Green entrepreneuring in tourism experience design for behaviour change

ABSTRACT

Tourism entrepreneurs have the responsibility to adopt and promote more sustainable behaviours. By drawing on the understanding of entrepreneurship as practice and focusing on environmental sustainability, this chapter explores the case of an ecotourism company and its experience design process for behaviour change. This process is conceptualised as a complex entrepreneurial practice composed of the following components observed in the investigated case: 1) reflecting, visioning and strategizing, 2) weaving, 3) embroidering, 4) bricolage and 5) quilting. The main contribution of the study is the use of a practice-based approach to studying experience design by entrepreneurs and the conceptualisation of this process across various components of the company's sustainable business model. Methodologically, this study presents an example of cross-boundary collaboration between the academic, industry and non-profit sectors, which emerged and developed based on a shared vision involving tourism, the environment and individual responsibility.

Keywords: behaviour change, experience design, entrepreneurship as practice, environmental sustainability, sustainable business model

INTRODUCTION

Tourism companies have a responsibility to promote a sectoral shift towards sustainability. Dwyer (2018) explained this responsibility by invoking several factors, among which is the implementation of sustainable business models. These models can involve the integration of sustainability thinking as part of a company's logic and the mechanisms through which value for all relevant stakeholders is created (Sahebalzamani and Bertella, 2018). Companies led by innovative entrepreneurs can be particularly important with regard to the implementation of sustainable business models. Several studies highlight that tourism entrepreneurs can be agents of change towards sustainability, for example, by combining tourism with other economic activities and promoting community development (e.g. Phelan and Sharpley, 2011; McCarthy, 2018). In the case of small companies, in particular, such potential can be explained as a factor of company flexibility and, sometimes, the idealistic and strong motivation of entrepreneurs (Lordkipanidze et al., 2005; Cunha et al., 2020).

Tourism companies' commitment to sustainability can include the design of experiences that promote behavioural change. Tourism experiences represent the market offering of companies or the customer value proposition of specific business models (Teece, 2010). Tourism experiences can be transformative and educational and can promote changes that can eventually lead to more sustainable behaviours (Lean, 2009; Morgan, 2010; Stone and Petrick, 2013; Wolf et al., 2017). Several scholars have employed various perspectives to explore this possibility, such as free-choice learning experiences, interpretative practices and edutainment (Moscardo, 1998; Ballantyne and Packer, 2005; Zeppel, 2008; Pratt and Suntikul, 2016). The common idea behind such perspectives is that, through an offer that educates, entertains and engages, companies can influence tourists' on-site behaviour as well as their behaviour once back in their place of residence. In this way, a company's value proposition can be related to

sustainability, thereby assuming a broader meaning, including the creation of value for stakeholders other than customers, for example, the natural environment (Bocken et al., 2015).

The potential of tourism experiences in terms of pro-environmental behaviour change can be considered in the light of combining educational strategies with contextual approaches. Educational strategies including information, persuasion and role models can be applied to promote behaviour change (Steg & Vlek, 2009). As suggested by the transformative tourism literature, tourism experience design can include such elements and, in some cases, operators can be perceived as role models (Seeler and Schänzel, 2019). Although behaviour change needs practice over time in order to be effective (Verplanken and Wood, 2006), tourism experiences can provide the initial motivation and act as windows of opportunity to reconsider everyday habits and routines.

Focusing on small-sized enterprises in the context of environmental sustainability, we reflect on the aforementioned ways through which companies can contribute to sustainability, namely the implementation of sustainable business models and the design of inspiring green experiences. Our aim is two-fold. First, we aim to contribute to the stream of research on practice-based theories in tourism (James et al., 2019), particularly in relation to tourism entrepreneurship and sustainability. Although such topics are broadly discussed in the tourism literature (e.g. Kokkranikal and Morrison, 2002; Lordkipanidze et al., 2005; Lundberg et al., 2014), the practice-based approach is novel. The second aim concerns a deeper understanding of the interrelation between what companies committed to sustainability do to create value (their business logic and mechanisms) and what they offer (their value proposition) as well as the process of development of their products (their tourism experience design process). This can contribute to the emerging literature on business models in tourism (Reinhold et al., 2017). We pose the following research question: which entrepreneurial practices are relevant to the design of tourism experiences that promote green behaviours?

In the next section, we describe the practice-based approach to entrepreneurship, namely entrepreneuring. This description starts by defining the concept of practice and then links it to entrepreneurship, both generally and in relation to environmental sustainability. This part ends with a commentary on the potential of the entrepreneuring approach in the context of tourism and experience design. We then present the study methodology concerning the case of an ecotourism company. Here, we specify and explain our roles as an employee of this company, an academic and members of non-profit organisations (NPOs). The chapter continues with a presentation and discussion of the case, in particular the entrepreneurial practices of sustainability adopted by the investigated company and their relevance to the design of tourism experiences. In the conclusion, we summarise the main findings and highlight the study's theoretical and methodological contributions.

THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE

This section describes the theoretical perspective adopted to investigate entrepreneurial practices of relevance to the design of tourism experiences that promote green behaviours. First, green entrepreneuring is described as a set of practices based on the effectuation logic. Second, we explain the relevance of the entrepreneuring concept in relation to tourism and experience design.

Green entrepreneuring

Entrepreneurship can be conceptualised as a set of practices that develop collectively. These practices involve knowing, doing and feeling and comprise engagement, tools and procedures (Reckwitz, 2002; Corradi et al., 2010). Johannisson (2011) uses the term entrepreneuring to refer to the practice-based approach to entrepreneurship and describes it as an 'ongoing

practice of creatively organizing people and resources according to opportunity' (p. 137).

Entrepreneuring is further described as a complex process of practices that are contextual,

embodied and charged with emotions and values. Johannisson (2011) highlights the necessity

of going beyond an understanding of entrepreneurship as an exclusively economic activity and

identifies the broader scope of entrepreneuring, noting the interplay of three aspects that are

recognised by entrepreneurs: *homo economicus* (the rational self-focused person), *homo*

curans (the caring person) and *homo ludens* (the playful person). According to this perspective,

entrepreneurs can be described as creative individuals who question existing frames and then

strive to construct new 'rules of the game' through their practices, which ultimately emerge from

their reflections and actions together with other actors. With regard to the latter aspect, practices

are considered non-individualistic phenomena that both influence and are influenced by their

physical and social contexts (Cope, 2005; Steyaert, 2007; Johannisson, 2011; Welter, 2011).

This perspective on entrepreneurship is in line with the understanding of entrepreneurs as

reflective practitioners, which derives from Schön's (1983) work on professionals at work,

specifically focusing on individuals who combine their actions with reflection in order to

accomplish their tasks while also learning. Considering entrepreneurs as reflective practitioners

implies that reflection is the core of the effectiveness of their entrepreneurial practice and that

the ability and interest in learning and self-development are the basis of their growth mindset

(Dimov, 2017). The reflective practitioner concept is used in the context of social learning, which

is relevant to the aforementioned aspect of practices as non-individualistic phenomena. In this

sense, in the organisational studies literature, the close collaboration among reflective

practitioners is instantiated through the expression of a community of practice or practitioners

and refers to both the routinised and innovative aspects of working (Brown and Duguid, 1991;

Wenger and Snyder, 2000).

Successful practices by entrepreneurs are based on the role played by the logic of

effectuation when dealing with challenging situations. The typical managerial thinking is based

on the logic of causation reasoning: selecting the means to achieve pre-determined goals (Lerner et al., 2018; Sarasvathy, 2001; Duening et al., 2012). An alternative logic is that of effectuation (Sarasvathy, 2001; Grégoire and Cherchem, 2020), according to which successful entrepreneurs 'know who they are, what they know, and whom they know—their own traits, tastes, and abilities; the knowledge corridors they are in; and the social networks they are a part of' (Sarasvathy, 2001, p. 205). Based on such knowledge, entrepreneurs are able to imagine and act towards 'a possible new' (Sarasvathy, 2001; Duening, et al., 2012). Effectuation involves exploiting contingencies, developing strategic alliances, attempting to influence the controllable aspects of the future and focusing on options that create more options instead of maximising return in the present and avoiding risks (Sarasvathy, 2001).

Three entrepreneuring practices based on the effectuation logic and which are of relevance to sustainability are identified in the literature. One practice is bricolage, described as 'making do by applying combinations of the resources at hand to new problems and opportunities' (Baker and Nelson 2005, p. 333, cited in Johannisson, 2018: 401). A second practice is quilting – the intuitive and creative process through which the various components and overall pattern emerge without pre-determined plans and goals (Sarasvathy, 2001; Johannisson, 2018). The third practice is weaving, referring to the entrepreneur's evolving personal network (Johannisson, 2000, 2018). Sustainable entrepreneurs are thought to be capable of recognising when and how to apply such practices with the aim of abandoning existing practices and finding new ways to respond to problems and opportunities (Sarasvathy, 2001; Hockerts and Wüstenhagen, 2010; Poldner et al., 2017; Johannisson, 2018; Muñoz and Cohen, 2018). According to Johanisson (2018), these three practices represent a clear departure from the idea that doing business is hardly reconcilable with sustainability.

We understand green entrepreneuring as a set of entrepreneurial practices consisting in bricolage, quilting and weaving, the purpose of which is to reduce a company's environmental

negativities and create environmental benefits. According to this perspective, entrepreneurs are reflective practitioners characterised by the aspects described in the ecopreneurship literature, mainly their intentionality to move towards a more sustainable future, their active search for opportunities and, not least, their values (Gast et al., 2017; Santini, 2017). With regard to the latter, Fors and Lennerfors (2019) suggest that entrepreneurs engaged in environmental sustainability might have an ethic of care in relation to human and non-human stakeholders and that this can influence their businesses. In terms of sustainable business models, these entrepreneurs are said to strive to create value for a broad spectrum of stakeholders, including the natural environment (Bocken et al., 2015).

Green entrepreneuring and experience design in tourism

Not many tourism scholars have adopted a practice-based perspective to entrepreneurship. The tourism studies literature, where the concept of practice is adopted, mainly concerns tourist practices (e.g. de Souza Bispo, 2016; Bargeman and Richards, 2020) and sustainable tourism pedagogy (e.g. Tribe, 2002; Jamal, 2004; Jamal et al., 2011). Few studies adopt the practice perspective to study the operators of the sector, and even fewer adopt it to investigate tourism entrepreneurs (e.g. Reinl and Kelliher, 2014; Lamers et al., 2017; Bertella, 2011, 2018; Çakmak et al., 2018; Bertella and Droli, 2019; James et al., 2019). None of these studies highlights the potential of the entrepreneuring approach in relation to the exploration of entrepreneurship in sustainability and experience design.

The adoption of the concept of entrepreneuring in the context of sustainability in tourism is both useful and appropriate. One explanation is the presence of relatively numerous lifestyle and values-based entrepreneurs (Ateljevic and Doorne, 2000; Carlsen et al., 2008). For such entrepreneurs, non-profit motivations deriving from lifestyle choices and values are particularly strong, and in some cases, they can relate to sustainability and contribute to innovation and

development (Thomas et al., 2011; Tomassini, 2019). Another related explanation for the adoption of the entrepreneuring approach is that, as observed by Lebe et al. (2014), although sustainable entrepreneurial thinking in tourism often starts with an innovation-oriented individual concerned about the natural and social environments, it develops collectively. This collective development is particularly important as no actor alone has the necessary knowledge, legitimacy and power to face the challenges of finding feasible solutions to sustainability challenges, and no singular perspective can capture the complexity involved (Kernel, 2005; Lebe et al., 2014).

With specific regard to experience design, the entrepreneuring approach can be useful for two reasons. The first concerns experience design in relation to the various components of a company's business model. Experience design is the object of study of numerous scholars, both in general terms and in relation to sustainability (e.g. Tussyadiah, 2014; Fesenmaier and Xiang, 2016; Scott et al., 2017; Smit and Melissen, 2018; Dixit, 2020). Most studies tend to represent and investigate experience design as a set of steps and techniques by businesses to develop their offerings and communicate their value proposition. In terms of business models, these studies consider experience design among a company's activities, which tend to be market-oriented, focusing on the business model components of customer segments, relationships and channels (Osterwalder and Pigneur, 2009).

The current study is business-oriented and, by adopting the entrepreneuring approach, focuses on the business model components of key partners, activities and resources and their interrelation (Osterwalder and Pigneur, 2009). Some scholars investigate experience design in relation to some of these components. For example, Fossgard and Fredman (2019) explore the experiencescape, i.e. the physical, social and cultural contexts where experiences of nature-based tourism occur. The authors focus on natural resources and identify some of the main dimensions, such as access to resources and experience facilitation. Adopting the concept of practice, our study broadens the focus of the investigation of experience design to include

various types of resources, in addition to key activities and partners. In this way, it recognises the importance of the coherence and interdependency of the various components of sustainable business models (Joyce and Paquin, 2016), and with the relevance of networking for value co-creation among and for all relevant stakeholders (Zott and Amit, 2010; Orefice and Nyarko, 2020).

The second reason for adopting the green entrepreneuring approach that we propose concerns the broadening of the pool of recognised stakeholders that benefit from the designed experiences. As mentioned in the introduction, tourism experiences can be educational and transformative, which can lead to nature-related benefits in the long term. This can be related to innovation for strong environmental sustainability and implies an understanding of nature among primary stakeholders (Laine, 2010; Bocken et al., 2015; Brozovic, 2020), which is evident in the idea of the entrepreneur as *homo curans* by Johannisson (2011) and the ethic of care noted by Fors and Lennerfors (2019).

METHODOLOGY

The methodological choice of the study follows a recommendation regarding the opportunity for academics to collaborate with non-academics in order to contribute to sustainable advancements in the theory and practice of tourism (e.g. Cockburn-Wootten et al., 2018; Hales et al., 2018). This recommendation is also emphasised by some entrepreneurship scholars. Johannisson (2011) highlights the importance of capturing insights that are not easily available to researchers as outsiders (e.g. feelings), and Binder and Belz (2015) argue that this can be done by supplementing traditional methods such as interviews, observations and ethnographies with alternative methods. Poldner et al. (2017) note that these alternative methods should

depart from the idea that, when entering the field, researchers should 'keep their own emotions, values, and subjective interpretations out of the picture' (p. 216).

Following this recommendation and aware of the challenge of establishing academia–industry collaborations (Duxbury et al., 2019), we argue that a sense of shared responsibility in relation to sustainability and a strong commitment and passion for the natural environment can constitute a good platform for collaboration. Consequently, to answer the research question about the entrepreneurial practices relevant to tourism experience design for sustainability, we investigated the case of Brim Explorer, a Norwegian ecotourism company. The first author, an academic, met the second author, who is a marine biologist, while investigating an ocean plastic clean-up initiative by the Zing Ocean Conservancy, the NPO of which the second author is co-founder and manager. The two authors met again when the second author, employed by the company under study, was working to establish collaborative relations for the design of the company's experiences. On this occasion, she made contact with Ocean Sounds, the NPO of which the first author is an active member. The motivation to collaborate was based on the authors' previous positive experience and common view about the responsibility of each individual in contributing to changes towards a more sustainable future.

The data on which this study relies were derived from the first-person experiences of the second author (as the head of research and education and a customer relations representative) and a series of meetings and conversations among the authors and the owners and managers of the company, who also revisited the draft of the final chapter. After the first meeting, the two authors developed and discussed their ideas while working together at the various drafting stages of the chapter. This process corresponds to the understanding of research as a knowledge co-production process in the form of a dialogic collaboration (Lander and English, 2000; Beech et al., 2010).

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Brim Explorer offers various types of cruises (e.g. whale watching tours, dinner cruises, nature tours) on two hybrid-electric ships along the Norwegian coast. The next sections adopt the theoretical perspective of entrepreneuring to describe the entrepreneurs and the practices relevant to the design of the Brim Explorer experience. They end with a summary and the development of a conceptual model of tourism experience design for behaviour change as a complex entrepreneurial practice.

The entrepreneurs

Brim Explorer was founded in 2018 by an Icelandic woman, who is the company's chief executive officer (CEO), and a Norwegian man, the chief technical officer (CTO). They can be qualified as reflective entrepreneurs (Schön, 1983; Brown and Duguid, 1991; Dimov, 2017) who combine their actions and reflections with their growth mindset. In considering some of the characteristics of the two founders and managers of Brim Explorer, there were signs of the three aspects of the entrepreneurial individual, as described by Johannisson (2011). With regard to the caring aspect (*homo curans*), the CEO has strong values in relation to the conservation and protection of the natural environment, as deducible from her previous working experience with Bellona, a Norwegian non-governmental organisation (NGO) that aims to identify and implement sustainable environmental solutions to tackle climate challenges at the national and international levels. The ludic aspect (*homo ludens*) can be observed among the characteristics of the Brim Explorer CTO, who has an educational background in social sciences and innovation. He strongly believes that travel does not necessarily have to lead to negative impacts on nature, and he loves working on solutions that can bring positive changes in the company and sector. These characteristics can be associated with a playful attitude, which

includes facing challenges with creativity and developing new solutions. With regard to the *homo economicus* aspect, the Brim Explorer CEO has considerable experience running a business, as she grew up working in her family business, which was the first whale watching company in Iceland.

The entrepreneurs also portray several aspects from the literature regarding the role of tourism operators and sustainable and lifestyle entrepreneurs, in particular strong motivation and self-perception as change agents (Lordkipanidze et al., 2005; Dwyer, 2018; Cunha et al., 2020). Their motivation to enter the tourism sector was their concern about the predominance of polluting, noisy and poorly designed ships operating in tourism, coupled with their desire to change this situation. They felt that several improvements were necessary, particularly in terms of reducing harm to the environment and the delivery of high-quality tourist experiences. This can be related to the entrepreneurs imagining a possible alternative tourism as the core process and engine of the effectuation logic reported in the entrepreneuring literature (Sarasvathy, 2001; Duening et al., 2012). This focus on change is implicit in the company's name, as explained on its websites: '*Brim* is an Old Norse word that means "breaking wave". And like a breaking wave that brings energy and change, Brim Explorer's vision is to change the way we experience the ocean' (BrimExplorer, 2020).

The Brim Explorer experience and its design

The Brim Explorer experience, as described on the company's website, highlights some components that are clearly related to the main ideas expressed in the tourism literature. The text reports that the company's vision is to create 'experiences that bring us closer to the ocean', and continues as follows: 'we hope to leave our guests with a stronger environmental understanding and engagement than when they arrived. We provide ocean excursions without noise or pollution on board silent hybrid-electric ships because the epic, rugged and awe-

inspiring Arctic coast deserves to be experienced from a silent, clean and comfortable ship'

(BrimExplorer, 2020). This description can be seen as the tourist value proposition on which the

company's business model is built. Strong emotions and the process of becoming more

knowledgeable about and engaged in marine environment protection are central to the Brim

Explorer experience and are in line with the main tenets in the literature regarding the potential

of nature-based tourist experiences to encourage sustainable behavioural changes (e.g.

Ballantyne and Packer, 2005; Zeppel, 2008; Lean, 2009; Morgan, 2010; Stone and Petrick,

2013; Pratt and Suntikul, 2016; Wolf et al., 2017).

The company's two hybrid-electric boats (fig. 1) are an important part of the Brim Explorer

experience, and their design process captures how the company operates in terms of finding

the resources it needs to turn the value proposition into reality. The boats were designed in

collaboration with the shipyard Maritime Partner, designers from Hareide Design and other

suppliers on the basis of a shared vision of combining functionality, sustainability and

aesthetics. The boats' hulls were made from recycled aluminium, and several types of

innovative technology have been incorporated into the boats' design. The entire ships, including

the interior, such as tables and walls, were made to be as light-weight as possible.

--- Fig 1. One of the Brim Explorer boats (photographer: Jonas Legernes) ----

The Norwegian technology Wavefoil was used to reduce on-board vibrations and energy

consumption, and the ships' high-speed craft propellers were from Servogear, redesigned with

thinner blades to reduce sound when manoeuvring. Currently, the technology does not allow

long-distance traveling using only electricity, and the boats run partly on diesel. The use of

diesel is kept to a minimum, and when the boats reach the destination or come close to whales

and dolphins, the electric engines are used to reduce the noise and enable silent sailing. The

entrepreneurs' intention is to continuously update and improve the ships in order to be able to

pioneer the world of ecological tourism. To do so, a considerable amount of time is invested in

the search for competent partners and suppliers. Among the latter, for example, is the Norwegian BlueEye Robotics, which delivered underwater drones that offer tourists an 'underwater experience'. Among the partners, the company is currently working on an application for a research project with a team of researchers from the Department of Strategy and Entrepreneurship at the Norwegian Business School.

The design process of the boats is a good example of the entrepreneurs' belief in the paramount importance of networking and collaboration, which can be associated with the practices of weaving and bricolage (Sarasvathy, 2001; Johannisson, 2000, 2018). In addition to the substantial experience from boat tourism and NGO work mentioned above, the entrepreneurial team has experience working for governmental and political organisations and the Confederation of Norwegian Enterprises, which has made them particularly competent at networking. Through weaving, the entrepreneurs have created an extensive and continuously expanding network of relations, which they perceive as the backbone of the company. They consider this network as a pool of resources on which they can count when necessary. This way of thinking can be associated with the practice of bricolage – selecting and combining the most suitable resources for each situation.

Nevertheless, with regard to the boats and their environmentally friendly design, it is notable that the description on the company's website regarding the tourist experience, which was reported at the beginning of this section, includes the environment as a subject. The use of the expression the 'Arctic coast deserves' suggests that nature is viewed not only as an important resource, constituting the main source of emotions and inspiration for tourists, as indicated in other nature-based tourism studies (e.g. Fossgard and Fredman, 2019). Nature is also regarded as a stakeholder through which the company's value proposition can be directed (Laine, 2010; Bocken et al., 2015; Brozovic, 2020). It can be inferred that the Brim Explorer experience is designed, more or less consciously, with this understanding of nature in mind. This can be related to a comment in the section dedicated to entrepreneurs, namely the *homo*

curans aspect and the ethic of care (Johannisson, 2011; Fors and Lennerfors, 2019). Interestingly, the issue about considering the natural environment as both a subject and a stakeholder also emerged during a meeting among the authors. It triggered an interesting conversation about how nature, sometimes referred as the silent stakeholder, has a very audible 'voice' in the various climate change effects the world population is experiencing, though it is often ignored by the majority of people, tourism operators included.

To make the Brim Explorer experience safe, green and of high quality, the company is highly selective in its recruitment process, pointing to an opportunity to identify an additional relevant entrepreneurial practice. The idea underlying the strategic selection of staff is to recruit competent people who hold the same standards as those of the entrepreneurs and are motivated to further develop their skills and acquire new ones if necessary. The company's employees, who refer to themselves as the Brim Team, are individuals of various educational and professional backgrounds and share a common passion for the ocean and its protection. Thus, employee recruitment can be described as 'hand-picking'. Following the metaphors used in the entrepreneuring literature (Sarasvathy, 2001), this process can be labelled under embroidery, the practice of enriching the existent social fabric of the company (the two entrepreneurs), in line with the main theme and vision.

Furthermore, with regard to the employees, Brim Explorer's organisational culture suggests that the concept of reflective practitioners applied to the entrepreneurs could also be applied to the employees. The Brim Team strives to live up to what they refer to as the Brim Concept, which is a constant improvement of employee quality and customer experience while upholding the triple bottom line of sustainability: environmental, socio-cultural and economic value. The main value highlighted by the entrepreneurs and shared among the employees can be described as a mindset, according to which the Brim Team members are change agents and trendsetters for the movement towards a greener future in the maritime and tourism industries. These considerations suggest that Brim Explorer's employees can be described as reflective

practitioners who, through their practices as captains, guides, machine engineers, politicians and business people, want to contribute to steering the tourism sector towards a more sustainable future. The motivation for this can be linked to their values, the basis on which they were recruited, and a strong team feeling, suggesting that the company's employees, together with the entrepreneurs, could be considered a community of reflective practitioners (Brown and Duguid, 1991; Wenger and Snyder, 2000).

The practices of weaving and bricolage addressed in relation to the company's broad network of partners and suppliers could also be observed in the project's experience design. Weaving can be related to both the company reaching out to and developing relationships with various actors for funding and collaboration and to the interrelation between its various projects. Recently, the company applied for government funding for the development of a tour, the *Norgesturné*, which covers the entire Norwegian coast and targets schools. This tour is based on another project, *Skoleskipet Brim*, which concerns research and education and consists in the development of a digital and physical platform in collaboration with five organisations active in marine life protection. For the *Norgesturné* tour, Brim is partnering with the World Wildlife Fund, a research and experience centre (*Vitenparken*), and the Norwegian Sea Rescue Society (*Redningsselskapet*). The latter partner is extremely valuable in terms of reaching a large number of schools: approximately 15,000 pupils and students are expected to be involved in the tours and the related physical and digital activities, including lectures about safety and sustainability in the marine environment, beach clean-ups, competitions and meetings.

The practice of bricolage in the context of experience design projects can be exemplified through the aforementioned *Skoleskipet Brim* project, of which the second author of this chapter is in charge. With a master's degree in marine biology, over 10 years of research and dissemination experience and a strong environmental consciousness, as demonstrated by her founding and management of an ocean protection NPO, she can reconcile the sometimes challenging connection between the scientific and corporate worlds and advocacy of

environmental protection. Putting her in charge of *Skoleskipet Brim* helps with the funding

applications, as well as the actual implementation of the project, due to her competence, skills,

motivations and personal network of relevant individuals and organisations.

Finally, the company's reaction to the COVID-19 outbreak highlights the important role of

the logic of effectuation, particularly the practice of quilting (Sarasvathy, 2001; Johannisson,

2018). The COVID-19 crisis (from March 2019 and ongoing) has precipitated dramatic change

in the tourism industry. In the summer of 2020, the company had plans to use both boats for

tours in the areas of Svalbard and Lofoten, which usually attracts a considerable number of

international tourists. With the introduction of travel restrictions, the company had to reconsider

these plans and develop new products for the domestic market. The areas identified as

interesting were Lofoten and Oslo. While several companies laid off their employees, relied on

the government to financially support their survival or went bankrupt, Brim invested in and

tested new products and concepts, including the arrangement of a boat concert as part of the

event *Lyse Netter* (Light Nights) in Lofoten and assuming the leading role in the Pride Festival's

sea parade in the Oslo Fjord. Turning the COVID-19 challenge into an opportunity was not

easy, but it was made possible by the entrepreneurs' attitude and creativity as well as support

instantiated through a strong organisational culture that values togetherness, growth and

novelty. This unique response to the crisis was reported by the local and national media and

arguably constituted a lesson of behaviour change for tourism operators, with the main

message being the possible co-existence of sustainability thinking, business viability and, not

least, resilience.

Entrepreneurial practices relevant to the design of tourism experiences that promote

green behaviours

The case of Brim Explorer suggests that the design of the company's offering as educational and transformative experiences aimed at inspiring tourists towards greener behaviours starts with the entrepreneurs' attitudes, values and beliefs. The case indicates that the entrepreneurs were explicit about their characteristics, in particular the ludic and caring aspects (Johannisson, 2011; Fors and Lennerfors, 2019), which were actively used in the company's vision and value proposition as well as in the search and selection of partners and employees. This can be seen as the overall entrepreneurial practice, which is associated with the concept of strategy in the practice literature (Whittington, 2003; Jarzabkowski et al., 2007). It is referred to as 'strategizing', that is, the 'doing of strategy' through a flow of actions and interactions among actors based on who they are, how they act and what resources they draw upon (Jarzabkowski et al., 2007). This overall entrepreneurial practice can then be labelled 'reflecting, visioning and strategizing' and is at the core of the creation of the community of practitioners (entrepreneurs, employees, partners, and suppliers) (Brown and Duguid, 1991) who are, ultimately, the protagonists of the experience design and the agents of change towards more sustainable tourism.

On a lower level, the entrepreneurial practices identified in the literature (Sarasvathy, 2001; Johannisson, 2018) and assessed as relevant in the investigated case were weaving, bricolage and quilting. The case resulted in the conceptualisation of an additional practice relevant to experience design, that of embroidering. Figure 2 shows the identified practices and parenthesises the activities where such practices were found to be particularly important in the investigated case. At the top of the figure, the text reports what can be labelled as the green entrepreneuring or ecopreneuring perspective, according to which a central role is recognised by the entrepreneurs regarding the possibility of doing business in a creative way and that respects the natural environment, perceived as a resource as well as a stakeholder. At the bottom of the figure, the element of behaviour change is reported. All the practices and, in particular, the visionary dimension of the reflecting, visioning and strategizing practice at the

basis of the experience design process can be related to the operators as role models, and the consequent function of tourism experiences as windows of opportunity for behaviour change (Steg & Vlek, 2009; Seeler and Schänzel, 2019). This can be relevant to the behaviour change of the company's customers and, combined with the quilting practice as suggested by the Brim case, to the other operators of the sector, with the result of an amplified effect on behaviour change by a vast number of tourists.

----- Fig. 2. Experience design for behaviour change as a complex entrepreneurial practice.

CONCLUSION

This study adopted a practice-based perspective on entrepreneurship and investigated the design process of tourism experiences for the promotion of green behaviours. It asked which entrepreneurial practices are relevant to the design of such experiences. The case of an ecotourism company (the place of work of one of the authors) was presented and discussed, and five entrepreneurial practices were identified as particularly relevant. Overall, the practice of reflecting, visioning and strategizing was found to be central in terms of the commitment by the entrepreneurs to enter the tourism sector with the intention to change it and the creation of a community of reflective practitioners among employees and partners. The practice of weaving was found to be particularly important in relation to networking with competent partners and suppliers of technology-related issues, and in the case under study, this proved to be essential for the creation of the physical experiencescape. To recruit employees and distribute the various tasks among them – for example, project management – the practices of embroidering and bricolage were identified as relevant. Bricolage involved the entrepreneurs' capacity to activate

partnership relations according to specific situations. The practice of quilting was found to be crucial for fast, radical changes necessary for the company's survival and renewal. This practice also appeared to inspire other tourism operators to adopt sustainable business models. Such aspect relative to the company demonstrating a best practice in times of crisis, together with the fundamental visionary dimension of the overall practice of reflecting, visioning and strategizing, has resulted to have the potential to amplify the company's effect on tourism behaviour change.

The main theoretical contribution of this study is the conceptualisation of the experience design process as a practice. This conceptualisation emphasises the interplay between some of the business model components: the key resources, activities and partners and the value proposition. Experience design intended for behaviour change towards sustainability was conceptualised as a complex entrepreneurial practice characterised by a company's business model, internal consistency and external dependencies, based on a shared vision of the natural environment as a resource and stakeholder, and on innovation as a feasible solution. This contribution was also valuable in relation to the still scant literature on business models in tourism.

This study focused on some business model components rarely explored in the experience design literature, which tends to be market-oriented. Future studies could adopt a more holistic perspective by investigating the entrepreneurial practices that link and give coherence to all the main business model components, both in terms of business and market-oriented in nature.

REFERENCES

Ateljevic, J. and Doorne, S. (2000) 'Staying within the fence: lifestyle entrepreneurship in tourism', *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 8(5), pp. 378–392.

Ballantyne, R. and Packer, J. (2005) 'Promoting environmentally sustainable attitudes and

    behaviour through free-choice learning experiences: what is the state of the game?'

    Environmental Education Research, 11(3), pp. 281–295.

Bargeman, B. and Richards, G. (2020) 'A new approach to understanding tourism

    practices,' *Annals of Tourism Research*, 84, pp. 102988.

Beech, N., MacIntosh, R. and MacLean, D. (2010) 'Dialogues between academics and

    practitioners: the role of generative dialogic encounters', *Organization Studies*, 31(9-10),

    pp. 1341–1367.

Bertella, G. (2011) 'Communities of practice in tourism: working and learning together. An

    illustrative case study from Northern Norway', *Tourism Planning & Development*, 8(4),

    pp. 381–397.

Bertella, G. (2018) 'Vegetarian ecofeminism in tourism: emerging tourism practices by

    institutional entrepreneurs', in Grimwood, B., Caon, K. and Cooke, L. (eds.) *New moral*

    natures in tourism. Oxon: Routledge, pp. 86–98.

Bertella, G. and Droli, M. (2019) 'Creative practices of local entrepreneurs reinventing built

    heritage', in Palmer, C. and Tivers, J. (eds.) *Creating heritage for tourism*. Oxon:

    Routledge, pp. x–xx.

Binder, J. and Belz, F. (2015) 'Sustainable entrepreneurship: what it is', in Kyrö, P. (ed.)

    Handbook of entrepreneurship and sustainable development. Cheltenham, UK: Edward

    Elgar, pp. 30–72.

Bocken, N. M. P., Rana, P. and Short, S. W. (2015) 'Value mapping for sustainable business

    thinking', *Journal of Industrial and Production Engineering*, 32(1), pp. 67–81.

BrimExplorer (2020) 'Electric Fjord cruises in Norway'. Available at: https://brimexplorer.com/

    [Accessed 01 December 2020].

Brown, J. S. and Duguid, P. (1991) 'Organizational learning and communities-of-practice: toward a unified view of working, learning, and innovation', *Organization Science*, 2(1), pp. 40–57.

Brozovic, D. (2020) 'Business model based on strong sustainability: insights from an empirical study', *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 29(2), pp. 763–778.

Çakmak, E., Lie, R. and 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, pp. 37–47.

Carlsen, J., Morrison, A. and Weber P. (2008) 'Lifestyle oriented small tourism firms', *Tourism Recreation Research*, 33(3), pp. 255–263

Cockburn-Wootten, C., McIntosh, A. J., Smith, K. and Jefferies, S. (2018) 'Communicating across tourism silos for inclusive sustainable partnerships', *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 26(9), pp. 1483–1498.

Cope, J. (2005) 'Toward a dynamic learning perspective of entrepreneurship', *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 29(4), pp. 373–397.

Corradi, G., Gherardi, S. and Verzelloni, L. (2010) 'Through the practice lens: where is the bandwagon of practice-based studies heading?' *Management Learning*, 41(3), pp. 265–283.

Cunha, C., Kastenholz, E. and Carneiro, M. J. (2020) 'Entrepreneurs in rural tourism: do lifestyle motivations contribute to management practices that enhance sustainable entrepreneurial ecosystems?' *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 44, pp. 215–226.

de Souza Bispo, M. (2016) 'Tourism as practice', *Annals of Tourism Research*, 61, pp. 170–179.

Dimov, D. (2017) *The reflective entrepreneur*. Oxon: Routledge.

Dixit, S. K. (ed.) (2020) *The Routledge handbook of tourism experience management and marketing*. Oxon: Routledge.

Duening, T., Shepherd, M. and Czaplewski, A. (2012) 'How entrepreneurs think: why effectuation and effectual logic may be the key to successful enterprise entrepreneurship', *International Journal of Innovation Science*, 4(4), pp. 205–216.

Duxbury, N., Bakas, F. E. and Pato de Carvalho, C. (2019) 'Why is research–practice collaboration so challenging to achieve? A creative tourism experiment', *Tourism Geographies*, DOI: 10.1080/14616688.2019.1630670.

Dwyer, L. (2018) 'Saluting while the ship sinks: the necessity for tourism paradigm change', *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 26(1), pp. 29–48.

Fesenmaier, D. R. and Xiang, Z. (eds.) (2016) *Design science in tourism: foundations of destination management*. Cham: Springer.

Fors, P. and Lennerfors, T. T. (2019) 'The individual-care nexus: a theory of entrepreneurial care for sustainable entrepreneurship', *Sustainability*, 11(18), p. 4904.

Fossgard, K. and Fredman, P. (2019) 'Dimensions in the nature-based tourism experiencescape: an explorative analysis', *Journal of Outdoor Recreation and Tourism*, 28, pp. 100219.

Gast, J., Gundolf, K. and Cesinger, B. (2017) 'Doing business in a green way: a systematic review of the ecological sustainability entrepreneurship literature and future research directions', *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 147, pp. 44–56.

Grégoire, D. A. and Cherchem, N. (2020) 'A structured literature review and suggestions for future effectuation research', *Small Business Economics*, 54(3), pp. 621–639.

Hales, R., Dredge, D., Higgins-Desbiolles, F. and Jamal, T. (2018) 'Academic activism in tourism studies: critical narratives from four researchers', *Tourism Analysis*, 23(2), pp. 189–199.

Hockerts, K. and Wüstenhagen, R. (2010) 'Greening Goliaths versus emerging Davids – theorizing about the role of incumbents and new entrants in sustainable entrepreneurship', *Journal of Business Venturing*, 25(5), pp. 481–492.

Jamal, T. (2004) 'Virtue ethics and sustainable tourism pedagogy: phronesis, principles and practice', *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 12(6), pp. 530–545.

Jamal, T., Taillon, J. and Dredge, D. (2011) 'Sustainable tourism pedagogy and academic community collaboration: a progressive service-learning approach', *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 11(2), pp. 133–147.

James, L., Ren, C. and Halkier, H. (2019) *Theories of practice in tourism*. Oxon: Routledge.

Jarzabkowski, P., Balogun, J. and Seidl, D. (2007) 'Strategizing: the challenges of a practice perspective', *Human Relations*, 60(1), pp. 5–27.

Johannisson, B. (2000) 'Networking and entrepreneurial growth', in Sexton, D. and Landström, H. (eds.) *Handbook of entrepreneurship*. London: Blackwell, pp. 368–386.

Johannisson, B. (2011) 'Towards a practice theory of entrepreneuring', *Small Business Economics*, 36(2), pp. 135–150.

Johannisson, B. (2018) 'Disclosing everyday practices constituting social entrepreneuring–a case of necessity effectuation', *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 30(3-4), pp. 390–406.

Joyce, A. and Paquin, R. (2016) 'The triple layered business model canvas: a tool to design more sustainable business models', *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 135, pp. 1474–1486.

Kernel, P. (2005) 'Creating and implementing a model for sustainable development in tourism enterprises', *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 13(2), pp. 151–164.

Kokkranikal, J. and Morrison, A. (2002) 'Entrepreneurship and sustainable tourism: the houseboats of Keral', *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 4(1), pp. 7–20.

Laine, M. (2010) 'The nature of nature as a stakeholder', *Journal of Business Ethics*, 96(1), pp. 73–78.

Lamers, M., Van der Duim, R. and Spaargaren, G. (2017) 'The relevance of practice theories for tourism research', *Annals of Tourism Research*, 62, pp. 54–63.

Lander, D. A. and English, L. M. (2000) 'Doing research 'with': reading and writing our difference', *Reflective Practice*, 1(3), pp. 343–358.

Lean, G. L. (2009) 'Transformative travel: inspiring sustainability', in Bushell, R. and Sheldon, P. J. (eds.) *Wellness and tourism: mind, body, spirit, place.* New York: Cognizant, pp. 191–205.

Lebe, S. S., Mulej, M., Crnogaj, K., Rebernik, M., Hojnik, B. B. and Gomezelj, D. O. (2014) 'Building a model of researching the sustainable entrepreneurship in the tourism sector', *Kybernetes*, 43(3/4), pp. 377–393.

Lerner, D. A., Hunt, R. A. and Dimov, D. (2018) 'Action! Moving beyond the intendedly-rational logics of entrepreneurship', *Journal of Business Venturing*, 33(1), pp. 52–69.

Lordkipanidze, M., Brezet, H. and Backman, M. (2005) 'The entrepreneurship factor in sustainable tourism development', *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 13(8), pp. 787–798.

Lundberg, C., Fredman, P. and Wall-Reinius, S. (2014) 'Going for the green? The role of money among nature-based tourism entrepreneurs', *Current Issues in Tourism*, 17(4), pp. 373–380.

McCarthy, B. (2012) 'From fishing and factories to cultural tourism: the role of social entrepreneurs in the construction of a new institutional field,' *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 24(3-4), pp. 259–282.

Morgan, A. D. (2010) 'Journey into transformation: travel to "other" place as a vehicle for transformative learning', *Journal of Transformative Learning*, 8(4), pp. 246–268.

Moscardo, G. (1998) 'Interpretation and sustainable tourism: functions, examples and principles', *Journal of Tourism Studies*, 9(1), pp. 2–13.

Muñoz, P. and Cohen, B. (2018) 'Sustainable entrepreneurship research: taking stock and looking ahead', *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 27(3), pp. 300–322.

Orefice, C. and Nyarko, N. (2020) 'Sustainable value creation in event ecosystems–a business models perspective', *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, DOI: 10.1080/09669582.2020.1843045.

Osterwalder, A. and Pigneur, Y. (2009) *Business model generation – a handbook for visionaries, game changers, and challengers*. Amsterdam: John Wiley & Sons.

Phelan, C., and Sharpley, R. (2011)' Exploring agritourism entrepreneurship in the UK', *Tourism Planning & Development*, 8(2), pp. 121–136.

Poldner, K., Shrivastava, P. and Branzei, O. (2017) 'Embodied multi-discursivity: an aesthetic process approach to sustainable entrepreneurship', *Business & Society*, 56(2), pp. 214–252.

Pratt, S. and Suntikul, W. (2016) 'Can marine wildlife tourism provide an "edutaining" experience?' *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 33(6), pp. 867–884.

Reckwitz, A. (2002) 'Toward a theory of social practices: a development in culturalist theorizing', *European Journal of Social Theory*, 5(2), pp. 243–263.

Reinhold, S., Zach, F. J. and Krizaj, D. (2017) 'Business models in tourism: a review and research agenda', *Tourism Review*, 72(4), pp. 462–482.

Reinl, L. and Kelliher, F. (2014) 'The social dynamics of micro-firm learning in an evolving learning community', *Tourism Management*, 40, pp. 117–125.

Sahebalzamani, S. and Bertella, G. (2018) 'Business models and sustainability in nature tourism: a systematic review of the literature', *Sustainability*, 10(9), pp. 3226.

Santini, C. (2017) 'Ecopreneurship and ecopreneurs: limits, trends and characteristics', *Sustainability*, 9(4), pp. 492-503.

Sarasvathy, S. D. (2001) 'Causation and effectuation: toward a theoretical shift from economic inevitability to entrepreneurial contingency', *Academy of Management Review*, 26(2), pp. 243–263.

Schön, D. A. (1983) *The reflective practitioner: how professionals think in action*. New York: Basic Books.

Scott, N., Gao, J. and Ma, J. (eds.) (2017) *Visitor experience design*. Oxfordshire: CABI.

Seeler, S. and Schänzel, H.A. (2019) 'From the fluidity of the experience economy to transformative experiences as a catalyst for positive change: the future of experiential travel', *Journal of Tourism Futures*, 5(2), pp. 111–113.

Smit, B. and Melissen, F. (2018) *Sustainable customer experience design: co-creating experiences in events, tourism and hospitality*. Oxon: Routledge.

Steg, L. and Vlek, C. (2009) 'Encouraging pro-environmental behaviour: An integrative review and research agenda', *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 29(3), pp. 309–317.

Steyaert, C. (2007) 'Entrepreneuring as a conceptual attractor? A review of process theories in 20 years of entrepreneurship studies', *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 19(6), pp. 453–477.

Stone, M. J. and Petrick, J. F. (2013) 'The educational benefits of travel experiences: a literature review', *Journal of Travel Research*, 52(6), pp. 731–744.

Teece, D. J. (2010) 'Business models, business strategy and innovation', *Long Range Planning*, 43(2-3), pp. 172–194.

Thomas, R., Shaw, G. and Page, S. J. (2011) 'Understanding small firms in tourism: a perspective on research trends and challenges', *Tourism Management*, 32(5), pp. 963–976.

Tomassini, L. (2019) 'The co-creation of diverse values and paradigms in small values-based tourism firms', *Tourism Recreation Research*, 44(3), pp. 359–369.

Tribe, J. (2002) 'Education for ethical tourism action', *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 10(4), pp. 309–324.

Tussyadiah, I. P. (2014) 'Toward a theoretical foundation for experience design in tourism', *Journal of Travel Research*, 53(5), pp. 543–564.

Verplanken, B. and Wood, W. (2006) 'Interventions to break and create consumer habits',

    Journal of Public Policy & Marketing, 25 (1), pp. 90–103.

Welter, F. (2011) 'Contextualizing entrepreneurship – conceptual challenges and ways forward',

    Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 35(1), pp. 165–184.

Wenger, E. C. and Snyder, W. M. (2000) 'Communities of practice: the organizational frontier',

    Harvard Business Review, 78(1), pp. 139–146.

Whittington, R. (2003) 'The work of strategizing and organizing: for a practice perspective',

    Strategic Organization, 1(1), pp. 117–125.

Wolf, I. D., Ainsworth, G. B. and Crowley, J. (2017) 'Transformative travel as a sustainable

    market niche for protected areas: a new development, marketing and conservation

    model', *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 25(11), pp. 1650–1673.

Zeppel, H. (2008) 'Education and conservation benefits of marine wildlife tours: developing free-

    choice learning experiences', *The Journal of Environmental Education*, 39(3), pp. 3–18.

Zott, C. and Amit, R. (2010) 'Business model design: an activity system perspective', *Long

    Range Planning*, 43(2–3), pp. 216–226.