A Logit Model for Entrepreneurs' Support in Tourism: Case Study for the island of Mauritius

Vanessa GB Gowreesunkar
University of Africa, Toru Orua, Nigeria

Seraphin Hugues
University of Winchester, Reino Unido

Mustafeed Zaman
Department of Marketing, EM Normandie Business School, Francia

Abstract

■ There is growing evidence that tourism entrepreneurs not only contribute in the socio-economic development of a nation but also in the overall attractiveness of a destination. In fact, numerous studies on the topic have led researchers to conclude that local entrepreneurs are important stakeholders and their supportiveness and/or non-supportiveness has a considerable impact on overall tourism development of a nation. Mauritius, as a small beach destination, is not exempt from this phenomenon. The island, which is popular for its sea, sun and sand, is dependent on its tourism enterprises to promote local resources and sustain tourism businesses. As a result, understanding the exact factors that account for local entrepreneurs' support and/or non-support for tourism is important, failing which it might be difficult to develop tourism in a sustainable and socially compatible manner. At present, there is a dearth of research in the field of tourism entrepreneurship in Mauritius whereas this sector continues to be an important pillar of the local tourism industry. To address this knowledge gap, the present study analyses local entrepreneurs' support for tourism development in a specific region of Mauritius. Methodologically, the study takes place using the mixed mode. The quantitative part of the study related to the administration of questionnaires and these were followed by the development of a hypotheses meant to be tested in a logistic regression model. The qualitative data was derived from semi-structured interviews conducted with formal and informal tourism entrepreneurs. The findings cul-

Resumen

■ Cada vez existen más evidencias de que el emprendimiento en el sector turístico no solo contribuye al desarrollo socioeconómico de un país, sino también al atractivo general de un destino. De hecho, numerosos estudios sobre el tema han llevado a los investigadores a concluir que los emprendedores locales son una parte importante y que su apoyo y/o la falta de apoyo tienen un impacto considerable en el desarrollo turístico general de un país. Mauricio, como pequeño destino de sol y playa, no está exento de este fenómeno. La isla, que es conocida por su mar, sol y arena, depende de las empresas turísticas para promover los recursos locales y mantener los negocios turísticos. Como consecuencia, comprender cuales son los factores exactos que explican el apoyo de los emprendedores locales y/o la falta de apoyo en turismo es importante, ya que sin ello el desarrollo turístico social y sostenible puede ser difícil. Hasta la actualidad, la investigación sobre emprendiduría en el sector turístico en Mauricio ha recibido poco atención, a pesar de ser esto un pilar importante en la industria turística local. Para contribuir a las investigaciones existentes, este estudio analiza el apoyo al emprendimiento local para el desarrollo turístico en una región específica de Mauricio. El estudio se lleva a cabo utilizando una metodología mixta, mediante un análisis cualitativo y cuantitativo a través de un cuestionario para posteriormente, establecerán las hipótesis que serán analizadas mediante un Modelo de Regresión Logístico. El análisis cualitativo se realizó a través de una entrevista semiestructurada con emprendedores tanto

minate into a Logit Model which statistically explains the factors that account for entrepreneurs' supportiveness towards tourism. The uniqueness of this study lies in the fact that it is the first to propose a Logit Model on local entrepreneurs' support for tourism development. Findings derived from the study generate important information on factors motivating entrepreneurs to support tourism and are helpful to tourism planners and promoters as well as policy makers. The study winds up with some discussions and proposes avenues for future research.

Key Words:
Tourism, Entrepreneurship, Impacts, Logit Model, Mauritius.

experimentados como emergente en turismo. Los datos obtenidos fueron tratados estadísticamente a través del Modelo Logístico que determina los factores que explican el apoyo de los emprendedores en el sector turístico. La contribución de este estudio a la literatura existente radica en la metodología, ya que es la primera vez que se propone un Modelo Logístico para analizar el apoyo al emprendimiento en el desarrollo turístico. Los resultados del análisis aportan información importante sobre los factores motivadores del apoyo a la emprendiduría en turismo y son útiles tanto para los gestores y promotores de los destinos turísticos, como para los responsables políticos. El estudio concluye con algunas discusiones y propone vías para futuras investigaciones.

Palabras clave:
Turismo, Emprendimiento, Impactos, Modelo Logit,
Islas Mauricio.

Introduction. Problem Statement

■ There is growing evidence that tourism entrepreneurs not only contribute in the socio-economic development of a nation but also in the overall attractiveness of a destination (Conlin and Baum, 1995; Andriotis, 2004; Skelton, 2007; Cooper and Hall, 2008; Pasape, *et al*, 2014; Dwyer, 2010; Séraphin and Butler, 2014; Gowreesunkar and Seraphin, 2016). Only when tourism entrepreneurs are present, do a community's culture, climate, sea-sun.-sand, landforms, flora and fauna, and historic monuments become tourism resources that may be transformed into tourist attractions (Hatten and Koh, 2002: 21). Mauritius, as a small beach destination in the Indian Ocean, is not exempt from this phenomenon. The island, which is popular for its sea, sun and sand, is significantly dependent on its tourism enterprises to promote local resources, and sustain tourism businesses. In fact, the tourism entrepreneurship sector in Mauritius not only has the potential in securing social and economic benefits for residents but also, it constitutes a cultural resource and hence, an important buying factor in the tourism offer (Gowreesunkar *et al*, 2015; Séraphin *et al*, 2013). Despite the significant importance of this particular sector for the tourism industry, there is generally a paucity of research in the field (Gowreesunkar *et al*, 2019; Simms, 1981; Shaw and Williams, 1994). For instance, existing tourism researches in Mauritius are mainly based on island attractions (Gowreesunkar, 2015), branding and trust (Roodurman, 2011), attitude of residents (Nunkoo and Ramkissoon, 2010), service quality (Roodurman and Juwaheer, 2010) *inter alia*. To respond to this general lack of information on the topic, the present study proposes to investigate the why tourism entrepreneurs support/do not support tourism development at Grand Bay (Mauritius). Methodologically, the study takes place using the mixed method. The findings culminate into a Logit Model which quantitatively explains the factors that account for entrepreneurs' supportiveness towards tourism. The uniqueness of this study lies in the fact that it is the first to design a Logit Model that statistically explain factors that motivate tourism entrepreneurs support tourism deve-

lopment in their living environment. Findings from the study might generate important information to destination marketers planning to co-create tourism products with small entrepreneurs in order to promote authenticity and touristicity of the Mauritian tourism destination.

Literature Review

Island Tourism Entrepreneurs

■ Studying tourism entrepreneurs based on island destinations is a complex process due to the number of formal and informal entrepreneurs collectively involved in the creation of the tourism offer. In fact, entrepreneurship in island tourism plays two key roles; first, it attracts tourists and helps in safeguarding cultural attractiveness of the destination; second, it contributes to socio-economic prosperity and well-being of the locals, a point shared by Swanso and Devereaux (2012: 480): "tourism has a potential solution for increased economic prosperity". To this effect, island destinations are often dominated by small local enterprises, as residents want to capitalise on business opportunities to earn a living and therefore they turn to small entrepreneurs. In fact, most of them do business based on tacit knowledge, and they have no formal knowledge and training on entrepreneurship (Van der Sterren *et al*, 2008, Shinde, 2010). As a result, there is growing evidence that small businesses in the tourism sector do not seem to operate with a strategy but are driven by a need to survive (Van der Sterren, 2008). Another important point of contention is that islands are disadvantaged due to their size and limited resources so that the issue of sustainability is often a matter of concern while engaging natural and cultural resources for tourism entrepreneurship. To this effect, island governments encourage sustainable and social forms of entrepreneurship and these are not welcomed by entrepreneurs as profitability and return on investment are slow (Seraphin, *et al*, 2013). Entrepreneurship in the tourism sector en-

compasses both formal and informal entrepreneurs. The informal entrepreneurs as defined by Slocum *et al* (2011) are "all those individuals and businesses that engage with tourists and the tourism industry, but are not members of any formal association or trade organization". Many informal enterprise-owners are in business because it is a last resort to secure a livelihood (Kasseeah and Ragoobur, 2014; Portegies *et al* (2013); Rasanayagam, 2011; Gelb *et al*, 2009; Castells and Portes, 1989). Their activities are generally beyond the effective control of tourism authorities and they vary in different economies. For instance, in India, businesses like head and foot massage, hair coloring, prediction of future, prayers against evil, henna application on hands, road snack are mostly run by informal entrepreneurs. In Mauritius, the informal economy in tourism comprises a different landscape such as selling of caramelized tropical fruits, beach wears and balloons, hand-made shell accessories and jewelleries and key-rings. In an African destination, the main informal traders comprise tribal communities like the Massai selling traditional jewelleries, souvenirs, animal leather products among others while in Mediterranean destinations, street vendors, hat makers, unofficial tour guides, shoe shiners, musicians and dance troupes, artisans, providers of homestays, holders of food stalls, and the like compose this informal economy. Formal enterprises are registered and regulated by law. For instance, small hotels, taxi operators, beach hawkers and the like. Shah (2000) observes that when formal tourism enterprises are owned by locals, there is a high likelihood of local supplies, meaning other sectors of the local economy are going to benefit from the activity, a point endorsed by Hatten and Koh (2002: 22) - 'entrepreneurism creates entrepreneurism'.

Support for Tourism Development – The Tourism Entrepreneur Perspective

■ Studies on support for tourism development are well documented, but most of them have been treated from residents' perspective. Those studies indicate that locals play an important role in attracting and pleasing tourists and they generally support tourism when they perceive socio-economic benefit (see for example, Nunkoo and Gursoy, 2012; Wang and Pfister, 2008; Nepal, 2008; Sirakaya and Choi 2005). Locals at a tourism destination may be of the entrepreneurs or non-entrepreneurs community, and their support or non-support towards tourism impact on the quality of the tourism experience (Valle *et al*, 2011). In fact, two types of locals may be identified at the tourism destination; the enterprising local and the non-enterprising locals. The enterprising locals are risk takers and are driven by ambition and they support tourism so long they perceive an opportunity to capitalise on business businesses (Butler, 1980). However, Din (1992) observes that often, the receiving community may not possess the capacity to appreciate the opportunities particularly when the community is poor. To this end, non-enterprising locals do not support tourism as

this will require the understanding of the tourist language as well as capability to interact, communicate and enter into a transaction with tourists. In contrast, in a study conducted by Surugiu, (2009) in Romania, showed that despite limited education and knowledge, locals take entrepreneurship initiative and thus support tourism, as the sector not only represent a solution for locals, but also a means to be involved in other activities that bring social recognition and economic progress it has been found that small tourism entrepreneurs. In still some other context, the effect of colonisation has an impact on support for tourism. For instance, the tourism sectors of previously colonised islands like Mauritius, Haiti, Rodrigues, are still predominantly owned by white people who have continued to occupy the largest share. Tourism entrepreneurship on those islands operates as a cartel and thus, small tourism entrepreneurs benefitting from this privileged network will usually support tourism due to the benefit gained from the process. Another reality of island tourism is that, very often, foreign-controlled tourism businesses take over local small enterprises, and locals welcome the initiative and thus support tourism as it gives opportunity for international exposure, business growth, and marketing. In other cases, locals choose not to support tourism when they perceive tourism as an industry that trade off their living environment for money (Gowreesunkar *et al*, 2014). Thus, it is legitimate to suggest that in most cases local entrepreneurs choose to support tourism if they perceive social benefit and business opportunities associated with the tourism development (Das and Sharma, 2009).

The Tourism Entrepreneurship Sector in Mauritius

■ Mauritius is a volcanic island covering an area of 720 square miles. Situated in the southwest of the Indian Ocean, the island (Figure 1) is predominantly a holiday destination for beach tourists.

Figure 1 Mauritius in the Indian Ocean

Source: mapsofworld.com (2018)

The tourism sector is an important pillar of the Mauritian economy and is served by public and private stakeholders. According to Statistics Mauritius, the number of tourist arrivals for the first semester of 2018 increased by 3.4% from 625,859 in the first semester of 2017 to reach 646,865 (source: Statistics Mauritius, 2018) but with growing demand in tourism, many small formal and informal entrepreneurs have also joined the industry so that over the past years, the number of registered small and medium entrepreneurs in Mauritius has considerably increased (Kistoo, 2014). For instance, as compared to previous years, the number of registered small entrepreneurs increased to 92,388 in the year 2015 and employment capacity was rated at 211582 (source: Statistics Mauritius, 2018). To boost tourism entrepreneurship, the Government of Mauritius earmarked a budget of Rs 10 milliard (approximately USD 289 860 600) for the development of a comprehensive social programme of education and training for aspiring and vulnerable entrepreneurs in order to integrate them in the mainstream: "The most critical success factor to the shaping of the second miracle will be the emergence of the new breed of young entrepreneurs (Source: Budget Speech 2015-2019).

While initially there has been an attempt to encourage locals to form and join formal tourism enterprises and businesses, there are growing number of informal tourism entrepreneurs that have proliferated in popular tourism areas like Flic-en-Flac, Grand-Bay, Pereybere, Mon Choisy and Belle Mare. The performance of informal entrepreneurs is an attraction in its own right for tourists in Mauritius. For instance, the making of fruit salad with salt and chillies , the cooking of "Pootoo", a local traditional cake made from ground rice and cooked in metal pipe, the making of 'dholl puri' (Mauritian pancake), "gateau pima", "samoosa" and "badia" (local snacks), the frying of "merveille" (crispy snack served with chutney) and the making of barbecues are attractions to tourists. These examples highlight the contribution of informal entrepreneurs in the promotion of tradition, culture and heritage of Mauritius. But, because informal tourism entrepreneurs are not officially recognized, they generally go unnoticed and thus are not considered in formal platforms (see for example, Wilson, 2014; Kasseah and Ragoobur, 2014; Maloney, 2007). Consequently, certain small tourism entrepreneurs continue to face controversies due to lack of training, inequality of opportunities, lack of resources and entrepreneurship knowledge, technical facilities, technology, marketing and networking. For instance, a study conducted by Gowreesunkar (2013) in Northern Mauritius, showed that small entrepreneurs selling sea shells on Grand Bay beaches could not afford to hire a selling space at La Croisette shopping centre while those who could afford were refused a space as their products did not meet the quality standard. Therefore, while on one hand, the Mauritian tourism sector is diversifying, on the other hand, it is also depriving existing small entrepreneurs from growing and innovating. To this end, local entrepreneurs, residing at tourism destinations have

been expressing their discontent as they find themselves marginalised vis a vis established tourism entrepreneurs (including those residing outside the tourism destination and those of foreign origins). Examples abound, but respecting the ethical clause, the name of such tourism enterprises will not be disclosed.

Methodology

■ A mixed methodology was adopted given various tourism studies were successfully undertaken under this approach (Ap, 1990; Lee and McCormick, 2002; Andereck, 2000). This method also provides complementary and contrasting perspectives on a phenomenon (Hammond and Wellington, 2013). The study was conducted as part of a wider research on tourism entrepreneurship at Grand Bay (Mauritius). The quantitative part of the study related to the administration of questionnaires and these were followed by the development of hypotheses meant to be tested in a logistic regression model. The hypothetical construct was therefore motivated by the aim of designing a logistic model that could statistically illustrate the factors that motivate local entrepreneurs to support tourism in their living environment.

The qualitative data was derived from semi-structured interviews conducted with tourism entrepreneurs working at Grand Bay, a popular beach destination in Mauritius. The core sample comprised local residents living in the region of Grand Bay and serving the tourism destination as small entrepreneurs. Since the local entrepreneurs comprised both formal and informal ones, it was difficult to account for the exact number of tourism entrepreneurs operating at Grand Bay. Thus, the Small and Medium Enterprises Development Authority (SMEDA) were consulted to obtain information on formal tourism entrepreneurs while the 'Force Vive de Grand Bay', a non-governmental organisation at Grand Bay was contacted to obtain information on informal entrepreneurs. The convenience sampling technique was preferred, given that most entrepreneurs did not operate from a fixed location. In terms of external validity, that is, 'how far the data from the sample are representative of a wider population' (Hammond and Wellington, 2013), the paper eventually presents some limitations. However, in terms of construct validity and ecological validity, the sample is appropriate. In total, 83 local entrepreneurs were interviewed and the main businesses comprised selling of local snacks, tropical fruits pickle, fruit salad with salt and chillies, hand-made hats and baskets, artisanal products, sea shell jewelleries, beach wears, and embroideries among others. Interviews were conducted in parallel of the questionnaires administration for a duration of approximately 45 minutes per entrepreneur. The interview questions and questionnaires were developed upon a review of the literature (Toledano, 2011; Bothworth and Farell, 2011) and was designed to investigate factors motivating tourism entrepreneurs

to conduct their businesses at the tourism destination. A covering letter was included to guide participants. The common themes covered in the questionnaire and interview were: origin of the enterprise, type of business, reasons for starting business in tourism, challenges and difficulties, government support, training and education, perceived disadvantages of running the business, perceived advantages for running the business, motivation to continue the business, future of

the business, reasons for supporting or not supporting tourism in living environment.

Findings

■ Table 1 illustrates the outcome of the hypotheses using the logistic regression.

Table 1 Hypotheses' Result

Hypotheses	Results	Conclusion
Hypothesis H1: H1 was developed to examine the relationship between business opportunities generated from tourism and local entrepreneurs' support towards tourism. H0: Business opportunities generated from tourism will have no impact on local entrepreneurs' support towards tourism H1: Business opportunities generated from tourism will have an impact on local entrepreneurs' support towards tourism	**Result 1** The results were obtained as follows: Dependent Variable: Do you support tourism in your area? Independent variable: Q11C_REA It provides us with various business opportunities -2 Log Likelihood 159.379 Goodness of Fit 190.830 Cox & Snell - R^2 .105 Nagelkerke - R^2 .181 Variables in the Equation Variable B S.E. Wald df Sig R Exp(B) Q11C_REA .8189 .1767 21.4784 1 .0000 .3266 2.2680 Constant -1.4722 .6750 4.7575 1 .0292 **Result 2:** Dependent Variable: Do you support tourism in your area? Independent variable: Q11C_REA It provides us with various business opportunities -2 Log Likelihood 152.985 Goodness of Fit 209.996 Cox & Snell - R^2 .132 Nagelkerke - R^2 .227 Variables in the Equation Variable B S.E. Wald df Sig R Exp(B) Q11C_REA 22.2635 4 .0002 .2794 Q11C_REA(1) -.7340 .9916 .5478 1 .4592 .0000 .4800 Q11C_REA(2) .0488 .8543 .0033 1 .9545 .0000 1.0500 Q11C_REA(3) 1.0696 .7871 1.8469 1 .1741 .0000 2.9143 Q11C_REA(4) 2.8449 .9372 9.2149 1 .0024 .1987 17.1993 Constant .5108 .7303 .4893 1 .4843	The statistical results indicate that the estimated coefficient, 0.818 was highly significant so that the null hypothesis was rejected in favour of the alternative hypothesis. Taking the antilog of the coefficient, it implied that entrepreneurs who agreed that tourism provided them with business opportunities were 2.3 times more likely to support tourism than those who disagreed. By further investigating into the categories of the acceptance of entre-preneurs, it was found that only those who "strongly agree" was significant at 10% level and these were 17 times more likely to support tourism than the other categories. This implied that entrepreneurs were strongly motivated to support tourism whenever business opportunities were identified.

Hypotheses	Results	Conclusion
Hypothesis H2: Hypothesis H2 was developed to infer if there a relationship could be established between benefit generated from tourism and local entrepreneurs' support towards tourism. H0: Economic benefit generated from tourism will have no impact on local entrepreneurs' support towards tourism development H1: Economic benefit generated from tourism will have an impact on local entrepreneurs' support towards tourism	**Result 1** The results were obtained as follows: Dependent Variable: Do you support tourism in your area? Independent variable: Q11A_REA The benefit it generates outweighs the cost Estimation terminated at iteration number 4 because Log Likelihood decreased by less than .01 percent. -2 Log Likelihood 175.814 Goodness of Fit 209.854 Cox & Snell - R^2 .016 Nagelkerke - R^2 .028 Variables in the Equation	The statistical results indicate that the estimated coefficient, 0.603 was statistically significant at the 10% level, therefore the null hypothesis was rejected in favour of the alternative hypothesis. Taking the antilog of the coefficient, it implied that local entrepreneurs who agreed that the benefits of tourism outweighed its cost were 1.4 times more likely to support tourism than those who disagreed.

Variables in the Equation

Variable	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig	R	Exp(B)
Q11A_REA	.3363	.1790	3.5285	1	.0603	.0923	1.3998
Constant	.4952	.6575	.5672	1	.4514		

Result 2

Dependent Variable: Do you support tourism in your area?

Independent variable: Q11A_REA The benefit it generates outweighs the cost

Estimation terminated at iteration number 4 because Log Likelihood decreased by less than .01 percent.

-2 Log Likelihood   171.996
Goodness of Fit   209.999
Cox & Snell - R^2   .034
Nagelkerke - R^2   .059

Variables in the Equation

Variable	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig	R	Exp(B)
Q11A_REA			7.3936	4	.1165	.0000	
Q11A_REA(1)	.6931	1.0488	.4368	1	.5087	.0000	2.0000
Q11A_REA(2)	.0953	.9020	.0112	1	.9158	.0000	1.1000
Q11A_REA(3)	1.2809	.9074	1.9925	1	.1581	.0000	3.6000
Q11A_REA(4)	1.0761	.9431	1.3021	1	.2538	.0000	2.9333
Constant	.9163	.8367	1.1994	1	.2734		

By further looking into the categories, the results below showed that there were no differences among the level to which the local entrepreneurs agree about the statement.

Hypotheses	Results	Conclusion
Hypothesis H3: Hypothesis H3 was developed to examine if working in the tourism sector impacted on local entrepreneurs' support	**Result 1** Dependent Variable: Do you support tourism in your area? Independent variable: Q22 FAMIL Is anyone from your family working into the tourism sector? -2 Log Likelihood 175.199 Goodness of Fit 209.000	The statistical results indicate that the estimated coefficient, 0.747 was significant so that the null hypothesis was rejected in favour of the alternative hypothesis. Taking

Hypotheses	Results	Conclusion
towards tourism development. H0: Working in the tourism sector will have no impact on local entrepreneurs' support towards tourism H1: Working in the tourism sector will have an impact on local entrepreneurs' support towards tourism	Cox & Snell - R^2 .018 Nagelkerke - R^2 .031 Variables in the Equation Variable B S.E. Wald df Sig R Exp(B) Q22FAMIL .7471 .3886 3.6964 1 .0545 .0974 2.1109 Constant 1.3143 .2655 24.5093 1 .0000	the antilog of the coefficient, it implied that local entrepreneurs whose family worked in the tourism sector were 2 times more likely to support tourism than those who disagreed.
Hypothesis H4: Hypothesis H4 was developed to predict the relationship between knowledge of entrepreneurship education and local entrepreneurs' support towards tourism H0: Knowledge of entrepreneurship education will have no impact on local entrepreneurs' support towards tourism development H1: Knowledge of entrepreneurship education will have an impact on local entrepreneurs' support towards tourism	**Result 1** Dependent Variable: Q1SUPT_T Do you support tourism in your area? Independent variable: Q3ASTATM We have entrepreneurship knowledge to conduct our business -2 Log Likelihood 174.973 Goodness of Fit 200.030 Cox & Snell - R^2 .024 Nagelkerke - R^2 .041 Variables in the Equation Variable B S.E. Wald df Sig R Exp(B) Q3ASTATM .3276 .1506 4.7320 1 .0296 .1232 1.3877 Constant .6605 .4622 2.0429 1 .1529 **Result 2** Dependent Variable: Do you support tourism in your area? Independent variable Q3ASTATM We have entrepreneurship knowledge to conduct our business -2 Log Likelihood 173.892 Goodness of Fit 201.973 Cox & Snell - R^2 .029 Nagelkerke - R^2 .049 Variables in the Equation Variable B S.E. Wald df Sig R Exp(B) Q3ASTATM 4.7280 4 .3164 .0000 Q3ASTATM(1) .1283 .5891 .0474 1 .8277 .0000 1.1368 Q3ASTATM(2) .3979 .6265 .4035 1 .5253 .0000 1.4887 Q3ASTATM(3) .6180 .6046 1.0448 1 .3067 .0000 1.8553	Since the estimated coefficient, 0.3276, was statistically significant at the 5% level, the null hypothesis was rejected in favour of the alternative hypothesis. Taking the antilog of the coefficient, it implied that local entrepreneurs who had knowledge on entrepreneurship education were 1.4 times more likely to support tourism development than those who did not have knowledge By further investigating into the categories of the acceptance of the local entrepreneurs, it was found that only those who "strongly agree" was significant at 10% level and these were 5.4 times more likely to support tourism than those who "strongly disagree". The results are shown below:

Hypotheses	Results	Conclusion
	Q3ASTATM(4) 1.6797 .8650 3.7703 1 .0522 .0992 5.3638 Constant 1.1527 .4683 6.0587 1 .0138	
Hypothesis H5: Hypothesis H5 sought to predict the relationship between involvement in tourism activities organised by authorities and entrepreneurs' support towards tourism development. H0: Involvement of local entrepreneurs in tourism activities organised by authorities will have no impact on local entrepreneurs' support towards tourism H1: Involvement of local entrepreneurs in tourism activities organised by authorities will have an impact on local entrepreneurs' support towards tourism	Dependent Variable: Q1SUPT_T Do you support tourism in your area? Independent Variable: Q5INVOLV Are you involved by the authorities when a new tourism project is implemented in your living area? Estimation terminated at iteration number 4 because Log Likelihood decreased by less than .01 percent. -2 Log Likelihood 181.422 Goodness of Fit 210.000 Cox & Snell - R^2 .006 Nagelkerke - R^2 .010 Variables in the Equation Variable B S.E. Wald df Sig R Exp(B) Q5INVOLV .5155 .4820 1.1438 1 .2848 .0000 1.6744 Constant 1.5640 .2116 54.6121 1 .0000	It was observed that the coefficient on the independent variable was insignificantly different from zero and therefore the null hypothesis was accepted. This implied that involvement in tourism activities had no impact on entrepreneurs' support towards tourism development.

Source: Own elaboration

The overall results indicate that local entrepreneurs were supportive of tourism development whenever they perceived socio-economic benefits. Certainly, the finding aligns with previous researches in the field (see for example, Nunkoo and Gursoy, 2012; Wang and Pfister, 2008). But, the point that adds a new dimension to this finding is the coefficients from the logistic result indicating that entrepreneurs who perceived socio-economic benefits from tourism were 1.4 times more likely to support tourism than those who did not. Taking the antilog of the coefficient, it implied that entrepreneurs who agreed that tourism provided them with business opportunities were 2.3 times more likely to support tourism than those who disagreed. By further investigating into the categories of the acceptance of entrepreneurs, it was found that only those who "strongly agree" was significant at 10% level and these were 17 times more likely to support tourism than the other categories. Results also revealed that tourism entrepreneurs with no education were apprehensive and hence, not too supportive of tourism as they lacked skills to develop and market their businesses. The coefficients from the logit model indicated that entrepreneurs having education and knowledge were 1.5 times more likely to support tourism development than those who did not have education and knowledge. By further investigating into the categories of the acceptance of the local entrepreneurs, it was found that only those who "strongly agree" was significant at 10% level and these were 5.4 times more likely to support tourism than those who "strongly disagree". The findings were in line with previous studies (see for example, Andereck *et al*., 2005; Nunkoo and Ramkissoon, 2010; Andriotis, 2011). But as mentioned above, what adds a new dimension to this type of the study is the possibility to statistically show by how many times entrepreneurs

support to tourism exceed entrepreneurs' non-support to tourism development.

The Design of the Logit Model

■ The design of the Logit Model was based on the results of the five hypotheses. From the bi-variate results of the hypotheses, a multivariate logistic regression was stated to include variables which were significant at least at the 10% level. The objective was to further understand the impact of the variables when controlling the effect of all the variables together. The question chosen to run this model was Q1 – *"Do you support tourism in your living environment"* (dependent variable) so that the odds ratios of entrepreneurs' support to tourism due to a particular characteristic or response were identified. Since the dependent variable in question was a dichotomous one, a merit of the logistic regression resided in the interpretation of the coefficients. In fact, the nonlinear nature of the logistic transformation requires the use on maximum likelihood procedure which finds the most likely estimates in an iterative manner. Following Hair *et al* (1998) and Gujarati (2003), the logistic regression was expressed as follows:

$$\ln\left(\frac{P_i}{1-P_i}\right) = \beta_1 + \beta_2 X_1 + \ldots\ldots + \beta_n X_n$$

where X_1 to X_n are independent variables, P_i is the probability that the event is occurring and $P_i/(1-P_i)$ is simply the odds ratio in favour of an event occurring. This odds ratio can be expressed as:

$$\frac{P_i}{1-P_i} = e^{\beta_1 + \beta_2 x_1 + \ldots\ldots + \beta_n X_n}$$

The estimated coefficients (β_1, β_2, ….. β_n) are actually measures of the changes in the ratio of the probabilities. Their relative effect on the probabilities can be assessed by taking antilog. Ultimately the logistic results was reduced a two-variable model - Y= F (Q_{3C} and Q_{11C}). This is illustrated in Table 2.

Table 1 Hypotheses' Result

The multi-variable logistic regression	Results	Conclusion
A multivariate logistic regression was stated to include variables which were significant at least at the 10% level. In this context, the following seven variables were retained to be included in the model: Y= f (Q2FAMLTY, Q3ASTATM, Q3CSTATE, Q11A_REA, Q11C_REA, Q13MRE_X, Q22FAMIL) The objective was to further understand the impact of the variables when controlling the effect of all the variables together.	Dependent Variable: Q1SUPT_T Do you support tourism in your area? Independent Variable(s): Q2FAMLTY Are you familiar with tourism attractions within your living area? Q3CSTATM We have entrepreneurship knowledge to conduct our businesses Q11A_REA The benefit it generates outweighs the cost Q11C_REA It provides us with various business opportunities Q13MRE_X Would you like to see more expansion of tourism activities in your living area? Q22FAMIL Is anyone from your family working into the tourism sector? -2 Log Likelihood 135.928 Goodness of Fit 148.528 Cox & Snell - R^2 .139 Nagelkerke - R^2 .235	The logistic model was reduced to the variables to Q_3 and Q_{11}, given these were found to be statistically significant at the 0.077 level and 0.00 level. Ultimately, a two-variable model was produced as follows: Y= F (Q_{3C} and Q_{11C})

Variables in the Equation

Variable	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig	R	Exp(B)
Q2FAMLTY	.0827	.1636	.2554	1	.6133	.0000	1.0862
Q3ASTATM	.2289	.1965	1.3572	1	.2440	.0000	1.2572

The multi-variable logistic regression	Results	Conclusion
	Q3CSTATE .3301 .2016 2.6795 1 .1016 .0645 1.3911 Q11A_REA .2818 .2095 1.8097 1 .1785 .0000 1.3255 Q11C_REA .6549 .1965 11.1132 1 .0009 .2362 1.9250 Q13MRE_X .1894 .4427 .1831 1 .6687 .0000 1.2086 Q22FAMIL .1895 .4524 .1755 1 .6752 .0000 1.2087 Constant -4.0790 1.2789 10.1729 1 .0014 Dependent Variable: Q1SUPT_T Do you support tourism in your area? Independent Variables: Q2FAMLTY Are you familiar with tourism attractions within your living area? Q3ASTATM We have entrepreneurship knowledge to conduct our businesses Q11A_REA The benefit it generates outweighs the cost Q11C_REA It provides us with various business opportunities Q13MRE_X Would you like to see more expansion of tourism activities in your living area? Q22FAMIL Is anyone from your family working into the tourism sector? -2 Log Likelihood 141.507 Goodness of Fit 154.005 Cox & Snell - R^2 .130 Nagelkerke - R^2 .218 Variables in the Equation Variable B S.E. Wald df Sig R Exp(B) Q2FAMLTY .1112 .1604 .4809 1 .4880 .0000 1.1176 Q3ASTATM .3368 .1863 3.2680 1 .0706 .0871 1.4005 Q11A_REA .2621 .2040 1.6507 1 .1989 .0000 1.2997 Q11C_REA .6877 .1939 12.5838 1 .0004 .2516 1.9891 Q13MRE_X .1281 .4335 .0873 1 .7677 .0000 1.1366 Q22FAMIL .2705 .4404 .3774 1 .5390 .0000 1.3107 Constant -3.5100 1.2074 8.4507 1 .0036	

Source: Own elaboration

Thus, the two variables retained for the design of the logit model were business opportunities and entrepreneurship knowledge.

Discussions

Business Opportunities

■ Many studies have shown that tourism provides considerable economic benefits, such as employment for locals, investment opportunities, and tax revenues for government (see Gowreesunkar *et al*, 2019; Seraphin *et al*, 2018; Nunkoo and Ramkissoon, 2007). For the current study, tourism indeed did stimulate profitable domestic enterprises at Grand Bay, for example, eateries, small hotels, craft shops, bottom glass boat, taxi and guide services among others. But, it is observed that the business opportunities are mostly spread among established operators, except few small entrepreneurs who have been able to secure business contracts from hotels (bottom glass marine tour, excursions to islets like Ilot Gabriel, Ile Plate and Ile Ronde). According to qualitative findings, a majority of the entrepreneurs suffer this unequal distribution of wealth and hence they retaliate by

resenting tourism via public manifestation. To substantiate this point, some hotels market all-inclusive packages and prevent their clients to approach local entrepreneurs. Thus, business opportunities at Grand Bay is found to be confined among well-established external groups. Sharpley, (2009) argues that when locals cannot exercise control over local resources within their living environment themselves and when they find themselves in an economy with foreign domination, they oppose tourism development. Under such a circumstance, decision-making, rests in the hands of powerful bodies exogenous to the community: "decisions regarding their lives, even those that address local matters, are normally made according to the narrow interests of those that control the tourism industry" (Brohman, 1996; Gowreesunkar *et al*, 2010). For the case for Grand Bay, tourism businesses were found to operate as a cartel and business opportunities were always confined to a particular group of entrepreneurs. For instance, one entrepreneur reported that a particular restaurant imported lemons whereas local residents growing this fruit were not considered. The paradox was that the establishment was willing to spend on import and transportation cost, but was not willing to give business opportunities to locals. On one side, tourism is booming and enriching the richer, but, on the other side, small entrepreneurs who are struggling for survival are deprived of opportunities within their own living environment. Consequently, this situation had led failing entrepreneurs to turn to informal businesses like sensational massage, drug selling, and traditional healing among others. To further support this observation, Dupont (2009) explained that the link between tourism development and poverty is going only one way, that is, the reduction of poverty leads to the development of tourism and not the other way round. Examples abound. For instance, in Haiti, the MEMA project which stands for 'Mon Entreprise Mon Avenir' (in English, 'My business my future) is an Haitian business accelerator designed and funded by the Clinton Bush Haiti Fund aiming at developing entrepreneurship in Haiti (Séraphin *et al*, 2013). The MEMA project also aims to create institutions to support the new entrepreneurs via the creation of networks of businessmen and women; consultants and business angels. Any individual willing to start a business or expand an existing business is eligible for the MEMA scheme. But one reality of Haitian locals relates to the large proportion of the unemployed still have difficulty accessing these initiatives due to poverty, illiteracy and gender inequality (Séraphin *et al*, 2013). Similar to Haiti, the present study also shows that education and knowledge are major impeding factors that inhibit talented locals from accessing entrepreneurship facilities available on the island.

Entrepreneurship Knowledge and Education

■ The logit model proposes education and training as an important variable accounting for local entrepreneurs support for tourism whereas responses obtained were a testament to the lack of entrepreneurial education and training among the aspiring small entrepreneurs. For instance, formal and informal tourism entrepreneurs unanimously lamented on their inabilities to write a business plan and hence enjoy bank facilities and government incentives, international networking and marketing. This point was also highlighted by Holden (2013) and Seraphin *et al* (2017) who revealed that small entrepreneurs often missed out important business opportunities and networking due to lack of entrepreneurial education and illiteracy. Likewise, in a study conducted by Afeti *et al* (2003) in Ghana, it was found that technical and vocational education and training has emerged as one of the most effective human resource development strategies that African countries need to embrace in order to train and modernize their technical workforce for rapid industrialization and national development. Coming back to the present case study, technical and vocational training can bring a range of immediate benefits to formal and informal tourism entrepreneurs at Grand Bay, while encouraging the development of new dynamics between formal and informal economy. Nonetheless, a multitude of challenges must be overcome for skills training to fulfill its potential to improve employability and competencies of workers (International Labour Organisation, 2013). For instance, self-employed workers in tourism work alone or with the help of unpaid workers (generally family members) and because, they do not hire or fire staff, they have specific characteristics that may be addressed through tailored and private sector-driven vocational training. This allows them to operate freely, in a flexible way, and to a certain extent, at the margins of the law. Willingness and motivation of self-employed to participate in long training sessions is marginal, and only if there is a direct relation to higher income that informal entrepreneurs will participate in vocational training. Even though they express it differently, obtaining a degree or certificate is often less relevant than increasing their income through improved skills. This is driven by the fear of losing clients or places of selling if they do not appear at their usual place of work. These features require specific approaches in designing and implementing vocational training programmes. Part-time modular training, in low season periods, and on the spot where they operate (in the markets, on the street) might be a solution.

At present, the above discussion has no coherence with existing entrepreneurship incentives and facilities provided by training institutions in Mauritius and their capacity for outreach is limited. For instance, there is a lack of relevance in the quality of training dispensed by those institutions. Another point of contention is that because entrepreneurship institutions are mandated to conduct training and because funds are earmarked for that, they often organise mismatched training to justify that an activity has taken place and fund has been disbursed and appropriately utilised. Moreover, there is no follow-up after the training and thus, very often, no link between training outcome and employment opportunities can be established. The

same training are complacently conducted over years and no changes are made to match the new realities of the evolving environment of entrepreneurs. To support, training courses provided by certain entrepreneurship institutions in Mauritius do not seem to be rigorous enough to equip local entrepreneurs with skills required for the "shaping of the second miracle of Mauritius through a new breed of young entrepreneurs". Moreover, entrepreneurship books (1997 edition) covering basic entrepreneurship themes like costing, marketing, business planning, and customer care are still utilised and distributed to entrepreneurs, whereas these should have been reviewed and adapted according to requirement of the 21st century. Contemporary themes like social entrepreneurship, sustainability, online marketing, web-page designing are some of the compelling topics that need to be integrated while designing entrepreneurship training and education.

Conclusion and Limitations

■ This study has attempted to propose a Logit Model that explains local entrepreneurs' support for tourism development. The overall findings indicate that the entrepreneurs' community can be motivated to contribute effectively in the tourism development of a nation by attending to the two important variables derived from the Logit Model namely business opportunities and training facilities. These are found to be the most important determinants as local tourism entrepreneurs are mostly supportive whenever they perceive business opportunities and have appropriate knowledge and skills to develop their businesses. Such knowledge was perceived to be a key for networking, communication, international collaboration and marketing of their own products. While relevant authorities in Mauritius currently lacks a comprehensive and strategic approach for tourism entrepreneurship, steps such as designing of tailor-made vocational training and incentives to informal entrepreneurs might encourage potential entrepreneur to support the industry by embracing tourism entrepreneurship and integrate the main stream. Typical and routine entrepreneurship training provided by existing institutions need to be revamped and re-adapted to today's realities. It is also worth to note that technical and vocational education and training alone by itself does not lead to rapid industrialisation, economic development, job creation and eradication of poverty. Government support is required to achieve the three. The promotion of technical and vocational education and training demands policies and strategies that address the cross-cutting issues of quality and relevance of training, employability, collaboration between training institutions and employers, accreditation of training providers (in the formal and informal entrepreneurship sectors), assessment, certification, internal and external quality assurance of training programmes, funding, and instructor training. The government of Mauritius therefore, need to create an economic environment that promotes the growth

of enterprises and generally stimulates the economy. When businesses develop and expand, additional labour-market demands and new jobs trace and light the path of industrialisation.

The study also reveals a sad reality, which is shared by many islands: in the tourism sector, larger enterprises invade the market and take over small enterprises and it becomes increasingly difficult for small and micro tourism entrepreneurs to position themselves. In parallel, Statistics Mauritius also reveal that small and medium enterprises have higher employability potential for local people. The legitimising of informal enterprises in deprived rural communities could be an important but so far untapped means of promoting tourism enterprise and economic development. The issue of inclusion, equity and fair trade practice need to be addressed by urging more established entrepreneurs to network with smaller ones thus causing entrepreneurism create entrepreneurism, a point highlighted by Hatten and Kokh (2002). Similar to India and Pakistan, an observation centre for entrepreneurship can be created in Mauritius and not only for Mauritius, but also for Africa to enable the study of entrepreneurship from different perspectives and foster collaboration between small entrepreneurs in the tourism sector. Exchange and partnership programmes can also be organised between the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC) and Southern African Development Community (SADC) to give opportunities to small and unrecognised entrepreneurs to share knowledge and display their talents and also set up a tourism production chain in the African region.

This research provided new insight not only for Mauritius, but also for other islands facing similar tourism entrepreneurship challenges and limitations. Although the study makes a useful contribution by statistically proposing factors that motivate local tourism entrepreneurs to support tourism in their living environment, the research was not free from limitations. From an academic point of view this research paper gives ground to Visser (2015) who argued that sustainability in businesses will be achieved by unlocking changes through transformational leadership; enterprise reform; innovation; social responsibility and integrated value. One of the major weaknesses of the study was that it could not integrate a comprehensive list of small tourism entrepreneurs operating at Grand Bay. The official list available from the Central Statistical Office and the Small and Medium Enterprises Development Authority accounted for registered small entrepreneurs whereas no information could be retrieved for the population accounting for informal entrepreneurs. Therefore, methodologically, this research faced sampling challenges, which was not reflective of reality. Overall, the number of entrepreneurs surveyed was small and most informal entrepreneurs refused to participate in the study, fearing sanction for their unregistered businesses. Future research might consider a larger sample. To broaden the scope of the study, other tourism regions of the island could be studied

to capture a better picture of further factors that motivate informal and formal entrepreneurs to embrace and support tourism development in their living environment.

References

Andriotis K. (2004). Tourism in Crete: a form of modernization. *Current Issues in Tourism, 6* (1), 23-53.

Andereck, K. L. (2000). The relationship between residents' attitudes towards tourism and tourism development options. *Journal of Travel Research, 39* (1), 27-36.

Afeti G., Baffour-Awuah D. and Budu-Smith J. (2003). Baseline survey for the introduction of competency-based training in polytechnics. *National Council for Tertiary Education (NCTE) and Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA)*, Accra.

Ap, J. (1990). Residents' perceptions research on the social impacts of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research, 17* (4), 610-616.

Bosworth G. and Farell, H. (2011). Tourism entrepreneurs in Northumberland. *Annals of Tourism Research, 38* (4), 1474-1494.

Brohman, J. (1996). New directions for tourism in third world development. *Annals of Tourism Research,* 23, 48-70.

Butler, W. (1980). Tourism Development in Small Islands: Past Influences and Future Directions. *Environmental Conservation*, 27-31.

Castells, M. and Portes A. (1989). World underneath: the origins, dynamics, and effects of the informal economy'. In Portes, A., Castells, M. and Benton, L.A. (Eds), *The Informal Economy: Studies in Advanced and Less Developed Countries*. The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore.

Colin W. and Baum T. (1995). *Tourism development in the South Indian Ocean: the case of Mauritius*. Wiley: Chichester, 229-235.

Cooper, C. (2002). Sustainability and Tourism Vision' in Congreso International del CLAD sobre la Reforma del Estado y de la Administration Publica, Lisboa, Portugal.

Cooper, C. and Hall, C. (2008). Contemporary tourism marketing. *Contemporary Tourism*, Butterworth-Heinemann, Oxford.

Das, D. and Sharma, S.K. (2009). An Assessment of the impact of tourism development at Varanasi: pers-

pectives of local tourism businesses. *International Journal of Tourism Policy, 2* (3), 167-186.

Din, K.H. (1992). The involvement stage in the evolution of a tourist destination. *Tourism Recreation Research, 17* (1) 10 – 20.

Dupont L. (2009). Intégration et causalité entre développement touristique, croissance économique et reduction de la pauvreté: cas de Haïti', *Études Caribéennes* (http://etudescaribeennes.revues.org/ 3780)

Dwyer, L., Forsyth, P., and Dwyer, W. (2010). *Tourism economics and policy*. Channel View, Bristol.

Dwyer, L., Cvelbar K., Edwards D. and Mihalic T., (2011). Fashioning a destination tourism future: the case of Slovenia. *Tourism Management*, 33 (2), 305-316.

Gelb A., Mengistae V., Ramachandran M and Shah K. (2009). To formalize or not to formalize? Comparisons of microenterprise data from Southern and East Africa. (http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTMACRO)

Gowreesunkar GB and Rycha I., (2014). Impacts of dolphin watching as tourism activity: Western Mauritius as case study. *International Journal of Trade, Economics and Finance, 6*(1), 67-72.

Gowreesunkar, GB, Seraphin H. and Van der Sterren J. (2015). Social entrepreneurship as a tool for promoting global citizenship in island tourism destination management. *ARA Journal of Tourism Research, 5*(1) 7-23.

Gowreesunkar, V and Seraphin, H. (2016). Entrepreneurship in Haiti: Toward an Identification of the 'Blind Spots'. *Études caribéennes*, URL: http://etudescaribeennes. revues.org/10260, ISSN: 1961-859X.

Gowreesunkar, V. Seraphin, H. and Mustafeed, Z. (2019). Local Residents Expression of Dissatisfaction with Tourism and Events. An Empirical Study Based on Winchester (UK), International Joint World Cultural Tourism Conference, National Institute of Tourism and Hospitality, Hyderabad, India.

Gowreesunkar, V, Cooper, CP and Dubarry R (2010), A Study on Residents' Attitude Towards Tourism Development in Grand Bay (Mauritius) and its Implications on Sustainability, International Conference on Sustainable Tourism: Issues, Debates and Challenges, 22-25 April 2010, Crete and Santorini, Greece p25.

Gujarati D. (2003). *Basic Econometrics*. McGraw-Hill, New York.

Hair J.F., Anderson R.E., Tatham R.L. and Black W.C.

(1998). *Multivariate data analysis*, Prentice Hall, UK.

Hamond M. and Wellington, J. (2013). *Research methods: the key concepts*. New-York, Routledge.

Holden A., (2013). *Tourism, poverty and development.* Routledge, Abingdon.

International Labour Organisation (ILO). (2013).The informal economy and decent work: a policy resource guide - supporting transitions to formality.

Kasseeah H. and Ragoobur V., (2014). Women in the informal sector in Mauritius: a survival mode. Equality, *Diversity and Inclusion, an International Journal, 33* (8), 750-763

Kirsten M. and Rogerson C., (2002). Tourism, business linkages and small enterprise development in South Africa. *Development South Africa, 19* (1), 29-59.

Kistoo M., (2014). Barriers to growth in SMEs in Mauritius. *Research Journal of Business and Economic Studies, 3* (9), 24-33.

Hatten and Koh, (2002). The tourism entrepreneur: the overlooked player in tourism development studies. *International Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Administration*. 3 (1), 22-47.

Lee K.S and McCormick (2002). *Understanding Mixed Method*. SAGE Publication, London.

Maloney W. F., and Arias O. S., (2007). The Razon de Ser of the informal worker, in G. E. Perry, W. F. Maloney, O. S. Arias, P. Fajnzylber, A. D. Mason, and J. Saavedra-Chanduvi (Eds.), *Informality: Exit and exclusion* (pp. 43-78). Washington, DC: The World Bank.

Manyara G. and Jones E. (2007). Community-based tourism enterprise development in Kenya: An exploration of their potential as avenues of poverty reduction', *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 15* (6), 628 – 644.

Nepal, S. K. (2008). Residents' attitudes to tourism in central British Columbia, Canada. *Tourism Geographies, 10* (1) 42-65.

Nunkoo, R., and Gursoy, D. (2012). Residents' support for tourism: an identity perspective. *Annals of Tourism Research, 39* (1) 243-268.

Nunkoo, R., & Ramkisson, H. (2007). Residents' perceptions of the socio-cultural impacts of tourism in Mauritius. *Anatolia: An International Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Research, 18*(1),138–145.

Nunkoo, R. and Ramkisson, R. (2010). Small Island Urban Tourism: a Resident's Perspective. *Current Issues in Tourism, 13* (1) 37-60.

Pasape, L., Anderson, W and Lindi, G (2014). Sustaining Ecotourism in Tanzania through Community, *ARA Journal of Tourism Research, 4* (1) 7-25.

Portegies A., Cakmak E. and Van der Sterren J. (2013). Vocational training in the informal tourism economy. *Working paper*. NHTV Breda University of Applied Sciences

Rasanayagam, J., (2002). Spheres of communal participation: placing the state within local modes of interaction in rural Uzbekistan. *Central Asian Survey, 21*, 55-70.

Rogerson, C.M., (2003). Tourism and transformation: small enterprise development in South Africa. *Africa Insight, 33* (1/2), 108 – 115.

Roodurmun J. (2011). The effect of destination trust on destination loyalty: a myth or reality. *2nd International Research Symposium in Service Management,* Yogyakarta, Indonesia, 26 – 30 July, 519-526.

Roodurmun, J. and Juwaheer, T. (2010). The benefit of applying service recovery principles in Mauritian service organisations: an exploratory study'. *International Research Symposium in Service Management*, 26 – 30 July, 1-23.

Scheyvens, R. and Momsen, J., (2008). Tourism in small island states: from vulnerability to strengths. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 491-508.

Seraphin, H., Gowreesunkar, V., Zaman, M., Bourliataux-Lajoinie (2019). Community based festivals as a tool to tackle tourismphobia and Anti-tourism movements, *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, In press.

Seraphin, H., Gowreesunkar, V., Rodriguez D, Pagan, N (2018). Assessing the tourism performance of a destination. Towards a new approach using Cuba as a case study. *Critical Essays in Tourism Research*, Nova Publishers.

Shah, K. (2000). Tourism, the poor and other stakeholders: Asian experience, *Fair Trade Paper*. ODI, London.

Sharpley, R. (2009). Tourism in the Gambia: A Case of Planning Failure?. *Tourism Review International, 12*, 1-16.

Shinde, K. (2010). Entrepreneurship and Indigeneous Entrepreneurs in Religious Tourism in India. International *Journal of Tourism Research, 12*, 523-535.

Séraphin, H., Butler, C. & Gowreesunkar, V. (2013). Entre-

preneurship in the tourism sector: a comparative approach of Haiti, Coastal Kenya and Mauritius. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, *11* (2) 72-92.

Minto-Coy, I. & Séraphin, H. (2017). Role of the diaspora in the emergence of Economic and Territorial Intelligence in Haiti. *International Journal of Business and Emerging Markets*, *9*, (1), 48-67.

Séraphin H. and Butler C. (2014). An exploratory study of the potential contribution to peace through sustainable enterprise in the tourism industry in Haiti and Kenya. *International Journal of Human Potential Development*, 3 (1), 1-13.

Séraphin, H., Gowreesunkar, V and Chaarani, B (2017). *International hotel chains: A two tier CSR system: The case of the hospitality sector in the metropolitan area of Port-au-Prince (Haïti)* - Nova Science Publisher – E-book available at https://www.novapublishers.com/catalog/index.php – ISBN 978-53612-310-4 (2018).

Seraphin, H. (2018). *Locals' happiness: the missing measurement in Caribbean tourism development, Words in the bucket*. Retrieved from: https://www.words inthebucket.com/locals-happiness-the-missing-measurement-in-caribbean-tourism-development.

Séraphin H., Butler C., and Gowreesunkar GB. (2013). Entrepreneurship in the tourism sector: a comparative approach of Haiti, Mauritius and Coastal Kenya. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, *11* (2) 72-92.

Séraphin, H & Paul, B (2015). La diaspora: un levier pour le développement du tourisme en Haiti, *Mondes du Tourisme* [online], available from: http://tourisme.revues.org/990.

Skelton T. (2007). Islands for the young: culture and development for all – a commentary on John Connell's 'islands, idylls and the detours of development'. *Singapore Journal of Tropical Geography*, *28*(2), 136–138.

Slocum S., Backman, K and Robinson K. (2011). Tourism pathway to prosperity: perspective of informal economy of Tanzania. *Tourism Analysis*, *16* (1), 45-55.

Surugiu, C (2009). Development of rural tourism through entrepreneurship'. *Journal of Tourism*, *8*, 65-72.

Swanso K. and Devereaux, C. (2012). Culturally, sustainable entrepreneurship: a case study of hopi tourism. *Advances in Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research*, *6*, 479–494.

Statistics Mauritius (2018). International Travel and Tourism, www.gov.mu.

Sirakaya, E. and Choi, H (2005). Measuring residents' attitudes towards sustainable development: development of sustainable tourism attitude scale. *Journal of Travel Research*, 380

Seraphin, H., Gowreesunkar, V., & Teare, R. (2017). *What marketing strategy for destinations with a negative image?* Emerald Publishing Limited.

Toledano, N. (2011). Social entrepreneurship: the new narrative for the practice of the social economy. CIRIEC-España, *Revista de Economía Pública, Social y Cooperativa*, 73, Special Issue.

Valle, P. O., Mendes, J., Guerreiro, M., and Silva, J. A. (2011). Can welcoming residents increase tourist satisfaction? *Anatolia*, *22*(2), 260-277.

Van der Sterren, J., (2008). Financial markets, microfinance and tourism in developing countries. *ARA Journal of Tourism Research*, *2* (4) 35 – 43.

Visser, W. (2015). *Sustainable Frontiers. Unlocking Change through Business, Leadership and Innovation*, Sheffield: Greenleaf Publishing.

Wanhill S. (2000). Small and medium tourism enterprises. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *27*, 148-163.

Wang, Y. and Pfister, R. (2008). Residents' attitude towards tourism and perceived personal benefits in a rural community', *Journal of Travel Research*, *47*.

Wilson, TD (2014). Self-employed women in the informal economy: beach vendors in Acapulco'. *Production, Consumption, Business and the Economy: Structural Ideals and Moral Realities*, 269-292.

Author's Details

Vanessa GB Gowreesunkar
gvanessaa@gmail.co

Seraphin Hugues
hugues.seraphin@winchester.ac.uk

Mustafeed Zaman
mustafeedzaman@gmail.com