphasising the relationship between personal constructs and human experiences.
(Botterill, 1989). The findings suggest that this does not contrast with ethical entrepreneurship’s intuitive element, but rather denote a form of value pluralism, which is seen to be a pre-requisite for ethical entrepreneurship (Wempe, 2005). Miller & Collier (2010) call this the emergence of a holistic approach to entrepreneurship, which disrupts the current status quo. Entrepreneur14 explains, “I wanted to compete with the core industry and disrupt it from the inside by doing something better, something that was good for business and for society.”

Elements of an ontology for ethical entrepreneurship include intuition, belongingness, learning, fluidity and awakening. Intuition is acknowledged as an entrepreneurial quality (Schumpeter, 1934). 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. Fluidity is part of an ever-changing entrepreneurial environment (Brenkert, 2009). Awakening indicates the trigger moment of an orientation towards ethical entrepreneurship.

**4.2 A Mission for Ethical Entrepreneurship in Tourism**

A mission for an ethical entrepreneurship as derived from the findings is 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 benevolence and humility, and an appreciation of a wider spiritual existence. (Authors’ own definition)
Examining this in more detail, a mission for ethical entrepreneurship can manifest itself in the virtues that are associated with actively participating (Höckert, 2015) in doing the right thing. Interview participants talked about a range of virtues, with humility and benevolence being dominant in their answers respondents. The data suggests that ethical entrepreneurs have the integrity to decline opportunities that are at odds with their moral compass. Entrepreneur07 explains, “I think that first and foremost we have to practice what we preach. We try wherever possible as a business to be ethical. And sometimes that means making very, very difficult decisions.” This quote shows a belief in one’s own integrity. Raiborn & Payne (1990) confirm this need by stating that individual integrity is the backbone of ethical business conduct.

Additionally, the belief in one’s own integrity is strengthened by the belief in the integrity of one’s mission, as Entrepreneur03 explains, “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.” Bryant (2009) emphasises that integrity is usually stronger among self-regulating groups, such as entrepreneurs, suggesting a stronger locus of control increases integrity among entrepreneurs. High levels of integrity were indeed emphasised by the study entrepreneurs, who are highly self-regulating as founders and owners of their businesses. These high levels of integrity in the fluid and path-breaking situations faced by the tourism entrepreneur make intuition and gut-feeling more reliable than established codes. Here integrity should not be confused with self-efficacy. It is coupled with the virtue of humility as the findings suggested. Entrepreneur04 reflects, “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.” Humility can be seen as a psychogenic virtue that requires the entrepreneur to set aside individualistic tendencies and
become part of a group. This virtue is linked to the previously analysed ontological dimension of belongingness. It is furthermore linked to the notions of learning and fluidity as Entrepreneur03 remarks “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.” A key factor for ethical entrepreneurship is thus to strike a balance between integrity and humility.

It is further widely acknowledged that an entrepreneurial spirit is a crucial virtue for ethical entrepreneurship in tourism. This spirit translates into concrete entrepreneurial activity as stated in the above-mentioned mission. This includes managing a business, having knowledge of the market place and seeking-out new opportunities as Entrepreneur04 explains, “I hesitate to say it, but you have to be entrepreneurial. You have to have that entrepreneurial spirit.” Entrepreneur05, encapsulating Wempe’s (2005) notion of the ethical entrepreneur’s pursuit of society’s betterment, concludes, “An enlightened entrepreneur, an entrepreneur that does good, is an entrepreneur that understand that without a healthy environment and without a diversity of cultural heritage, they don’t have an industry anymore.” This suggests that ethical entrepreneurs instrumentalise nature for their benefit and have, to a certain extent, a utilitarian perspective.

Entrepreneurialism is also connected to a sense of spirituality, albeit not in a religious sense:

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. (Entrepreneur02)

Acknowledging the existence of wider spirituality is to accept that one is part of something bigger.
Choi & Gray (2008) see this as a premise for ethical entrepreneurship. Belief in a higher order of
things has been found to be true for individuals with high levels of need for achievement (Hagen,
1964). This spiritual pursuit is rooted in a form of non-religious idealism, which was found to be
high among small-business entrepreneurs (Dawson et al., 2002). Thus, the second key feature for
ethical entrepreneurship manifests itself in a form of spiritual entrepreneurialism.

Finally, leaving behind a legacy is perhaps the most prominent mission for these entrepreneurs. It
must be understood that a legacy here is not considered an action or material thing that
immortalises the entrepreneur’s name. Rather it refers to leaving behind something good to benefit
future generations as Entrepreneur15 states: “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.” This mission situates ethical entrepreneurship as a form of behaviour
(Drucker, 1985), which is ethically bound to motives that surpass the profit motive. Although the
moral obligation to surpass profit is recognised as a lifestyle entrepreneurship motive (Ateljevic &
Doorne, 2002), the same cannot be said about leaving a legacy. While lifestyle motives are bound
to the present simultaneous consumption and production of the tourism product (Williams et al.,
1989), leaving behind a legacy is future-orientated. An important conclusion to make is that ethical
entrepreneurs and lifestyle entrepreneurs do not necessarily pursue the same mission, despite the

Most notably though, in accordance to the virtue of humility these entrepreneurs also highlight that one must not succumb to the danger of becoming self-serving. Entrepreneur06 explains: “I think that any of these things, anything that involves humans and money… 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.” Leaving behind a legacy is linked to leaving behind something that future generations may benefit from, without the notion of self-aggrandisement. Weaver & Jin (2016) identify compassion as a driving force for enlightened tourism practice. Concern for others is reflected in the wish to leave behind something useful. It is a manifestation of the Aristotelian virtue of *benevolence*. This final dimension for a mission for ethical entrepreneurship is rooted in an ethic of care (Upchurch, 1998). An ethic of care emphasises responsibilities for members within a network of people (Gilligan, 1982) and the special relationships resulting from this network. 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 according to one’s own integrity, driven by virtues of benevolence and humility, and an appreciation of a wider spiritual existence.

4.3 *Motivations for Ethical Entrepreneurship in Tourism*

While a mission for ethical entrepreneurship denotes a goal-orientated framework, motivations behind ethical entrepreneurship are those psychological factors that trigger types of behaviour for achieving this mission. These were identified from the findings as: the need for supererogation;
non-identificational atonement; existential responsibility; transformational entrepreneurship; and individualistic altruism.

The dominating motivating factor is the need for supererogation, or simply put the need to do more than is required. Entrepreneur11 explains, “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.” The need for supererogation is an intrinsic motivation that emerged very strongly among the group of tourism entrepreneurs interviewed in this research. It means doing more than required, following the notion of maximisation of principle and going beyond duty (Baron, 2016). Entrepreneur01 reflects on beginning the entrepreneurial journey as follows, “If I was to do something, it had to be a little bit more than just a tour company.”

Jamal & Camargo (2014) argue that this motivation creates a rationale for ethical behaviour, which otherwise can be regarded as irrational by peers. It follows Kant’s view of the imperfect duty (Baron, 2016). From an entrepreneurial perspective, this addresses a need for legitimations of good entrepreneurship (Anderson & Smith, 2007). The need for supererogation is thus a process-motivation (Arthur & Hisrich, 2011). This, however, does not make it an extrinsic motivation because the need to do more than is required is because of duty, not just in accordance with principles (Macdonald & Beck-Dudley, 1994).

On the other hand, Entrepreneur14 explains how he was always preoccupied with “…these sorts of issues and thought there 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. Entrepreneur10 explains, “I got to see the dark side… 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.” Non-identificational atonement is driven by the avoidance of punishment and a sense of positive unfairness (Sedlacek, 2011). Thus, it is linked to the notion of responsibility, which is the sum of accountability and ethical behaviour (Fennell, 2006). The extrinsic element results from a wish to avoid punishment, while the intrinsic element is echoed in accountability.

In addition, a prevailing sense of an existential responsibility emerged as a motivational factor. Entrepreneur02 explains, “By creating this brand, we almost set ourselves up for being responsible.” 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, 2006) and authenticating one’s behaviour (Anderson & Smith, 2007). Such authentication of values and behaviour has been linked to the ethical stance of social intuitionism (Fennell, 2006), although the motivational factor of existential responsibility has also been linked to the darker side of entrepreneurship (Kets de Vries, 1985). The authentication of values and behaviour suggests a need for control and sense of distrust.

A desire to effect change has emerged as an important motive for ethical entrepreneurship. Entrepreneur13 emphasises that it is “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.” This is an extrinsic motivation leading the entrepreneur to become an agent for change (Gartner, 2008), contributing to society’s betterment (Wempe, 2005).

Finally, **individualistic, altruistic motives** are also present:

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. (Entrepreneur03)

McClelland (1961, p.203) defines individualistic altruism as an “achievement satisfaction from having contributed to the success of a group, so long as it is he [the entrepreneur] who made some of the decisions contributing to a successful outcome and he therefore has some way of telling how well he has done.” Individualistic altruism is seen to be strong among self-regulatory groups such as entrepreneurs (Bryant, 2009). As Seldacek (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. Entrepreneur06 remarks, “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.”
summarises these key findings and situates them within an ethical prism. Herein lies an important
contribution of this research, which combines ethical theory, the study of the entrepreneurial
personality and the peculiarities of tourism entrepreneurship.

It has been shown that while a mission for ethical entrepreneurship is bound to an ethic of care,
the motivational drivers behind ethical entrepreneurship are more utilitarian in nature. A mission
for ethical entrepreneurship emphasises relationships. Whereas motivations are much more
individualistic. The latter has been identified as typical for entrepreneurial role behaviour by
Lashley & Rowson (2010) and Mottiar (2007) among others. This difference in ethical disposition
between motivations and goals may require further research.
**FIGURE 2: AN ‘IDEAL-TYPICAL’ DYNAMIC 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>Max (Principle)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deontology</td>
<td>Idealism</td>
<td>Spirituality (non-religious beliefs)</td>
<td>Need for supererogation (Beyond duty)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kantian Duty Ethics</td>
<td>Humility (Practical imperative)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Contract Theory</td>
<td>Belongingness (Consensus)</td>
<td></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>Learning (Phronesis)</td>
<td>Legacy (Flourishing society)</td>
<td>Transformational entrepreneurship (Agents of change)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Awakening (Value pluralism)</td>
<td>Integrity (Self-regulation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fluidity (Phronesis)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intuitionism</td>
<td>Intuition (Value pluralism)</td>
<td>Existential responsibility (Authentic behaviour)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Entrepreneurialism (Instrumentalism)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-identificational atonement (Repentance of sins)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hedonism</td>
<td>Individualistic altruism (Need for achievement)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Max (Utility)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5 CONCLUSION

This paper examines the ontology, mission and motives for ethical entrepreneurship in tourism and thereby derives a Weberian Ideal-Type model for the ethical tourism entrepreneur. Methodologically, this is built upon Personal Construct Theory and Weber’s Ideal-Type theoretical differentiation technique, and his Ideal-Type Capitalist Entrepreneur construction (Weber, 1930). We respond to calls for research on ‘ethical and healthy’ entrepreneurial predispositions (Miller, 2015), and conclude with an Ideal-Type of the Ethical Tourism Entrepreneur. Figure 2, provides the ‘ideal-typical’ characteristics of ethical tourism entrepreneurial predispositions, important for providing a framework, not only pulling together the key conceptual contributions developed in this paper, but also a dynamic model to be tested through further research, applied, and utilised to inspire practice in a dynamic/theory-driven and informed way. Ontology, mission and motivations have been evaluated along a continuum of ethical theories ranging from the maximisation of principle toward the maximisation of utility, resulting in the development of a Weberian Idea-Type of the ethical tourism entrepreneur.

Weber’s (1930) capitalist entrepreneurs follow a calling towards the engagement in economic life though production rather than consumption. Their focus is on the present time. Ethical entrepreneurs, as this research has shown, demonstrate a greater future-orientation. Their calling for entrepreneurial practice is based on a mission to leave behind a legacy, learning, and desire to effect change as a key motive. For Weber (1930), the capitalist entrepreneur acts out of duty to contribute to economic development and the achievement of profit. Colonomos (2005) corroborates economic and social benefits for the firm as key motives for entrepreneurial activity. While ethical entrepreneurs also embrace entrepreneurialism, the need for supererogation and a
sense of existential responsibility go beyond the motives of Weber’s Ideal-Type. Equally, high
levels of self-interest, often regarded as a typical entrepreneurial trait (Longenecker et al., 1988),
could not be corroborated in this research. Elements such as belongingness, benevolence, humility
and existential responsibility suggest an emphasis on relationships and an ethic of care. Some
scholars regard an ethic of care as the fundamental basis for ethical entrepreneurship (Upchurch,
1998).

Overall, the nature of ethical entrepreneurship in tourism 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. This in itself contributes to extending Colonomos’ (2005)
definition of the virtuous entrepreneur. The latter, societal wellbeing, can be seen in the need for
supererogation and non-identificational atonement. The virtue approach, as advocated by Miller
& Collier (2010) for ethical entrepreneurship, has been extended to include humility and
benevolence as primary virtues for ethical entrepreneurship. Humility also counteracts
entrepreneurial vices as described by Kets de Vries (1995). The elements of awakening, learning
and fluidity reflect the uncertainty paradigm within which entrepreneurship is rooted. Finally,
utilitarian aspects are reflected in the dimensions of individualistic altruism, awakening and
entrepreneurialism. Colonomos’s (2005) approach advocates utilitarian efficiency as a crucial
element of an entrepreneurial ethic.

It can thus be concluded, that the nature of ethical entrepreneurship in tourism is ethically complex,
does not sit within one ethics theory spectrum, and must rather be viewed through a prism of ethical
lenses. For our construction of a Weberian Ideal-Type of the ethical tourism entrepreneur, this
means that these individuals can ideal-typically, and relatively objectively, be regarded as ethical
tourism entrepreneurs with principle-led values (humility, spiritualism, belongingness), who
engage in a range of behaviours from across the ethics spectrum (achieve, repent, show care,
exceed one’s duty) in order to achieve goals with a notion of the greater good (legacy,
entrepreneurial opportunities, transformational entrepreneurship).

The significance of this research is determined by its key findings and their implications. To date,
there has been a lack of research at the academic juncture of ethics, entrepreneurship and tourism.
This in itself constitutes an original contribution to academia. Entrepreneurs are important to the
tourism industry. Understanding their values, behaviours and individual ethic is crucial for a
tourism future based on ethical best practices. It is suggested that future research examines other
key entrepreneurial personality constructs, such as risk-taking, locus of control, opportunity
recognition and self-efficacy among others, under the auspices of ethical entrepreneurship, to
gauge whether there are noticeable differences between different types of entrepreneurs and how
action towards a more ethical entrepreneurship can be stimulated. The present study has limitations
in the sampling frame, as commended ethical entrepreneurs were the key actors in this research.
Research with entrepreneurs who have not been commended for their ethical business conduct
would provide interesting comparisons. However, this research has shown that by understanding
the constructs that underpin ethical entrepreneurship, paths towards a more integrated and self-
reflective form of entrepreneurial ethic can be explored.
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