



Social Business Model and Sharing Economy for Community-Based Tourism Development: A Case Study of Lisinia Doğa

*Emre ERBAŞ^a 

^a Burdur Mehmet Akif Ersoy University, School of Tourism and Hotel Management, Department of Gastronomy and Culinary Arts, Burdur/Turkey

Article History

Received: 09.08.2019

Accepted: 27.11.2019

Keywords

Sharing economy

Business model

Tourism

Community

Community-based tourism enterprises

Abstract

This study explores the role of a community-based tourism enterprise at micro rural tourism destination level (i.e., Lisinia Doğa) in creating sharing economy through a social business model. The findings reveal i) critical associations between boundary objects and visitors participation patterns; ii) vital importance of project-based boundary objects in designing a destination-specific communities of practice (a simple social system); and iii) deployment of boundary objects and communities of practice in harmony within the components of a social business model creates a sharing economy. The case study shows that exploring sharing economy within a social business model can be a new driver for the success of the community-based tourism (CBT) implications especially in the involvement of community individuals.

Article Type

Research Article

* Corresponding Author

E-mail: emreerbas85@hotmail.com (E. Erbaş)

Suggested Citation: Erbaş, E. (2019). Social business model and sharing economy for community based tourism development: A Case Study of Lisinia Doğa. *Journal of Tourism and Gastronomy Studies*, 7 (4), 2399-2417.
DOI: 10.21325/jotags.2019.478

INTRODUCTION

Sharing economy presents a new frame for today's knowledge economy. The sharing economy is attributed as a socioeconomic ecosystem predicated on the sharing of knowledge and physical capabilities (Dredge & Gyimóthy, 2015). Here, regardless of their different backgrounds, the individuals create an economy of social capital within a boundary object more or less freely by sharing their knowledge, attitudes, skills, and values (Matilainen, Suutari, Lahdesmaki & Koski, 2018; Putnam, 1995). In other word, the connection of peers creates bounding social capital in the platforms within the sharing economy (Putnam, 1995). Creating a social system, members of the platforms take advantage of the capital by experiencing trust, reciprocity, and synergy (Souland, Knollenberg, Boley, Perdue, & McGehee, 2018). In this manner, it reminds a simple social system called communities of practice. Communities of practice refer to a group of people bound together to share their experiences, knowledge, concerns, and passion for something they do and learn how to do it better. Hence, it is a form of a social learning system (Wenger, 2010). A serious number of groups and organizations in many sectors are now relying on communities of practice as a key to improving their performance (Wenger, 2010). For this, firms design social business models and create boundary objects to build their own communities of practice. The community, regardless of numbers of members, has a core of participants whose ambition for the boundary object energizes the community and who leads socially and intellectually (Wenger & Synder, 2000). For example, Eatsa, a restaurant operation in San Francisco, with the slogan of "build a bowl with 65 different ingredients", involve its consumers to design and order their own dish with their mobile devices. While this business model creates less service cost and error-free service for the restaurant, it creates time economy and tailor-made dishes for the consumers. Researchers have proposed further examination of the operative methods and instruments of present organizations, adopting business models that create social capital (Michelini & Fiorentino, 2012). The sharing economy has been posited as a vital channel in the success of such business models (Gössling & Hall, 2019). Thanks to production, consumption, learning, and finance is decentralized in sharing economy, it is fairer, transparent, and participatory. Sharing economy presents an atmosphere in which "sharable value" is reached (Rifkin, 2015). In this context, sharing economy occurs more within such social and community-oriented platforms with the ease of today's information technologies (Komoski, 2007).

As in many area of research, sharing economy in tourism research is recently highly emphasized. However, most of the research is exploratory and biased towards accommodation sector such as Airbnb (Kang, Kim, & Song, 2019), lack of theoretical background (Heo, 2016), and away from examining the role of tourism as a precursor of sharing economy. Hence, in this study, we investigate how boundary objects embedded in the social business model of a case study of a community based tourism enterprise (CBTE) creates a sharing economy. Creating a fit among profit-making goals with social objectives is also a key strategy behind the success of community based tourism enterprises and initiatives (Simpson, 2008; Ngo, Hales, & Lohmann, 2018; Franzidis, 2018; Poon, 2011). CBTEs, as an economic-based and entrepreneurship-oriented initiative, are generally viewed for the purpose of enhancing sustainable tourism development (Ngo et al., 2018). While community based tourism at different entrepreneurial levels has proven beneficial and is captivating academic attention (Simpson, 2008; Ngo et al., 2018; Bertella and Romanelli, 2018; Matilainen et al., 2018), studies fall short explaining how CBT can be practiced and sustained at

the entrepreneurial level. Hence, we need operationalisable mechanisms, as reminded by Mowete and Thapa (2015) and such a management model provided by Rodriguez and Prideaux (2017), to better guide the actors in the involvement of the community individuals benefiting especially its socio-economic capital. Therefore, travel and tourism operations designing social business models to create a sharing economy where communities of practice feel belonged and are attracted by boundary objects could be an effective mechanism for CBTEs.

In this context, this paper aims to enhance the existing literature by assessing a successful CBTE (i.e., a micro rural tourism destination) in Burdur, Turkey explaining its social business model. The success of Lisinia Doğa lies in its focus on communities of practice and boundary objects. Even though many 'designed' communities of practice fail or die early (Wenger, 2010), Lisinia Doğa sustains successfully, thanks to its dynamic creation of projects-based boundary objects, use communities of practice strategically in its business model by creating the sharing economy. Since the case CBTE host large communities, its project-based boundary objects are the key in its success. As Wenger and Snyder (2000) indicated, large communities are repartitioned by geographic region or by subject matter in order to motivate individuals to act a part actively. Namely, each community in the projects joins to the production of its own practice in relation to the whole system (Wenger, 2010) or the mission of the organization. In other word, there is an inherent locality to engagement and to practice thanks to the unavailability of boundaries (Wenger, 2010).

Consequently, as exploratory research, the main purpose of this research is to investigate a successful community based tourism enterprise in Burdur, Turkey. Specifically, the main rationale behind the study is to expand the literature by introducing how the community can really be the main actor and or the actual owner of a community based tourism enterprise rather than a factor to be controlled or given role as in previous studies extensively emphasize. We use the *Business Model Canvas* to examine how a well-designed CBTE creates value among stakeholders and clears the way for community individuals to involve in tourism by creating various sharing economy activities. The revealed business model of the case CBTE can serve as operationalisable mechanism for developing and implementing policies for the sharing economy, as well as contribute to formalizing community based tourism practices.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Community based tourism enterprises

CBTEs, as an economic-based and entrepreneurship-oriented business model, priorities community values in the business activities and it is usually considered for the empowerment of sustainable tourism development (Ngo et al., 2018). CBTEs (Spenceley, 2008; Zapata, Hall, Lindo, & Vanderschaeghe, 2011) have three principles: local community members' ownership of the business; full community involvement in the business management and operation; and the community as the main beneficiary from the business. By virtue of these principles, CBTEs are promising to spread tourism opportunities into the grassroots level and to deploy tourism benefits to the wider community (Simpson, 2008).

However, in CBT studies, researchers mostly focus on the roles of stakeholders who can create resource and operate CBT initiatives. In particular, these stakeholders include agencies from public and private industries, for-

profit and non-profit businesses, non-governmental organizations that create resources to partake community stakeholders in tourism (Okazaki, 2008; Stronza & Gordillo, 2008; Jamal & Gerz, 1995; Ngo et al., 2018; Simpson, 2008). However, the place of community individuals in CBT research is very limited. Researchers see community individuals as if they are a factor outside the tourism that needs to be controlled. They even developed the term community control in CBT (Ap, 1992). In another word, individuals in the communities are seen needy and CBT initiatives are casted with the leadership role responding to their needs. On the other hand, the extant limited numbers of studies (Zapata et al., 2011; Tosun, 2000; Novelli & Gebhardt, 2007) have developed theoretical models but these models present a framework that is not easy to operationalise though useful for explanation.

Hence, we need operationalisable mechanisms to better guide the actors in the involvement of the community individuals (Mowete and Thapa, 2015; Rodriguez and Prideaux, 2017). For example, Rodrigues and Prideaux (2017) emphasized that transfer of ownership from these external actors to the local community will be successful if the community has the necessary managerial skills to operate the project as a commercial business. The researchers proposed a management model that may be employed to empower the local community develop enterprises of this nature. Ngo, Hales and Lohmann (2018) examined the social entrepreneurship roles of stakeholders in underlying CBTE development. They exemplified that tour operators adopting social business models can facilitate the CBTE by clarifying the structure of benefits.

CBTEs could offer guidance with a developmental route enabling the establishment of a support network which in the longer term might benefit indigenous small and medium tourism enterprises (Manyara et al., 2006). Therefore, we need guidance or a model that shows how community individuals can be the owner and the main actor of CBTEs at micro, small and small and medium sized entrepreneurial roles. In this context, this paper aims to enhance the existing literature by examining a successful CBTE in Karakent Village in Burdur, Turkey. The success of involving and owning of community individuals through the social business model, our case CBTE will be explained by its three trivets; i) communities of practice ii), boundary objects, and iii) the sharing economy.

Social business model

A business model defines the rationale of how an organization creates, delivers, and captures value (Osterwalder & Pigneur, 2010). It comprises nine building blocks: customer segments, value proposition, channels, customer relationships, revenue streams, key activities, key resources, key partner and cost structure. Falling between for-profit and non-profit organizations and operating with a similar structure as a for-profit business, social business models (SBMs) are designed to address the world's pervasive social problems within these nine building blocks (Yunus, Moingeon, & Lehmann-Ortega, 2010; Wilson & Post, 2013). Here, the social impact and the sustainability of the model determine the profit (Bull and Crompton, 2006). SBMs target to serve society by building a balance among their social mission, revenue generation, and the types of social benefits they provide, funding, and their use of tangible and intangible assets (Day & Mody, 2016). They have both the potential to act as a change agent for the world, and sufficient business-like characteristics to ensure it survive to do so (Yunus et al., 2010). Therefore it contributes to how coordination and cooperation are brought about in such social business settings without the lacking

of time and limited socialization as traditional structures face emphasized by Meyerson Weick, and Kramer (1996, p. 167). The common mission of SBMs is to strengthen the sustainability practices in peripheral economies (Aziz & El Ebrashi, 2016). For example, Franzidis (2018) illustrated that how a social business model created an avenue to battle the obstacles that prevent particular stakeholders from engaging in tourism in a mid-range boutique hotel case in Nicaragua. Ngo et al. (2018) examined the social entrepreneurship roles of stakeholders in underlying CBTE development. They exemplified that tour operators adopting social business model can facilitate CBTEs by clarifying the structure of benefits. Sloan, Legrand and Kaufmann (2014) exemplified the applicability of community-based social entrepreneurial management systems as a means of fostering socio-economic development. They revealed that employment possibilities for local indigenous people led to improved living standards and protection of the local cultural traditions. Despite the growing importance of social business models, how such a business model can successfully be designed and operationalized within a CBTE is still limited.

Communities of practice and the sharing economy

To gain a better understanding of the participation pattern of community members and stakeholders within our case CBTE, we have adopted Wenger's (1998) communities of practice. Communities of practice represent groups of individuals who share a concern, a set of problems, or a passion about an issue, and who deepen their knowledge and expertise in this area by interaction on mutual engagement, joint enterprise, and a shared repertoire (Wenger, 1998; Wenger et al., 2002). In the concept, 'dispositional know-how' created out of practice and held by the community as a whole is emphasized (Brown & Duguid, 1998). In this community, an individual, enjoying a legitimate peripheral participation, learns how to function in the community and he/she is being enculturated instead of educated (Brown et al., 1989). This conveys the notion of group members knowing approximately the same things, experiencing things similarly, and having a common worldview (Lindkvist, 2005: 1195). Knowledge inheres situatedly in practice and creeps into and occupies the community members when they work jointly (Lindkvist, 2005: 1196). They solve problems quickly, transfer best practices, develop professional skills, and help companies recruit and retain talent (Wenger & Snyder, 2000). In our case CBTE, communities of practice are formed within a social business model attracted through project-based boundary objects. Besides the monetary profit, it mainly serves for extensification of the similar CBTEs by the local communities which represents its social profit.

Similarly, the sharing economy is mostly about knowledge creation, exploration, and exploitation especially with the ease of digital platforms. Here, the economy is a result of synchronization of organizational structures, processes and culture with open collaborative and collective learning processes in the surrounding communities, networks and stakeholder groups ensuring the integration of different internal and external knowledge sources (Hafkesbrink & Schroll, 2011). The sharing economy, especially within digital platforms, allow for quicker information exchange, richer media content, and seamless integration of geographically distant members, distributed communities of practice are rapidly becoming the standard, not the exception (Kerno, 2008, p. 71). Thanks to ease of IT networking, in theory, the extent of sharing of knowledge and learning is constant and easily world-wide (Komoski, 2007). The sharing economy also creates an invited space which is largely a necessity in CBT participation, compromising the

community's degree of voluntary involvement (Tosun, 2006). Similarly, sharing of knowledge to create co-production is defined as a success factor in sustainable development of CBTEs (Ngo et al., 2018).

Therefore, there is a substantial need to in-depth investigation of social impact of the sharing economy businesses have on the community (NSW Business Chamber, 2015: 5). The sharing economy platforms with their sui generis objects serves as common denominator of boundary objects and they give birth to community based informal and formal hybrid business models in the leadership of different knowledge bases and communities of practice. In another word, community members who see the benefits of sharing economy-based social business models are keen to establish informal organizations (Çakmak, Lie, & McCabe, 2018; Simpson, 2008). Through these organizations create monetary or social contributions; there is a greater sense of ownership and ability to become more self-sufficient (Dodds, Ali, & Galaski, 2018). In this manner, creating sharing economy through boundary objects within the ease of digital world can be assumed to be a strong platform for greening CBTEs within CBT. Hence, to better appeal the communities of practice, boundary objects are vital for the formation of the CBTE and creation of sharing economy. In a recent study, boundary objects is proven to be useful for creating CBT initiatives by the study of Matilainen et al (2018).

Boundary objects and communities of practice

The common interests among the communities of practice maybe the reason members work together for shared purposes (Hafkesbrink & Schroll, 2011). However common interests do not guarantee cooperation among the members. Still, they can be gathered around objects bounding and orchestrating those (Hafkesbrink & Schroll, 2011). Boundary objects are a kind of platforms that motivate unlike groups to work unitedly regardless of consensus (Star, 2010; Matilainen et al., 2018). In practice, boundary objects (e.g., jointly agreed tasks, physical artefacts or discussion forums) creates platforms that unite different groups to knowledge sharing and raise collective learning, in a way that each group suits a feasible role concerning the boundary object, and the boundary object allows them to interpret the knowledge of other groups to apply to the common goal (Matilainen et al., 2018). Hence, boundary objects are at once temporal, based in action, subject to reflection and local tailoring, and distributed throughout all of these dimensions (Star, 2010: 603). Hence any artefact that is actioned within groups may be a boundary object through elasticity and shared structures (Star, 2010).

The success of community based business models depend on well-defined objects. Because, the objects are the channels firms use to attract the community (Fosfuri, Giarranta & Roca, 2011). Firms see boundary objects (by actions, activities, policies) as community focused strategies to create a connection or relational bonds with one or more target communities of customers (Fosfuri et al., 2011). The management theorists regard the theory as mediating artefacts that have explanatory power, and can be a substantial means of fostering collaboration and encouraging the sharing of knowledge between distinctive stakeholders and communities (Sapsed & Salter, 2004). The theory is empirically tested and found to be a backbone concept in explaining CBT in recent study by Matilainen and his colleagues (2018). Hence, boundary objects theory is important for researchers to understand the participation behavior of communities to the tourism movement (Matilainen et al., 2018). For example, Fosfuri et al. (2011) found

that if values and symbols are formed congruent with those of the target community, the involvement of the community into any initiative is more possible. Similarly, community based tourism projects also need to be in harmony with the demands and benefits of the local communities and be designed in accordance with community norms (Snyman, 2012). For instance, Kiss (2004) emphasized the concrete goals needs to be drawn up in order to practice CBT rather than only motivating local communities with income. For instance, Ethiopian diaspora musical initiatives attract and build new affinity communities, whether through performances of traditional music and dance, or through new hybrid styles on the jazz and popular music scene (Shelemay, 2012). Hence, gravitational embedding forces must be created in order to expand the communities of practice (Hafkesbrink & Schroll, 2010).

Designing communities of practice through boundary objects by creating sharing economy, our case CBTE presents an industry-leading social business model for future CBTEs. To reveal how the model works, business model canvas is used. Since the case study has clear social objectives within project-based boundary objects, its model provides in-depth understanding and allows more flexibility as indicated by Yunus et al. (2010).

Case study Lisinia Doğa

Lisinia Doğa is a CBTE, at micro rural tourism destination level established in 2005 in the city of Burdur (known as region of lakes), Turkey. Being the most important city of Psidia region, it was named as Lisinia in ancient times, and our case CBTE takes its name (*Lisinia Doğa*) from here (Lisinia Doğa, 2018). The first mission of the Lisinia Doğa was to canalize the locals to new income models alternative to cattle farming. Because this farming has destroyed the balance of nature and causes water shortage and water pollution in the lakes and an increase in diseases like cancer. For this, lavender and juniper based agriculture projects developed. The reason behind this was twofold. First, both herbs consume only rainwater and pertinent to the region. Second, proving the profitability of final products (oils, honey, cosmetics) from these herbs with high added value was believed more profitable compared to current economic activities. It was critical for appealing and inducing the locals to practice the same models. With the time, the mission broadened to nine different projects (i.e., boundary objects) with the help of the increasing number of communities of practice (i.e. visitors). These are future without cancer in our hand; Lisinia nature school, native plant/production of animal species and gene reservation; keep Burdur Lake alive; volunteer nature protector; Lisinia takes its energy from nature, wildlife rehabilitation and ecological production/ eco-friendly agricultural practices (Lisinia Doğa, 2018; Ongun, Sop, Yeşiltaş ve Ekiztepe, 2017). These are the objects that bound and widen the communities of practice of it. Through these projects, the Lisinia Doğa provides a venue for its daily activities and operations with “learning by doing” environment and other benefits to the communities.

With the time, these projects have turned Lisinia Doğa into a micro rural tourism destination visited by tourists. The tour operators have developed package tours including Lisinia Doğa (i.e., region of lake tours). The founder of and the owner of the centre, Öztürk Sarıca (veterinary surgeon born and raised in the area), defines the project as a rural tourism centre which is owned by communities from all around of the world. Ongun et al. (2017), in their study, also defined Lisinia Doğa under the ecotourism concept. In this context, it can be defined as a real-life example of a true CBTE. It is also a unique example of how a single man creates and leads a sharing economy platform for greening

a CBTE by gathering communities of practice (visitors and volunteers) around boundary objects adopting a social business model within the theme of a micro rural tourism destination. The guidance framed by the boundary objects (i.e., projects) attract community individuals to become a part of CBTE and on the other hand dynamize empowerment roles of stakeholders within the role of mastery or advisory based on knowledge sharing. The income from tourism is mostly transposed to the sustainability and spreading of the projects. For example, Mr. Öztürk has been invited to EXPO Taiwan for six months to present and teach Lisinia Doğa's projects. Thirty countries have already adopted its projects. This was possible thanks to the successful creation of communities of practice.

METHODOLOGY

We preferred a case study approach for collecting and analysing data. Case study approach examines a current fact within its real-life framework, especially in the cases in which the boundaries between phenomenon and context blurred (Yin, 2003). It can solve a common problem through analysis of a specific sample (Beeton, 2005). This approach was applied to explain community participation in situ (Creswell, 2013). Lisinia Doğa as a case study was intentionally picked since it meets the three criteria: that are case reputation (Miles, Huberman, & Saldana, 2014); exemplifying a phenomenon (Creswell, 2013); and conceptual relevance of the case (Miles et al., 2014). Moreover, it fits the measure of a social business model that is self-sustaining from the profit gained by the business, has identified projects with different social objects.

Non-participant unstructured observation technique through site visits for observations and face-to-face interviews with the members of communities of practice (visitors) were conducted by the lead author. Unstructured observation is preferred since less structure is needed for broad, exploratory, and early-stage research (Guest, Namey & Mitchell, 2013: 92). Such elasticity offers one the opportunity to shift focus, pursue emergent aspects of the phenomenon, and investigate a variety of issues (Grove & Fisk, 1992). All of the interviews were a conversational style and open-ended. Notes from interviews were later transcribed by the author as relevant to the themes in the business model canvas. Researchers focusing on the business model as a tool will operationalize the business model with specific frameworks and representations such as the business model canvas (Osterwalder & Pigneur, 2009). As known theoretical patterns in the literature help researchers to explore and observe organizational practices (Abah, 2017). Moreover, observation or direct measurement (Rienhold, Zach & Krizaj, 2017) and conceptual elements that allow direct measurement or observation (e.g. activities, profit formula) are used to specify the business model (Zott & Amit, 2010). During the observation, we focused on participation practices of the communities of practice. As known the fundamental frame of unstructured observation method lies in its focus on the rules (i.e., theories in the literature) leading social behavior and the social structure (e.g., communities of practice) of the culture (i.e., the unit of analysis) being researched (Gillham, 2008: 45).

The interviews and observation were supplemented by secondary information, including photographic documentation, annual reports, printed and visual media sources, and web and social media content. Data relevant to community participation were approached inductively. Notes from interviews and observation were used to design the deep, subtle meanings (Aull Davies, 2008) as relevant to the categories in the business model canvas. Solid,

definite portrayals were then utilized to fictionalize the script of involvement of communities of practice and business model of the case CBTE following Flyvbjerg (2006) and through content analysis (Kohlbacher, 2005).

FINDINGS

The components in the business model canvas (Osterwalder and Pigneur, 2010) have been described relevant to Lisinia Doğa. The business model of the Lisinia Doğa is a social business model. The main mission of this model is to be a role model that teaches community individuals how to become a CBTE what roles the stakeholders can play in the developments of such initiatives. Each component in the model relies on the three factors as discussed in the literature that are i) communities of practice ii), boundary objects, and iii) the sharing economy. From Table 1 to Table 9, below is a portrayal of each of the components of the model as it relates to the case CBTE Lisinia Doğa. Findings are grouped and presented according to the component in Osterwalder and Pigneur’ (2010) canvas, and explained within theoretical background of the study within the Tables.

Table 1. Lisinia Doğa Business Model Canvas

| Key partnerships in Lisinia Doğa Business Model Canvas | |
|--|--|
| Key partnerships | Communities of practice and their roles |
| <p>Every visitor forms communities of practice and key partners. They disseminate the missions of the projects of Lisinia Doğa through online or offline platforms in context of what they learn within learning by doing environment.</p> <p>The partnerships especially with the community are strong since the projects involve boundary objects which are well-defined under different themes (i.e., projects) within a learning atmosphere.</p> <p>As on the right column, the roles the communities of practice play explain why they are identified as communities of practice.</p> | <p><i>Volunteers (visitors)</i> Work in the projects and share what they learn on online and offline platforms.</p> |
| | <p><i>Local residents</i> Support the projects by their labour power and knowledge and create awareness to the projects among the communities in the region.</p> |
| | <p><i>Local state institutions and organizations</i> Providing land for sustainability of the projects and orienting students in all levels of education learn the projects of the Lisinia Doğa.</p> |
| | <p><i>Global Environment Organization (GEO)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Sharing members with Lisinia Doğa, -Cooperating in the projects of the Lisinia Doğa in the areas of selection and placement of volunteers; educating the educators from Turkey and all-around of the world; forming training pattern; preparing courseware; managing press relations, -The educated volunteers then train the students from the schools in Burdur about the projects identified in key activities in the canvas based on a hands-on training model. The students then are given certificates and trophies as evidence of their successful completion of the course work, -The main purpose of education programs is to provide lifelong learning outcomes. |
| | <p><i>Ankara University, Faculty of Veterinary (The first faculty in the field in Turkey with the support of UNESCO)</i> Lisinia Doğa, one of the first wildlife rehabilitation centers, provides internship opportunities for the faculty students. Then the students gain awareness and spread what they experience here through online and offline platforms.</p> |
| | <p><i>İksir cosmetics</i> Lisinia Doğa cooperates with İksir cosmetics in creating final-products (e.g. natural care creams extracted from lavender and juniper) for visitors to better sustain the center’s projects missions with profits from these products. Before the cooperation, the oils extracted from the lavender and juniper used to be exported as byproducts which has low profit comparing to current final-products.</p> |
| | <p><i>Different institutions and organizations</i> EU and Turkish National Agency creates funds for the projects. For example, an Erasmus + project titled “Different Cultures Maintaining the Burdur Lake” were used to fund the creation of awareness to extinction of the Lake Burdur. Hence, the attention of MAWA foundation, the Doğa and the BirdLife International has been taken.</p> |

Table 1. (Continue)

| Key activities in Lisinia Doğa Business Model Canvas | |
|--|---|
| Key activities | Project-based boundary objects |
| <p>Relying on projects, boundary objects are created within the themes and activities in the projects.</p> <p>This approach creates the basement for the communities of practice. There are nine main projects (boundary objects) in Lisinia Doğa. The orientation in activities is living, learning, and sharing.</p> | <p><i>Future without Cancer in Our Hand</i> “Cancer House” and “Cancer Pyramids” built (wood-made) to visualize how the cancer affects human body. Courses and programs make sure that students and the visitors learn how to be safe from such chemicals through practices of drugless and organic agriculture. For this, they learn the basics of homeopathy and phytotherapy by practical examples.</p> |
| | <p><i>From Lisinia to World; Keep Burdur Lake Alive to Live Less</i> water consuming production models are created, illustrated, and thought in the center. For example, by now, the use of using drips irrigation system in all surrounding villages increased by %20. Local plants, especially lavender and juniper that consumes only rainwater have been revitalized and commercialized for the sustainability of the projects and recognition in the region. High water need of cattle-raising has decreased by the intensive studies of goat and sheep farming. The purpose here was also to reach the true value of Burdur. Because, though Burdur is known as the capital region of goat farming for centuries, thanks to heavy cattle-raising, it is now likened to Holland and named as little Holland in Turkey. The more the models are profitable and sustainable, the more the local community involvement adopting the models has been reached. High income from the production of honey, jams, tomato paste, cosmetics, oils and different side products such as organic soaps have increased the local’s appetite. Especially, the panoramic scene of the lavender has attracted many visitors. Hence, a sustainable and higher income model for the local community has been exemplified practically. Hence, the models are expected to be adopted by local villages, region-wide, country-wide and later the world. In the center, locals learn operational functions and practices of the model based on the on-the-job training. How these models (agriculture and stockbreeding) have advantages over current income models have been emphasized in the training. For the long term sustainability of the project, the kids in the region are given special attention by intensive practical training. Establishing the communication of the project with different stakeholders is highly emphasized. For example, non-governmental organizations from all regions of Turkey and eight countries in Europe have involved in this project. The communication is continuous through cooperation in developing the infrastructure of similar projects and information exchange in different parts of the world.</p> |
| | <p><i>Wildlife rehabilitation</i> Animals, shot by hunters, poisoned by chemicals and diseased ones, is retreated and reintroduced to their natural environment.</p> |
| | <p><i>Lisinia Nature School</i> The themes of the training programs include; smart use of water, actions against global warming, the importance of wildlife, biological diversity, organic farming techniques, chemical treatment.</p> |
| | <p><i>Volunteer nature protector</i> The participants are trained within teacher education training program to spread the projects around the world.</p> |
| | <p><i>Ecological Production / Eco-Friendly Agriculture Practices</i> Zero-chemical production, revitalization of the forgotten local products and the production methods unique to the region. The products are certificated with organic-agriculture label and eco-label to create a sustainable economy.</p> |
| | <p><i>Native plants and animals</i> All products in the center have been produced from endemic seeds and animals (e.g., Honamlı goat). The villagers believing in the projects provided these sources. A gene bank for seeds is also established for the support of future CBTEs.</p> |
| | <p><i>Lisinia Takes Its Energy from Nature</i> How sun, wind, and water provide 100% clean energy is illustrated.</p> |
| | <p><i>Lavender stream project</i> The lavender is the basement of all the projects. The project aims to teach locals how to create income through lavender planting. Lavender creates a very good income with its side products such as honey, oils, cosmetics, and scenery for photographic tourism. Moreover, it consumes less water, prevents erosion, rehabilitates the soil, and puts barren soils into place, the betterment of the lands left behind by unrestrained marble quarries.</p> |

Table 1. (Continue)

| Value proposition in Lisinia Doğa Business Model Canvas | |
|--|--|
| Value propositions | Lisinia Doğa offers; |
| <p>The key partners create the value propositions based on learning by doing and sharing what they learn. Hence, the values are uniquely perceived by individuals' own experiences.</p> | <p><i>at individual-level;</i> raising awareness to protect the local and endemic values, -crafting and living individuals' own experience, learning to live in harmony with nature and do more with less and remain healthy, methods to live without cancer, benefit from nature, add value to nature, visitors to create their own product, getting unique photographs from the biggest lavender field in the world, and certification of the visitor experience as proof of learning.</p> |
| | <p><i>at group-level;</i> different business models for the CBTEs under the theme of rural tourism, teaching and counseling local individuals for their CBTEs regardless of size, the stakeholders can easily identify their roles thanks to clear objects and activities, especially how the government can play a leadership role in developing and supporting CBTEs is illustrated (e.g., land incentives, supporting training programs), and how to transform into tourism business enterprise through the local values.</p> |
| Customer relationship in Lisinia Doğa Business Model Canvas | |
| Customer relationship | Cues |
| <p>There is no customer in the Lisinia Doğa. The participators are identified as the members the communities of practice. The relationship with them is based on sharing and creating values. In this manner, as long as the mission and vision are shareable, the relationship is endless. The individuals feel belonged since the involvement is high.</p> | <p>Showing that everyone can reach to natural life without any exception such as economic and social.</p> |
| | <p>Mutual hospitality</p> |
| | <p>Cooperation on strong boundary objects</p> |
| | <p>Harmony with the rest of the other parts of the business model</p> |
| Customer segment in Lisinia Doğa Business Model Canvas | |
| Customer segment | Cues |
| <p>People from all around the world are welcomed to learn, practice, and spread the mission of the Lisinia Doğa.</p> | <p>Any person that has an interest in the mission and the projects of Lisinia Doğa are welcomed.</p> |
| | <p>Individuals that have interest and awareness to healthy and natural life, rural tourism, and learning orientation in their travel experience are welcomed.</p> |
| Continue Key resource in Lisinia Doğa Business Model Canvas | |
| Visionary management | The managerial abilities to produce and operate boundary objects within a well-established mission and vision |
| Ownership | The single man ownership has made it easy to deploy ownership among the community individuals and create belongingness among the visitors. Moreover, the ease in decision making thanks to high community involvement makes the operations dynamic. |
| People's tendency to learn (i.e., Communities of practice) | People look for ways to enrich their travel experiences and ask for more involvement into creation process of their journeys. |
| Sharing platforms | People are eager to share what they learn thanks to information technologies, and this promotes the Lisinia Doğa to global arena. |
| Demand conditions | The rising awareness to healthy and natural products. |
| A rich flow of information | A wide variety of experiences of communities of practice (e.g., vocational, thinking styles) enriches the information and learning based service experience in the center. |
| Harmony in nature | The endemic natural wealth (soil, plants, and animal genes) empowers the quick adoption of projects by residents in the region |
| Clustering | The clustering of the similar projects in the region has begun to create economies of scale in the region. |
| Location/Accessibility | Lisinia Doğa is very close (1.5-2.5 hours) to the main tourist destinations (Antalya and Muğla, 15 million visitors in 2018) in Turkey. |
| Hospitality | Tourism activities are well accepted by the community thanks to the hospitality of the region. |

Table 1. (Continue)

| Distribution Channel in Lisina Doğa Business Model Canvas | |
|---|--|
| Social media platforms | Visitors sharing photos and information on social media platforms such as Instagram, Facebook, and different travel blogs |
| Networking platforms | www.helpx.net, www.workaway.info, sanito.org, www.geo.org.tr, www.Lisia.com, and the key partners (see Table 1) |
| Education institutions | Primary and secondary level schools, universities, and other education-related programs |
| Exhibitions | For example, a miniature of the Lisina Doğa has been built and exhibited at the 2018 Taichung World Flora EXPO for six months in Taiwan as a guest. |
| Leadership | Visitors gain appreciation from each other and Dr. Öztürk in creating communities of practice. |
| On-premise sales | Visitors have a chance to buy what they produce during their visit. |
| Cost structure in Lisina Doğa Business Model Canvas | |
| Refusing grants | For sustainable corporate governance, to prevent conflict of interest because of power and authority, and to be able to sustain the deployment the ownership of the center to the communities of practice, no grants or incentives are accepted. |
| Transfer of ownership | Ownership of the land of Lisinia Doğa transferred to the state for ten years. To be able to rehabilitate animals from nature obliges the involvement of the state. Even so, the local state allows operating project activities in this land thanks to their belief in mission and projects. |
| Break taboos | To convince the locals to abandon current improper practices (e.g., high water consumption and intensive chemical use, and cattle farming), we bear the cost of intensive time, patient, and fund. |
| Intensive communication | Being active on online and offline platforms through channels (see Table 7) to sustain the sharing economy and attract communities of practice |
| Fixed costs | Such as meals for volunteers, medication for animal rehabilitation, and transportation |
| Revenue stream in Lisina Doğa Business Model Canvas | |
| Soft revenue streams | |
| Belief and non-monetary local government grants | Ease of dissemination of projects and training programs through educational institutions and the similar projects in the city is supported by the local government especially through land incentivisation. |
| Awareness | The more the project proliferated in the local, regional and global levels, the more motivation among the participants and resource created. |
| Hard revenue streams | |
| Product development | High value-added products developed and sold within the projects (especially organic and edible cosmetics, medicinal liquids, oils, soaps, colognes, honey, and concentrated food) |
| Certification | Ecological labeling provides high revenues from the products. |

The main mission of the business model is to present an encouraging and operative model in creating CBTEs. Especially, local residents and visitors from different rural economies witness and learn how to establish and operate CBTEs. In this business model, the economy of scale is created and being sustained within the community itself when the community stakeholders share intangible and tangible possessions that can be transferred at insignificant costs thanks to sharing economy and boundary objects. Such an economic structure creates a barrier to the dominance of out of local investors (i.e., in search of excessive profit making and causing over commercialization) and exposes sustainability rooted within community involvement for the area. The formation and operation of the mission within the learning orientation provide the dynamic capabilities. Exploiting and exploring key resources depending on the abilities of the communities of practice creates organizational ambidexterity for the case CBTE. For example, the exploitation of the forgotten indigenous plants and animal species are then explored with value-added products through key partnerships is explored.

Moreover, the clarity and variety of boundary objects and activities form a learning platform at which people experience and exchange knowledge. At the same time, the project-based boundary objects illuminate the different stakeholders to see what roles they can play. Thus dissemination of mission among the members of communities of practice is strongly supported by a diverse range of stakeholders from various online and offline platforms. For example, after participating in 2018 Taichung World Flora EXPO for six months, a return visit is made from Taiwan Economy and Culture Representative Office. The parties have built a trade collaboration regarding tourism. As a first step, Taiwan orchids will be exhibited in Lisinia Doğa for six months in 2019. Hence these kinds of boundary objects bring along a wide repertoire of visitors from all-around of the world and strengthen the sustainability and spreading of the missions of the Lisinia Doğa.

CONCLUSION

This research exemplifies the use of the business model canvas to reveal an operationalisable mechanism of a CBTE for the success of future CBT practices. Our case CBTE, representing a social business model by collaborative networks in the platforms of learning, teaching, production, consumption, sustainability, and awareness-raising based on boundary objects, demonstrates that exploiting sharing economy and communities of practice can be a new driver to the success of CBT initiatives, especially at the entrepreneurial level. Successful transformation of communities of practice by creating sharing economy into social entrepreneurship can ease the community individuals establish CBTEs upon clarifying the benefits of such business models.

This research illustrates that the sustainability of social benefits in this business model is characterized by a high degree of financial independence from grants and charities as similar to the case studies of Sloan, Legrand, and Kaufmann (2014). In this manner, social business models can be a sustainable approach for CBTEs without losing focus on business profits. Because, expecting quick income from mass tourism, many developing countries intensively rely on inappropriate land uses disregarding carrying capacities and earnings leak out into foreign investors and intermediary dependency as emphasized by Franzidis (2018). Hence, the well-thought involvement of the community members through boundary objects in every part of the business model (from key activities to revenue stream) should guide the operation of the future entrepreneurs in creating social, economic and environmental value creating successful CBT practices. On the other hand, this research reveals that the deployment of ownership to the community at the individual level can produce many advantages in terms of sustainable CBT practices as illustrated in our case study of Lisinia Doğa. It can also be pointed out that teaching the local residents how to create social and economic added value using indigenous possessions; rural tourism has been proven a perfectly suitable platform to do that. In another word, the case study shows that when the rural tourism platform is well-rooted and themed within the social business model, how social, economic, and environmental profits can be created in harmony by exploring and exploiting the indigenous resources in the region. The success of the Lisinia Doğa in indigenous resources based rural tourism has attracted locals demanding to adopt similar models. The local government had responded to this demand with a project in which lavender streams from Burdur to the lake of Salda (known as the Maldives of Turkey) covering a sixty kilometer will be supported by government land to the locals. In the project (to be completed in 2019), the local people are given state lands and free lavender seedlings and a publicity agency for the project. Private

tours have already begun with the increasing economies of scale under the different themes of roses-lakes-lavenders. Undoubtedly, the case CBTE exemplifies that tourism can involve the local community, instead of just foreign investors or local chosen ones provided that it is developed in a socially responsible manner as mentioned by Franzidis (2018) and by creating sharing economy. Here, the creation of a platform organization where communities of practice can function independently is crucial. Because, communities of practice organize themselves, meaning they draw their own roadmap and establish their own leadership (Wenger & Snyder, 2000). Similarly, successful involvement role (i.e., employment) of social tourism enterprises in their operational models were found vital for their success in the case studies of Weppen and Cochrane (2012). In this manner, the case CBTE provides such a platform within a business model (showing also operational cues) that different CBT businesses or initiatives can follow.

Last, this research examined a CBTE at the micro tourism destination level, in a specific geographical site. Further case study research needs to be performed in different entrepreneurial scenarios where the transformative power of the social business model with different boundary objects has on the involvement of communities into tourism and create sharing economy. Such models will provide a clear understanding of how such mechanisms can be operated in different organizational levels to advance the CBT research. Moreover, a comparative approach among the case studies will help to uncover the salience, relevance, and determinance of the factors that will help us to understand the success of such mechanisms in CBT practices.

REFERENCES

- Ap, J. (1992). Resident's perceptions on tourism impacts. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 19(1), 665–690. doi: 10.1016/0160-7383(92)90060-3
- Abah, E. O. (2017). *Administrative and Management Principals, Theories and Practice*. Uganda: Lambert Academic Publishing.
- Aull Davies, C. (2008). *Reflexive ethnography* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.
- Aziz, H. A., & El Ebrashi, R. (2016). A business model design process for social enterprises: the critical role of the environment. *International Journal of Social, Behavioral, Educational, Economic, Business and Industrial Engineering*, 10(5), 1527-1533.
- Beeton, S. (2005). The case study in tourism research: a multi-method case study approach. In Ritchie, B. et al. (Eds.), *Tourism Research Methods: Integrating Theory with Practice*, (pp. 37-48). UK: CAB International.
- Bertella, G., & Romanelli, C. R. (2018). Tourism Initiatives Developed through Collaboration with Foreign Organizations: The Emergence of Responsible Practices in Cuba. *Tourism Planning and Development*, 15(3), 260-276. doi: 10.1080/21568316.2017.1349688
- Brown, J. S., Collins, A., & Duguid, P. (1989). Situated cognition and the culture of learning. *Educational Researcher*, 18, 32-42. doi: 10.3102/0013189X018001032

- Brown, J. S., & Duguid, P. (1998). Organizing knowledge. *California Management Review*, 40, 90-111. doi: 10.2307/41165945
- Bull, M., & Crompton, H. (2006). Business practices in social enterprises. *Social Enterprise Journal*, 2(1), 42-60. doi: 10.1108/17508610680000712
- Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks: SAGE.
- Çakmak, E., Lie, R., & McCabe, S. (2018). Reframing informal tourism entrepreneurial practices: Capital and field relations structuring the informal tourism economy of Chiang Mai. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 72, 37-47. doi: 10.1016/j.annals.2018.06.003
- Day, J., & Mody, M. (2017). Social Entrepreneurship Typologies and Tourism: Conceptual Frameworks. In Sheldon P. & Daniele R. (eds.). *Social Entrepreneurship and Tourism* (pp. 57-80) Cham: Springer.
- Dredge, D., & Gyimóthy, S. (2015). The collaborative economy and tourism: Critical perspectives, questionable claims and silenced voices. *Tourism Recreation Research*, 40(3), 286-302. doi: 10.1080/02508281.2015.1086076
- Dodds, R., Ali, A., & Galaski, K. (2018). Mobilizing knowledge: Determining key elements for success and pitfalls in developing community-based tourism. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 21(13), 1547-1568. doi: 10.1080/13683500.2016.1150257
- Flyvbjerg, B. (2006). Five misunderstandings about case-study research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 12(2), 219-245.
- Franzidis, A. (2018). An examination of a social tourism business in Granada, Nicaragua. *Tourism Review*, doi:10.1108/Tr-04-2017-0076
- Fosfuri, A., Giarranta, M. S., & Roca, E. (2011). Community-focused strategies. *Strategic Organization*. 9(3): 222-239. doi: 10.1177/1476127011415248
- Geheb, K., & Mapedza, E. (2008). The political ecologies of bright spots. In D. Bossio & K. Geheb (Eds.), *Conserving land, protecting water* (pp. 51-68). Wallingford: CABI.
- Grove, S.J., & Fisk, R.P. (1992). Observational data collection methods for services marketing: An Overview. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 20(3), 217-224. doi: 10.1007/BF02723408
- Gössling, S. and Hall, C. M. (2019). Sharing versus collaborative economy: how to align ICT developments and the SDGs in tourism?. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 27(1): 74-96. 10.1080/09669582.2018.1560455
- Guest, G., Namey, E. E., & Mitchell, M. L. (2013). *Collecting Qualitative Data A Field Manual for Applied Research*, California: Sage.
- Hafkesbrink, J., & Schroll, M. (2010). *Business Model Innovation in the Digital and New Media Economy*. Innowise research consulting. Retrived from <http://www.innowise.de/en/node/21>.

- Hafkesbrink, J., & Schroll, M. (2011). Innovation 3.0: Embedding into community knowledge-collaborative organizational learning beyond open innovation. *Journal of Innovation Economics and Management*, 1(7), 55-92.
- Heo, C. Y. (2016). Sharing economy and prospect in tourism research. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 58, 166-170.
- Jamal, T. B., & Getz, D. (1995). Collaboration theory and community tourism planning. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 22(1), 186-204. doi: 10.1016/0160-7383(94)00067-3
- Kerno, S. J. (2008). Limitations of Communities of Practice A Consideration of Unresolved Issues and Difficulties in the Approach. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 15(1), 69-78. doi: 10.1177/1548051808317998
- Kang, S. Kim, W. G., & Song, H. (2019): Exploring the role of travel and tourism in sharing economy activities: A case study of South Korea. *Journal of Quality Assurance in Hospitality and Tourism*, doi: 10.1080/1528008X.2019.1579079
- Kiron, D., Palmer, D., Phillips, A. N., & Kruschwitz, N. (2012). Social Business: What are Companies Really Doing?. *MITSloan Management Review, Research Report*, 1-28.
- Kiss, A. (2004). Is community-based ecotourism a good use of biodiversity conservation funds?. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, 19(5), 231-237.
- Kohlbacher, F. (2005). The use of qualitative content analysis in case study research. *Forum Qualitative Social Research. Qualitative Social Research*, 7(1), 1-30. doi: 10.17169/fqs-7.1.75
- Komoski, K. (2007). 21st Century Teachers as Prosumers in a Bi-literate Knowledge-Driven Global Economy. In R. Carlsen, K. McFerrin, J. Price, R. Weber & D. Willis (Eds.), *Proceedings of SITE 2007--Society for Information Technology & Teacher Education International Conference* (pp. 1303-1311). San Antonio, Texas, USA: Association for the Advancement of Computing in Education (AACE). Retrieved from <https://www.learntechlib.org/primary/p/24742/>.
- Lindkvist, L. (2005). Knowledge Communities and Knowledge Collectivities: A Typology of Knowledge Work in Groups. *Journal of Management Studies*, 42(6): 1189-1210. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-6486.2005.00538.x
- Lisinia Doğa (2018, March). Projects. Retrieved from <https://www.lisinia.com/en/projects.html>
- Manyara, G., Jones, E., & Botterill, D. (2006). Tourism and poverty reduction: The case for indigenous enterprise development in Kenya. *Tourism, Culture and Communication*, 7(1), 19–38.
- Matilainen, A., Suutari, T., Lahdesmaki, M., & Koski, P. (2018). Management by boundaries-Insights into the role of boundary objects in a community-based tourism development project. *Tourism Management*, 67, 284-296. doi: 10.1016/j.tourman.2018.02.003
- Meyerson, D., Weick, K. E. & Kramer, R. M. (1996). Swift trust and temporary groups. In Kramer, R. M. & Tyler, T. R. (Eds), *Trust in Organizations* (166-195). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Michelini, L., & Fiorentino, D. (2012). New business models for creating shared value. *Social Responsibility Journal*, 8(56), 1-577. doi: 10.1108/17471111211272129
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldana, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Mowete, N., & Thapa, B. (2015). Factors that influence support for community-based ecotourism in the rural communities adjacent to the Kgalagadi Park, Botswana. *Journal of Ecotourism*, 4(2-3), 243-263. doi: 10.1080/14724049.2015.1051537
- Ngo, T., Hales, R. and Lohmann, G. (2018). Collaborative marketing for the sustainable development of community-based tourism enterprises: a reconciliation of diverse perspectives. *Current Issues in Tourism*. 1-18.
- NSW Business Chamber (2015, November). *The Sharing Economy: Issues, Impacts, and Regulatory Responses in the Context of the NSW Visitor Economy*. Retrieved from <https://www.nswbusinesschamber.com.au/NSWBC/media/Policy/Tourism/Sharing-Economy-Issues-Impacts-and-Regulatory-Responses-COMBINED-POLICY-9-11-15.pdf>
- Novelli, M., & Gebhardt, K. (2007). Community based tourism in Namibia: ‘Reality Show’ or ‘Window Dressing’? *Current Issues in Tourism*, 10(5), 443-479. 10.2167/cit332.0
- Okazaki, E. (2008). A community-based tourism model: Its conception and use. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 16(5), 511-529.
- Ongun, U., Yeşiltaş, M., Sop, S. A., and Ekiztepe, B. A. (2017). Alternatif bir ekoturizm merkezinin incelenmesi: Lisinia Doğa örneği. *Akademik Araştırmalar ve Çalışmalar Dergisi*, 9(16), 49-60.
- Osterwalder, A. and Pigneur, Y. (2009). *Business Model Generation – A Handbook for Visionaires, Game Changers, and Challengers*. Amsterdam: Osterwalder & Pigneur.
- Osterwalder A, Pigneur Y (2010). *Business Model Generation – A Handbook for Visionaries, Game Changers and Challengers*. New Jersey: John Wiley and Sons.
- Poon, D. (2011). The emergence and development of social enterprise sectors. *Social Impact Research Experience (SIRE)*, Retrieved from <http://repository.upenn.edu/sire/8>.
- Putnam, R. D. (1995). Bowling alone: America’s declining social capital. *Journal of Democracy*, 6(1), 65-78. doi: 10.1007/978-1-349-62397-6_12
- Reinhold, S., Zach, F. J., & Krizaj, D. (2017), *Business Models in Tourism: A Review and Research Agenda*, *Tourism Review*, 72(4), 462-482. doi: 10.1108/TR-05-2017-0094
- Rifkin, J. (2015). *The Zero Marginal Cost Society: The Internet of Things, the Collaborative Commons, and the Eclipse of Capitalism*. New York: Palgrave MacMillian.

- Rodriguez, C. B., & Prideaux, B. (2017) A management model to assist local communities developing community-based tourism ventures: a case study from the Brazilian Amazon, *Journal of Ecotourism*, 17(1), 1-19. doi: 10.1080/14724049.2017.1309045
- Sapsed, J., & Salter, A. (2004). Postcards from the edge: Local communities, global programs and boundary objects. *Organization Studies*, 25(9), 1515-1534.
- Simpson, M. C. (2008). Community benefit tourism initiatives- A conceptual oxymoron? *Tourism Management*, 29, 1-18. doi: 10.1016/j.tourman.2007.06.005
- Shelemay, K. K. (2012). Rethinking the Urban Community: (Re)mapping Musical Processes and Places. *Urban People*, 14(2): 207-226.
- Sloan, P., Legrand, W., & Kaufmann, C. S. (2014). A survey of social entrepreneurial community-based hospitality and tourism initiatives in developing economies: A new business approach for industry. *Worldwide Hospitality and Tourism Themes*, 6(1), 51-61.
- Snyman, S. L. (2012). The role of tourism employment in poverty reduction and community perceptions of conservation and tourism in Southern Africa. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 20(3), 395-416. doi: 10.1080/09669582.2012.657202
- Sourland, J., Knollenberg, W., Boley, B. B., Perdue, R. R., & McGehee, N. G. (2018). Social Capital and Destination Strategic Planning. *Tourism Management*, 69: 189-200. doi: 10.1016/j.tourman.2018.06.011
- Spenceley, A. (2008). Local impacts of community-based tourism in Southern Africa. In A. Spenceley (Ed.), *Responsible tourism: Critical issues for conservation and development* (pp. 159-187). London: Earthscan.
- Stronza, A., & Gordillo, J. (2008). Community views of ecotourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 35(2), 448-468. doi: 10.1016/j.annals.2008.01.002
- Star, S. L. (2010). This is not a Boundary Object: Reflections on the Origin of a Concept. *Science, Technology, & Human Values*. 35(5): 601-617. doi: 10.1177/0162243910377624
- Tosun, C. (2006). Expected nature of community participation in tourism development. *Tourism Management*, 27(3), 493-504. doi: 10.1016/j.tourman.2004.12.004
- Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case Study: Design and Methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Yunus, M., Moingeon, B., & Lehmann-Ortega, L. (2010). Building Social Business Models: Lessons from the Grameen Experience. *Long Range Planning*, 43, 308-325. doi: 10.1016/j.lrp.2009.12.005
- Zapata, M. J., Hall, C. M., Lindo, P., & Vanderschaeghe, M. (2011). Can community-based tourism contribute to development and poverty alleviation? Lessons from Nicaragua. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 14(8), 725-749. doi: 10.1080/13683500.2011.559200

- Zott, C., & Amit, R. (2010), Business Model Design: an Activity System Perspective. *Long Range Planning*, 43(2/3), 216-226. doi: 10.1016/j.lrp.2009.07.004
- Wilson, F., & Post, J. E. (2013). Business models for people, planet (& profits): exploring the phenomena of social business, a market-based approach to social value creation. *Small Business Economics*, 40, doi: 715-737. 10.1007/s11187-011-9401-0
- Wenger, E. C. (2010). Communities of Practice and Social Learning Systems: the Career of a Concept. *Social Learning Systems and Communities of Practice*, 179–198. doi: 10.1007/978-1-84996-133-2_11
- Wenger, E. C. (1998). *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning, and Identity*. New York: Cambridge: University Press.
- Wenger E. C., & Snyder W. M. (2000). Communities of practice: The organizational frontier. *Harvard Business Review*, 78(1), 139-146.
- Wenger, E. C., McDermott, R., & Snyder, W. M. (2002). *A Guide to Managing Knowledge: Cultivating Communities of Practice*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Weppen, J., & Cochrane, J. (2012). Social enterprises in tourism: an exploratory study of operational models and success factors. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 20(3), 497-511.