



I Feel Good! Perceptions and Emotional Responses of Bed & Breakfast Providers in New Zealand Toward Trip Advisor

Girish Prayag, C. Michael Hall & Hannah Wood

To cite this article: Girish Prayag, C. Michael Hall & Hannah Wood (2017): I Feel Good! Perceptions and Emotional Responses of Bed & Breakfast Providers in New Zealand Toward Trip Advisor, Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management, DOI: [10.1080/19368623.2017.1318731](https://doi.org/10.1080/19368623.2017.1318731)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/19368623.2017.1318731>



Accepted author version posted online: 19 Apr 2017.
Published online: 19 Apr 2017.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 103



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



I Feel Good! Perceptions and Emotional Responses of Bed & Breakfast Providers in New Zealand Toward Trip Advisor

Girish Prayag, C. Michael Hall and Hannah Wood

Department of Management, Marketing and Entrepreneurship, University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to segment the perceptions of Bed & Breakfast (B&Bs) providers in relation to user-generated content (UGC) and to identify their felt emotions in response to customers' online positive and negative comments. A survey of B&B providers in New Zealand revealed the existence of four clusters of perceptions (Neutrals, Detesters, Supporters, and Apprehensives). The identified clusters are not different on their business characteristics but felt a wide range of emotions in response to UGC reviews. The four clusters differ significantly more in their emotional responses to reading positive rather than negative online reviews. Implications for management of online reviews by B&B providers as well as their well-being are suggested.

KEYWORDS

B&B operators; felt emotions; New Zealand; segmentation; UGC perceptions

本研究旨在细分住宿与早餐（B&B）提供方对用户生成内容（UGC）的看法，并确定他们对客户的积极和消极在线评论的感受。对新西兰B&B提供方的调查显示，存在四组感知人群（中立者、厌恶者、支持者和欣赏者）。这些细分群体在业务特征上并没有差异，但对UGC的评论却有完全不同的情绪感受。这四个群体在看到积极（而不是消极）的在线评论时的情绪反应差异明显。研究结果对于B&B提供方管理在线评论及其利弊有重要参考意义。

Introduction

User-generated content (UGC) has a significant influence on consumers' travel behavior and accommodation choice (Cox, Burgess, Sellitto, & Buultjens, 2009; Ye, Law, Gu, & Chen, 2011). Surprisingly, few studies explore tourism and hospitality providers' perceptions of social media (Pappas, 2016; Yoo & Lee, 2015). Existing research mainly examines the impacts of UGC on travel planning (Ayeh, Au, & Law, 2013; Cox et al., 2009; Schmallegger & Carson, 2008), hotel online bookings (Sparks & Browning, 2011; Ye et al., 2011), and hotel sales (Ye, Law, & Gu, 2009). Some studies examine how managers in the hospitality industry respond to negative online reviews by customers (e.g., Mauri & Minazzi, 2013) and may even set out to influence or manipulate reviews (Gössling, Hall, & Andersson, 2016). Lu and Stepchenkova (2015) review of UGC studies in the tourism and hospitality literature suggest that the majority of research examines customer-related issues. It is, therefore, of no surprise that existing studies on perceptions of UGC have

CONTACT Girish Prayag ✉ girish.prayag@canterbury.ac.nz Department of Management, Marketing and Entrepreneurship, University of Canterbury, Private Bag 4800, Christchurch 8140, New Zealand.

© 2017 Taylor & Francis Group, LLC

prioritized customers' perceptions and attitudes at the expense of service providers. Service providers' perceptions of online comments influence the type of management strategies they put in place to respond to UGC, and these strategies can impact the ultimate success or even the survival of smaller accommodation providers (Gössling et al., 2016; Hills & Cairncross, 2011). Limited research has examined how small accommodation providers perceive UGC (Hills & Cairncross, 2011). Specifically, not much is known about the perceptions of Bed & Breakfast (B&B) owners/managers toward UGC. This group of accommodation providers is significant to many destinations, including New Zealand, but often overlooked with respect to their business practices and online behavior (Gössling et al., 2016).

Likewise, emotions are central to consumption experiences (Nyer, 1997). Studies on service providers' emotions have dealt mainly with the management of emotions as part of service delivery, that is, emotional labor (Gursoy, Boylu, & Avci, 2011; Sohn & Lee, 2012). Attitudes, perceptions, as well as emotions are strong predictors of behavior (Allen, Machleit, & Kleine, 1992). In the entrepreneurship literature, it is increasingly recognized that the emotions of small business owners affect the entrepreneurial process, including the evaluation, reformulation, and exploitation of business opportunities (Cardon, Foo, Shepherd, & Wiklund, 2012) as well as the preferred courses of action (Foo, 2011). As such, small business operators' perceptions of and emotions felt toward UGC are possible explanatory variables of how they respond to customers' online comments (behavior). In fact, previous studies (Patzelt & Shepherd, 2011) confirm that entrepreneurs are more susceptible than employees to experience negative emotions due to stress, fear of failure, and mental strain among others. This has an impact not only on the well-being of SME owners but also on the long-term success and survival of such businesses.

The main objective of this study is, therefore, to examine the relationship between service providers' perceptions of UGC and their felt emotions in response to customers' comments on Trip Advisor. Trip Advisor is the most popular form of travel-related UGC and arguably the most influential (McCarthy, Stock, & Verma, 2010). Most studies in the tourism and hospitality field use Trip Advisor and other similar websites as their UGC source (Lu & Stepchenkova, 2015). As such, the contribution of this study is three-fold. First, by segmenting and profiling service providers' perceptions of social media and UGC, the study identifies both strong and vulnerable groups of B&B accommodation providers. These groups may require different support strategies by the government and the accommodation sector to capitalize on the business opportunities provided by social media (e.g., reputation enhancement and online visibility). Existing studies (Del Chiappa, Alarcón-Del-Amo, & Lorenzo-Romero, 2016; Del Chiappa, Lorenzo-Romero, & Alarcón-del-Amo, 2015; Ip, Lee, & Law, 2012; Lo, McKercher, Lo, Cheung, & Law, 2011) prioritize consumers' perspectives and therefore fail to consider that different providers may have different levels of understanding and acceptability of UGC (Gössling et al., 2016; Hills & Cairncross, 2011). Second, the study contributes to the limited literature on the emotions of tourism entrepreneurs. The majority of existing studies (Cardon et al., 2012; Foo, 2011; Patzelt & Shepherd, 2011) have examined the positive and negative emotions of small business owners other than small accommodation providers. The findings have important implications for understanding the well-being of small business owners and its subsequent impact on business success (Patzelt & Shepherd, 2011). Third, there are limited studies on commercial homestay businesses (e.g., Lynch, McIntosh, & Tucker, 2009) such as B&Bs,

despite the importance of the sector to the hospitality industry in New Zealand and elsewhere (Hall & Rusher, 2004, 2005; Nummedal & Hall, 2006). With the growth of online booking sites (Sluka, 2015), understanding B&B operators perceptions of and emotions related to UGC can enhance the current literature on the online behavior of service providers.

Literature review

UGC and accommodation providers' perceptions

UGC offers businesses several advantages such as a viable channel for understanding and monitoring consumer feedback and preferences (Basarani, 2011), communicating with existing and potential customers, and using UGC as a source of information for organizational change and new product development (Tussyadiah & Zach, 2013). Positive reviews are a form of free marketing as they enhance awareness and improve overall attitude toward the business (Racherla, Connolly, & Christodoulidou, 2013). Negative reviews can potentially help accommodation providers become more aware of problems when they occur (Litvin & Hoffman, 2012). Existing research on the influence of UGC on business practices suggests that UGC can improve perceived trustworthiness (Cox et al., 2009) and reputation (Basarani, 2011), improve facilities, enhance visitor satisfaction, monitor business image, and provide insight into how service failures can be resolved (Litvin, Goldsmith, & Pan, 2008). Despite these advantages, with issues of unfair and fraudulent ratings and reviews being of concern (Ayeh et al., 2013), it is not surprising that accommodation providers feel threatened by the lack of control they have on UGC websites (Gössling et al., 2016; Hills & Cairncross, 2011; Pantano & Corvello, 2013).

Despite misgivings as to the validity of online reviews, the general consensus among hospitality managers seems to be that if hospitality businesses are to succeed in the future, managers need to be actively monitoring (O'Connor, 2010) and influencing (Gössling et al., 2016) their online business reputation. Businesses that are unaware of, or do not keep up with UGC and its developments, could become severely disadvantaged (Hills & Cairncross, 2011). Yet, many hospitality businesses do not know how they should be handling online reviews, particularly those that are negative (Basarani, 2011; Gössling et al., 2016; Gössling & Lane, 2015; Zhang & Vásquez, 2014). Only 10% of the Trip Advisor reviews in Smyth, Wu and Greenes (2010) study received a management response. Hotels with a lower overall rating are much less likely to reply to negative reviews (Levy, Duan, & Boo, 2013).

Detailed accounts of managerial response to negative reviews are still limited (Gössling et al., 2016, 2016; O'Connor, 2010; Zhang & Vásquez, 2014), with organizations often preferring not to react to such reviews (Pantano & Corvello, 2013). There is no agreement among researchers on the best way to respond to poor reviews, although there is growing interest in their importance for reputation management (Dijkmans, Kerkhof, & Beukeboom, 2015). Schmallegger and Carson (2008) believe managers should promptly respond to negative reviews in order to tackle the problem early, dispel rumors, and improve customer relations. Mauri and Minazzi (2013) feel managers should be cautious when replying directly to negative eWOM as defensive responses could have a negative effect on the purchase intention of other customers. Instead, they believe managers should

acknowledge the problems and determine the best way to resolve the issue, but if they feel the criticism is unjust, they should contact the complainant privately in order to avoid further negative eWOM (Mauri & Minazzi, 2013). Starkov and Mechoso (2008) outline a number of measures that should be followed when replying to a negative review (e.g., thank the customer; apologize if the negative review is right; provide a short explanation of what went wrong without making excuses managers; offer a direct line of communication between management and the reviewer, amongst others). Nonetheless, Gössling, Hall and Andersson (2016, p. 6) noted that guest comments at times were perceived by managers “as harsh and unjustified, affecting them in personal ways, contributing to emotions of hurt, sadness, irritation, or anger.” Overall, the literature seems to suggest that there is significant variation in how accommodation providers respond to UGC.

Perceptions and emotions

The cognition-affect school of thought (Lazarus, 1991) posits that cognition is a necessary but not sufficient condition to elicit affect. Affect has been described as the overall emotions and/or moods experienced over a certain period of time (Nawijn, Mitas, Lin, & Kerstetter, 2013). The hospitality industry offers what can be described as an emotionally laden experience (Ladhari, 2009). Several studies have examined the influence of positive and/or negative emotions of customers in response to service delivery (Chen, Peng, & Hung, 2015; Ekinci, Dawes, & Massey, 2008; Jang & Namkung, 2009), while there is also substantial interest in the emotional labor of employees (Li, Canziani, & Barbieri, 2016; Ram, 2015; Warhurst & Nickson, 2007; Xu et al., 2015). Surprisingly, there are no studies that evaluate the emotions felt by accommodation providers as a result of customers’ evaluations of their service offering. Emotions can be described as short-lived, intense, conscious responses of humans to stimuli in their environment (Nawijn et al., 2013). According to Lazarus (1991), people first recognize what is happening around them based on perceptions and then evaluate how they feel about the situation. External and internal cues are thus appraised in terms of one’s own experience and goals. “Appraisal of the significance of the person–environment relationship, therefore, is both necessary and sufficient; without a personal appraisal (i.e., of harm or benefit) there will be no emotion; when such an appraisal is made, an emotion of some kind is inevitable” (Lazarus, 1991, p. 177).

Lin (2004) argues that an individual’s cognitive perception stimulate his or her emotional responses. In tourism studies, the cognition-affect link has been evaluated in several studies (Bigne, Andreu & Gnoth, 2005; Lee, Lee, & Lee, 2005; Lo, Wu, & Tsai, 2015), with the conclusion that customers’ emotions are very much dependent on their perceptions of the tourism experience. Generally, tourists tend to recall positive emotions more than negative ones (Hosany & Prayag, 2013; Nawijn et al., 2013) when holidaying. However, dissatisfied consumers in UGC-related research tend to express negative emotions such as anger and frustration (Banerjee & Chua, 2014; Presi, Saridakis, & Hartmans, 2014). In a study of Swedish hotel managers’ reactions to online reviews, Gössling et al. (2016) found that owners of small businesses reported several negative emotions such as hurt, sadness, irritation, and anger. Overall, the literature remains thin on the positive and negative emotions that are elicited by UGC content among hospitality service providers, but which

may be critical for future interaction with customers as well as the degree of commitment individuals feel toward their business (Bensemann & Hall, 2010).

Relatedly, the term “entrepreneurial emotion” (Foo, 2011) has been used to describe the felt emotions of entrepreneurs with respect to opportunity evaluation and self-employment in the entrepreneurship literature (Foo, 2011; Patzelt & Shepherd, 2011). These studies suggest that self-employed individuals generally in the context of family businesses experience positive emotions such as passion, excitement, hope, and happiness. These individuals, due to income and job uncertainty, required work effort, as well as responsibility and risk taking, can experience considerable negative emotions such as fear, anxiety, anger, and loneliness (Foo, 2011; Patzelt & Shepherd, 2011). However, it has been suggested that in comparison to those who are employed, self-employed individuals experience fewer negative emotions (Patzelt & Shepherd, 2011).

Segmentation studies on emotions and perceptions of UGC

Segmentation remains a core element of marketing theory. While traditionally segmentation has been applied to consumers, several studies use the technique to segment stakeholders with the aim of identifying, for example, similar groups of stakeholders based on their perceptions of corporate social responsibility (Hillenbrand & Money, 2009) and to facilitate resource allocation (Rupp, Kern, & Helmig, 2014). Emotion as a segmentation variable has received considerable theoretical support (Bigné & Andreu, 2004). In tourism studies, existing studies have segmented consumer emotions (Bigné & Andreu, 2004; Del Chiappa, Andreu, & G. Gallarza, 2014; Hosany & Prayag, 2013) and perceptions of UGC (Del Chiappa et al., 2015). For example, Bigné and Andreu (2004) found two clusters of emotions (pleasure and arousal) based on the intensity of tourists’ felt emotions. Hosany and Prayag (2013) found five clusters (delighted, unemotional, negatives, mixed, and passionate) in their study of UK consumers. These studies proceed with profiling of the identified clusters using demographic and travelling characteristics. In contrast, Del Chiappa et al. (2015) segment the perceptions of trust by consumers in relation to UGC uploaded in different types of peer-to-peer application. Their findings suggest the existence of three customer groups (untrusted, social-web, and distrustful tourists). The untrusted tourists, for example, express a moderate degree of trust in UGC. These authors then profile the segments on the basis of various sociodemographic characteristics including motivation to use UGC. Despite the lack of studies on segmentation of emotions in tourism (Bigné & Andreu, 2004; Hosany & Prayag, 2013), in this study we segment the perceptions of UGC first and then profile the segments by emotions felt and business characteristics for two reasons. First, by linking clusters of perceptions with emotions felt, the results conform to the traditional cognition-affect school of thought (Lazarus, 1991). Second, by linking perceptions to emotional responses for service providers, a better understanding of managerial responses to reviews and their capacity to manage online customer relationships can be gained (Gössling et al., 2016).

Method

The research context

A B&B is defined as an establishment, usually a private home, that provides overnight accommodation and breakfast to members of the public (Lynch, 1994). According to Hall and Rusher (2004, 2005), the typical B&B business in New Zealand is small, offering two or three bedrooms, and is often a “lifestyle” business where the B&B operator combines social and monetary goals in his or her entrepreneurial strategies. B&Bs in New Zealand usually cater to a maximum of 10 guests at any one time to ensure that the personal service expected is not compromised (Bed and Breakfast Association New Zealand, n.d.). B&B accommodation providers usually offer some sort of esthetic, historical, architectural, personal, or other features that make the property distinctive or memorable to guests (Kline, Morrison, & John, 2005). B&Bs worldwide vary in terms of their amenities, location, and service (Crawford & Naar, 2016). It is well accepted that small accommodation providers have a difficult time balancing work and life (Bensemman & Hall, 2010; Hsieh, 2010). This is often due to the owner–operator business model of the B&B which requires the delivery of a personal service out of the family home (Hall, 2009). Given that owners are often managers, they have to cope physically with the demands of operating the business but also emotionally as a result of positive and negative comments by their customers, whether face-to-face or online (Gössling et al., 2016; Lynch et al., 2009).

Survey instrument

The survey instrument was built from both the literature review and content analysis of B&B websites in New Zealand. Following a process similar to Smyth et al. (2010), the Trip Advisor reviews of 75 New Zealand B&Bs uploaded by users in the period July 2010–June 2013 were content analyzed. In total, 2462 reviews were included in the content analysis sample, with an average of 32.8 reviews per B&B, which represented just over three pages. The purpose of the content analysis was to identify emotional responses from customers about the B&Bs, the Trip Advisor ratings of the B&Bs, and B&B operators’ responses to online reviews. This study focuses on reporting the survey rather than the content analysis results. From the content analysis phase and the literature review (Hall & Rusher, 2004, 2005; Hills & Cairncross, 2011; Presi et al., 2014), 13 items ($\alpha = 0.747$) measured respondents’ perceptions of online reviews and Trip Advisor on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree, 5 = Strongly Agree). A 7-point semantic differential scale was used to measure seven and nine emotional responses that B&B owners felt after reading positive ($\alpha = 0.939$) and negative ($\alpha = 0.754$) online reviews, respectively. These emotional responses were identified from the content analysis and the literature (Bigné & Andreu, 2004; Holbrook & Batra, 1987). The survey also included measures of business characteristics (location, number of years of operation, number of guest rooms), UGC-related behavior, and an open-ended question on respondents’ general views of online reviews. The survey instrument was pre-tested before survey administration.

Sampling, data collection, and data analysis

The online survey was developed using Qualtrics software and distributed to a database of New Zealand B&Bs. The database consisted of 650 B&Bs and was purposely developed for this study. The contact details of the B&Bs were found using the Bed and Breakfast Association of New Zealand website, the 2013 New Zealand Bed and Breakfast eBook, and the AA (Automobile Association) travel website. A cover letter and the survey instrument were initially sent via e-mail in 2013 and a follow-up e-mail was sent as a reminder a week after the initial e-mail was sent, excluding respondents who had initially completed the survey and those who opted out of the study. Finally, a second reminder was e-mailed out to the sample, once again excluding those who had completed the survey or chosen to opt out 2 weeks after the initial e-mail was sent out. A total of 150 completed surveys were obtained, equating to a 23% response rate which is relatively high for an online survey, given that the average has been found to be about 11% (Monroe & Adams, 2012). Of the 150 completed surveys, 128 were useable for data analysis. While the resulting sample size is relatively small compared to segmentation studies on consumers, it should be noted that the sampling frame (650 B&Bs) itself is considerably smaller than those employed in consumer studies. In comparison to consumer studies, stakeholder segmentation studies tend to have smaller sample sizes (Hillenbrand & Money, 2009; Rupp et al., 2014).

The data were analyzed in three stages. First, using Dolnicar's (2004) common sense approach to segmentation, the original scores for the 13 perception items were used to cluster respondents into homogenous groups using the *k-means* algorithm. Second, in line with previous studies (e.g., Park & Yoon, 2009; Prayag & Hosany, 2014; Sarigollu & Huang, 2005), discriminant analysis was used to confirm the validity of the "best" cluster solution. Given the small sample size, the results were bootstrapped for the best cluster solution (1000 sub-samples) to ensure stability of the identified clusters. Ernst and Dolnicar (2017) recommend bootstrapping as a means to avoid random segmentation solutions. Finally, the clusters were profiled against the business characteristics and emotions (positive and negative), with the objective of identifying B&B operators that were either the most apprehensive or contented based on their emotional responses to UGC comments by customers. Pertinent quotes from the open-ended questions in the survey are embedded within the results to further characterize and validate the clusters.

Findings

Characteristics of the B&Bs surveyed

Of the B&Bs surveyed, 43.8% have been in operation more than 10 years, with more than a quarter (25.8%) having three guest rooms, and more than a third (33.6%) charging between \$151 and \$200 per night. As can be seen in Table 1, the majority of hosts (69.6%) have less than half of their total household income derived from their B&B. The B&B is the sole source of household income for only 9.4% of B&Bs. Compared to Hall and Rusher's (2004) nightly tariff of \$81 for a single bed and \$127 for a double bed, the average nightly tariff of this sample appears higher, with 63.3% of the sample charging more than \$150. The sample also comprised of 60.5% of owners/operators who are mainly middle aged (≥ 45 years old).

UGC-related behaviors of B&B operators

By far, the most commonly utilized customer feedback methods of B&B operators are the guestbook (89.1%) and Trip Advisor (81%). Over two-thirds (68%) of the B&Bs in the study hold a Trip Advisor Certificate of Excellence. Trip Advisor is not the only form of UGC B&B operators are monitoring, Table 2 displays the other websites operators are checking for content related to their B&B. The “other” category in Table 2 includes websites such as AA Travel, Agoda, Bookit, Travel Bug, and Wotif.

Segmenting perceptions of online reviews and Trip Advisor

Cluster analysis was used to identify homogeneous groups of B&B operators based on their perceptions of UGC. As a starting point, Wards’s (1963) hierarchical clustering method with squared Euclidean distances was performed on the sample to identify potential clusters in the dataset. The agglomeration schedule proposed the presence of three to five clusters. Initially, three-, four-, and five-cluster solutions were generated and evaluated in terms of their size and group membership. The four-cluster solution was the best based on these criteria. To ensure that differences existed between the

Table 1. Bed and breakfast characteristics.

Number of years in operation	%	Location	%	Average nightly tariff (NZ\$)	%
< 1 year	3.1	Northland	8.6	\$50–100	6.3
1–2 years	5.5	Auckland	3.9	\$101–150	30.5
3–5 years	20.3	Waikato	14.1	\$151–200	33.6
6–10 years	27.3	Bay of Plenty	10.2	\$201–250	16.4
+10 years	43.8	Gisborne	1.6	\$250+	13.3
		Hawke’s Bay	5.5		
		Taranaki	1.6		
		Manawatu-Whanganui	3.1		
		Wellington	7.0		
		Nelson-Marlborough	9.4		
		West Coast	5.5		
		Canterbury	17.2		
		Otago	10.2		
		Southland	2.3		
Number of guest rooms		% of household income derived from B&B			
1	5.5	Less than half			55.5
2	39.1	Approximately half			14.1
3	25.8	More than half			12.5
4	15.6	Sole source			9.4
5	4.7	Not disclosed			8.6
6+	9.4				

Table 2. Other UGC monitored by B&B hosts.

Other UGC monitored by B&B operators	Number	%
Booking.com	46	36
Facebook	42	33
Bed&breakfast.com	38	30
Google+	22	17
Expedia	18	14
Travel blogs	10	8
Other	47	37

clusters and perceptions of online reviews, a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) with the 13 perceptions items as the dependent variables and the four clusters as the fixed factors was conducted. Results show that the four clusters are significantly different from each other in regard to all 13 perceptions items ($p = .000$), providing evidence of the reliability of the cluster solution (Table 3). Cases are not evenly distributed across the four clusters (Table 3). Cluster 1 is the largest, accounting for 42.2% of respondents ($n = 54$). Cluster 2 is the smallest, containing only 5.5% of respondents ($n = 7$). Though, small, there is no rule on the appropriate size of a cluster (Dolnicar, 2002). Clusters 3 and 4 have reasonable size memberships, with 31.2% ($n = 40$) and 21.1% ($n = 27$) of respondents, respectively.

Multiple discriminant analysis was also used to validate the accuracy of the four-cluster solution (Hosany & Prayag, 2013; Prayag & Hosany, 2014; Sarigollu & Huang, 2005). The results (Table 4) showed that three discriminant functions were extracted, explaining the majority of the variance in the four-cluster solution. The canonical correlations for functions one and two are high and significant ($p = .000$), while the canonical correlation of function three is moderate and significant ($p = .029$). These correlations indicate that the model explains a significant relationship between the functions and the dependent variable, perceptions. The classification matrix shows that 97.7% of cases have been classified correctly (hit ratio) in the respective cluster, thus demonstrating a very high accuracy rate of this cluster solution.

Cluster 1 was labeled “Neutrals,” as most of their perception scores were generally mid-scale, compared to the other three clusters. Although it appears that these hosts understand the significance of online reviews as a form of consumer feedback ($M = 4.09$) and perceive the reviews to be reasonably credible ($M = 3.65$), these hosts are only moderately influenced by reviews to improve aspects of their business ($M = 3.69$). Examining this in closer detail, they are slightly motivated by positive reviews to improve both hosting skills ($M = 3.33$) and their property ($M = 3.44$), but they do not feel pressured by negative reviews to improve either hosting skills ($M = 2.93$) or the property itself ($M = 2.83$). It is interesting that these hosts place some value on holding a high Trip Advisor (TA) rating to attract new guests ($M = 3.24$), but they do not worry about losing potential guests if they read poor reviews ($M = 2.57$). The following quotes reflect this groups’ attitude toward online reviews:

“They [online reviews] can only be part of your overall promotion and motivation. You need to work with them but not let them rule you.”—Charles, Northland

“As an assessor, as well as a host, I have found some relevance, but I am not always prepared to accept all comments as gospel.”—Helen, Bay of Plenty

“We cannot please people all of the time! There will always be people who will find fault with whatever you do... I do not get ‘hung up’ on the few that are not so lovely to host. You can of course improve your service if people give constructive criticism which is helpful.”—Rose, Northland

Respondents in Cluster 2 appear to be very anti-TA and online reviews. It can be argued that they despise the power consumers hold in UGC. Accordingly, Cluster 2 was labeled “Detesters.” This group neither believes online reviews can help them to identify aspects of their business that could be improved ($M = 2.29$) nor do they feel pressured/motivated by online reviews (Table 3). In their opinion, TA and other forms of UGC are not a good phenomenon ($M = 2.00$), and they certainly do not rely on them to attract new

Table 3. Four-cluster solution of perception items.

Perception items	Clusters				F-ratio ^a
	Cluster 1 "Neutrals" (n = 54, 42.2%)	Cluster 2 "Detesters" (n = 7, 5.5%)	Cluster 3 "Supporters" (n = 40, 31.2%)	Cluster 4 "Apprehensives" (n = 27, 21.1%)	
Online reviews help me to identify aspects of my business that could be improved	3.69	2.29	4.50	3.81	27.46
I feel pressured to improve my property when I read a negative online review	2.83	2.29	4.23	3.93	40.24
I feel pressured to improve my hosting skills when I read a negative online review	2.93	1.86	4.15	3.85	35.92
Positive online reviews motivate me to improve my property	3.44	2.14	4.50	3.81	37.51
Positive online reviews motivate me to improve my hosting skills	3.33	2.14	4.43	3.85	31.55
I feel negative online reviews put me in a difficult position when I cannot afford to make changes to my B&B	2.78	2.29	3.45	3.85	15.58
Sometimes I feel like giving up after reading negative online reviews	2.52	1.57	2.40	3.11	5.16
I believe consumer review websites such as TripAdvisor are a good thing	3.83	2.00	4.38	3.00	30.65
I perceive online consumer reviews as being credible	3.65	2.14	4.10	2.85	22.10
I believe online reviews are an important form of guest feedback, whether positive or negative	4.09	2.29	4.40	3.30	23.24
I feel as though consumer review websites are destroying my B&Bs reputation	1.94	3.29	1.60	2.89	16.25
I worry that I will lose potential guests if they read negative online reviews	2.57	2.86	3.35	3.78	9.77
I rely on a high TripAdvisor rating to attract new guests.	3.24	1.57	4.03	2.78	16.34

^aAll F-ratios are significant at the 0.01 level; measured on a 5-point scale: [1] strongly disagree; [5] strongly agree.

Table 4. Results of discriminant analysis.

Structure matrix				
Perception items		Discriminant functions		
		1	2	3
Item 1		.497*	.166	
Item 2		.446*	.233	
Item 3		.435*	.429	
Item 4		.431*	.023	
Item 5		.315*	-.201	
Item 6			.550*	
Item 7			.470*	
Item 8			-.451*	
Item 9			.437*	
Item 10			-.436*	
Item 11			.417*	
Item 12			-.413*	
Item 13				.667*
Clusters		Group centroids		
Eigenvalue		3.549	1.056	.198
Canonical correlation		.883	.717	.407
Wilk's lambda		.089	.406	.835
Chi-square		286.37	106.85	21.44
p-level		.000	.000	.029
Classification results		Predicted group membership		
	Cluster 1	Cluster 2	Cluster 3	Cluster 4
Cluster 1	94.4%	0	1.8%	3.7%
Cluster 2	0	100%	0	0
Cluster 3	0	0	100%	0
Cluster 4	0	0	0	100%

guests ($M = 1.57$). These hosts do not feel that online reviews are an important form of consumer feedback ($M = 2.29$); thus, they do not see them as credible ($M = 2.14$). The following quotes sum up this groups' attitude toward TA and consumer power:

"The main problems I see with TripAdvisor are: 1. that it gives people the power of the Hotel Inspector. The positive/negative mindset of a traveler, level of tiredness and level of expectation will all affect the perception of the quality of their experience. . . 2. Criticism on TripAdvisor only presents one side of the story. Negative reviews often arise out of serious misunderstandings, I wonder how often people actually go on to read the owners response."—John, West Coast

"Not a fan of TripAdvisor type reviews. Too many picky and negative people not considering the price they are paying or researching properly what they should expect to get for the price, style and location. Most frustrating and very unfair."—Joan, Canterbury

Cluster 3 appears to be the opposite of Cluster 2. This group can be labeled as "Supporters." In their opinion, TA and similar websites are very beneficial ($M = 4.38$), and the feedback they provide is invaluable ($M = 4.40$); thus, they deem consumer reviews as being very credible ($M = 4.10$). Reviews play a significant role in assisting these hosts to identify aspects of their B&B that could be improved ($M = 4.50$). Positive reviews are a highly motivating factor to improve both their hosting skills ($M = 4.43$) and property ($M = 4.50$). On the other hand, negative reviews pressure respondents to improve both their property ($M = 4.23$) and hosting skills ($M = 4.15$). Cluster 3 hosts' perceptions of TA and online reviews can be summed up by the following quote:

“They are a valuable sales tool and make you strive for improved standards. We encourage our guests to make comments because we believe in what we do, we adore our country and we want our reviews to reflect that.”—Anne, Canterbury

“In many ways TripAdvisor is quite addictive for accommodation owners who are serious about their guests’ happiness. There is a lot of competition amongst owners to outdo each other, which results in an increase in the quality of the accommodation and a chance at getting the much-coveted number 1 on TripAdvisor.”—Philip, Bay of Plenty

Cluster 4 can be labeled as “Apprehensives” as they seem to be quite fearful of UGC, given the damaging effect poor reviews can potentially have on their B&Bs reputation. Interestingly, this was the only cluster that registered some agreement with the statement “sometimes I feel like giving up after reading negative online reviews” ($M = 3.11$). These hosts worry that they will lose potential guests if they read negative reviews ($M = 3.78$) and they feel as though negative reviews put them in a difficult position ($M = 3.85$). Despite understanding that online reviews are important form of consumer feedback ($M = 3.30$), they do not perceive reviews as being credible ($M = 2.85$). Although, they do feel that online reviews help them to identify aspects of their business that could be improved ($M = 3.81$). Like Cluster 3, this group feels both motivated by positive reviews and pressured by negative reviews to improve aspects of their business (Table 3). The following quote sums up the apprehensive attitude of Cluster 4 toward online reviews:

“It is consumer power which can be very soul destroying and there is nothing we can do to remove the negative comments which often are not justified. Some guests are just not pleasant no matter how much you do for them; they are the miserable lot who find fault in little things. We can respond, however the damage has already been done when they ranked you lowly and it takes forever to get up the [TripAdvisor] rank again.”—Mary, Bay of Plenty

To verify the external validity of a cluster solution, a statistical comparison with a theoretically relevant variable is necessary (Prayag & Hosany, 2014; Singh, 1990). In this case, respondents’ satisfaction levels with TA, “How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with customers’ comments on your B&B on TA?” were measured on a Likert scale (1 = Very Satisfied and 5 = Very Dissatisfied). As suggested in the literature (Gossling, Hall & Andersson, 2016), accommodation providers that receive more positive online comments are generally more satisfied with UGC. ANOVA with Tukey’s post-hoc comparisons revealed significant differences between the clusters on this satisfaction measure. Cluster 1 (Neutrals) was significantly more ($M = 1.48$) satisfied with TA than Cluster 2 (Detesters) on customers comments ($M = 2.57$). Cluster 3 (Supporters) was significantly more satisfied ($M = 1.15$) than Cluster 2 (Detesters), while the former was also significantly more satisfied than Cluster 4 (Apprehensives) ($M = 1.96$). Accordingly, the clusters are sufficiently different from each other, thus establishing the external validity of the four identified clusters.

Cluster profiling by business characteristics

To profile the four clusters, cross-tabulations with the demographic variables such as number of years in operation, number of guest rooms, nightly tariff, and proportion of income derived from B&B were carried out. The results of the Chi-square tests showed that there was no significant difference between any of the demographic variables and the

four clusters ($p = > .05$). This implies a fairly homogeneous sample in terms of business characteristics.

Cluster profiling by emotions

Finally, the clusters were profiled against their emotional responses to reading online reviews. ANOVA with Tukey's post-hoc comparisons showed that significant differences existed between the clusters on five of the eight emotional responses to positive online reviews (Table 5). The low means ($M = < 3.5$) for all four clusters indicate that good reviews by customers had a positive emotional response from B&B operators, even on the "Detesters" (Cluster 2) who perceived online reviews to have no credibility. The "Supporters" (Cluster 3) showed the strongest feelings of being valued ($M = 1.53$), inspired ($M = 1.55$), honored ($M = 1.60$), respected ($M = 1.40$), enthused ($M = 1.43$), and delighted ($M = 1.18$). Of these emotional responses to positive online reviews, the cluster of "Supporters" was significantly different from the cluster of "Detesters" on feeling valued. All the other three clusters were significantly different from the "Detesters" on feeling inspired and delighted. The "Supporters" were also significantly different from the "Apprehensives" on feeling respected, enthused, and delighted.

Table 5. ANOVA results and post-hoc comparisons for emotional responses on positive reviews.

Positive emotional responses		N	Mean	Standard deviation	F-ratio and significant post-hoc comparisons
Admired: Despised	Neutrals (1)	54	1.98	1.037	2.026 ^{n.s.}
	Detesters (2)	7	2.71	1.113	
	Supporters (3)	40	1.75	1.214	
	Apprehensives (4)	27	2.26	1.228	
Valued: Disregarded	Neutrals (1)	54	1.78	0.883	3.481** Supporters>Detesters
	Detesters (2)	7	2.71	1.113	
	Supporters (3)	40	1.53	1.012	
	Apprehensives (4)	27	2.04	1.160	
Inspired: Deterred	Neutrals (1)	54	2.02	1.073	5.819* Neutrals>Detesters Supporters>Detesters Apprehensives>Detesters
	Detesters (2)	7	3.29	1.254	
	Supporters (3)	40	1.55	0.876	
	Apprehensives (4)	27	2.00	1.177	
Honored: Belittled	Neutrals (1)	54	2.02	1.141	4.077* Supporters>Detesters
	Detesters (2)	7	3.14	1.215	
	Supporters (3)	40	1.60	1.008	
	Apprehensives (4)	27	2.07	1.238	
Respected: Disrespected	Neutrals (1)	54	1.85	1.035	6.187* Neutrals>Detesters Supporters>Detesters Supporters>Apprehensives
	Detesters (2)	7	3.00	1.414	
	Supporters (3)	40	1.40	0.672	
	Apprehensives (4)	27	2.07	1.207	
Enthused: Bored	Neutrals (1)	54	1.81	0.973	5.206* Supporters>Detesters Supporters>Apprehensives
	Detesters (2)	7	2.86	1.345	
	Supporters (3)	40	1.43	0.781	
	Apprehensives (4)	27	2.11	1.281	
Delighted: Angered	Neutrals (1)	54	1.52	0.841	11.278* Neutrals>Detesters, Supporters>Detesters>Apprehensives Apprehensives > Detesters
	Detesters (2)	7	3.00	1.414	
	Supporters (3)	40	1.18	0.446	
	Apprehensives (4)	27	1.89	1.050	

**Significant at the 0.05 level, *Significant at the 0.01 level, n.s. = not significant.

Table 6. ANOVA results and post-hoc comparisons for emotional responses on negative reviews.

Negative emotional responses		N	Mean	Standard deviation	F-ratio and significant post-hoc comparisons
Disheartened: Encouraged	Neutrals (1)	54	2.98	1.205	2.065 ^{n.s.}
	Detesters (2)	7	3.86	0.690	
	Supporters (3)	40	2.80	1.418	
	Apprehensives (4)	27	2.56	1.368	
Ashamed: Proud	Neutrals (1)	42	3.98	0.680	2.963** Neutrals>Supporters
	Detesters (2)	7	3.43	1.272	
	Supporters (3)	36	3.33	1.219	
	Apprehensives (4)	25	3.64	0.907	
Insulted: Flattered	Neutrals (1)	38	3.29	1.063	1.030 ^{n.s.}
	Detesters (2)	6	3.17	0.983	
	Supporters (3)	31	3.35	1.199	
	Apprehensives (4)	25	2.84	1.344	
Angered: Delighted	Neutrals (1)	37	3.32	0.973	0.840 ^{n.s.}
	Detesters (2)	6	3.33	0.816	
	Supporters (3)	30	3.43	1.073	
	Apprehensives (4)	24	3.00	1.103	
Useless: Useful	Neutrals (1)	36	4.11	0.747	1.323 ^{n.s.}
	Detesters (2)	6	4.00	0.000	
	Supporters (3)	30	4.00	1.390	
	Apprehensives (4)	23	3.57	1.080	
Strong: Powerless	Neutrals (1)	54	4.20	0.919	3.629** Apprehensives>Neutrals Apprehensives>Supporters
	Detesters (2)	7	4.43	0.976	
	Supporters (3)	40	4.28	1.396	
	Apprehensives (4)	27	5.11	1.502	
Dignified: Humiliated	Neutrals (1)	40	4.25	0.927	1.459 ^{n.s.}
	Detesters (2)	7	4.29	0.488	
	Supporters (3)	34	4.47	1.187	
	Apprehensives (4)	25	4.80	1.155	
Gratified: Hurt	Neutrals (1)	37	4.57	1.168	1.900 ^{n.s.}
	Detesters (2)	6	4.50	1.049	
	Supporters (3)	31	5.16	1.416	
	Apprehensives (4)	25	5.20	1.323	

**Significant at the 0.05 level, *Significant at the 0.01 level, n.s. = not significant.

ANOVA with Tukey's post-hoc comparisons was used to analyze the emotional responses from reading negative online reviews, and the results showed (Table 6) significant differences between the clusters on only two emotional responses (Ashamed/Proud and Strong/Powerless). The "Supporters" (Cluster 3) ($M = 3.33$) felt significantly more ashamed when they read negative reviews than the "Neutrals" ($M = 3.98$). The "Apprehensives," though being quite fearful of online reviews, felt more powerless ($M = 5.11$) in comparison to "Neutrals" ($M = 4.20$) and "Supporters" ($M = 4.28$) upon reading negative online reviews.

Discussion and implications

The significance of UGC in the travel planning process (Ayeh et al., 2013; Cox et al., 2009) and the value of online reviews as a learning tool for hosts (Basarani, 2011) are well accepted. However, the relationship between perceptions of UGC and the emotional responses of service providers as a result of reading online reviews remains yet to be established, even though it has

been noted as potentially significant in the literature (Gössling et al., 2016). According to the findings of the study, four groups of B&B providers were identified on the basis of their perceptions of UGC (Neutrals, Detesters, Supporters, and Apprehensives). These groups differ mostly on their emotional responses to reading positive online reviews rather than negative reviews. The findings have several theoretical and managerial implications.

Similar to Hills and Cairncross (2011), the findings of this study suggest that small businesses understand the importance of UGC. Online reviews are an invaluable feedback tool for improving both hosting skills and the property itself, as suggested in previous studies (Basarani, 2011; Gössling et al., 2016; Litvin et al., 2008). Specifically, using UGC as a source of information for organizational change and new product development is well recognized in the literature (Gössling & Lane, 2015; Tussyadiah & Zach, 2013). However, only one segment of B&B providers (Supporters) was totally comfortable with social media. The other three segments (Neutrals, Detesters, and Apprehensives) had varying levels of understanding and support for UGC. This result suggests that some level of training by national/regional government bodies (e.g., Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment, and Tourism New Zealand) and/or private sector bodies (e.g., Motel Association of New Zealand) in utilizing and managing social media may be necessary so that B&B providers can fully maximize the opportunities it provides for small businesses.

Other stakeholders such as TA and online travel agents (OTAs) may also have a role to play in supporting small accommodation providers' understanding and acceptance of UGC. Two segments (Apprehensives and Detesters) were particularly concerned about the credibility of UGC. Similar perceptions were noted in Gössling, Hall and Andersson's (2016) study of accommodation managers in southern Sweden. Given that many OTAs are now linked in with TAs, developing relationship management strategies for hosts (accommodation providers) beyond those aimed at customers may be necessary to ensure that small businesses are able to manage UGC with specific reference to their online reputation. This may well contribute to their long-term survival.

Irrespective of their perceptions of UGC, B&B operators in this study experienced mostly positive emotions when they read positive online reviews about their business. As suggested in the entrepreneurial emotion literature (Patzelt & Shepherd, 2011), experiencing positive emotions for entrepreneurs has an impact on business opportunity evaluation and exploitation (Cardon et al., 2012) as well as their chosen course of action (Foo, 2011). In particular, B&B operators in this study felt admired, valued, honored, and delighted among others. Positive emotions contribute to the well-being of entrepreneurs that can have positive impacts not only on their business (Patzelt & Shepherd, 2011) but also their family, thus building social capital (Gössling et al., 2016; Hall & Rusher, 2004).

As the findings of this study showed, entrepreneurs' perceptions of UGC and social media are related to both positive and negative emotions felt in response to reading online comments. Thus, some groups (e.g., Detesters and Apprehensives) are more vulnerable to experiencing negative emotions, and this may have implications for the type of business and social support provided to such accommodation providers. For example, all the groups felt humiliated and hurt when reading negative online reviews, which is not uncommon for self-employed individuals (Patzelt & Shepherd, 2011). This hints to the need for training on coping mechanisms for small hospitality owners/operators that may well contribute to enhance their psychological well-being.

The segment of “Supporters,” while they do feel negative emotions when reading negative online comments and positive emotions when reading positive online comments, have the most positive perceptions of UGC and social media. They fully embrace the opportunities UGC provides to improve their hosting skills. This group can serve as role models for other B&B operators in New Zealand who are struggling to manage and respond to UGC. Providing opportunities for the “Supporters” segment to interact with and share their experiences either face-to-face or online with the other segments (Neutrals, Apprehensives, and Detesters) may create more positive attitudes and perceptions of UGC among B&B providers.

Conclusion, limitations, and areas of further research

B&B providers are an important part of the accommodation sector in New Zealand and in other countries tending to offer more bespoke accommodation services to tourists. Due to the owner–operator business model of the B&B, which requires the delivery of a personal service out of the family home or property, owner–operators have to cope emotionally with the demands of operating the business as a result of positive and negative comments by their customers, whether face-to-face or online (Gössling et al., 2016). Although there has been a substantial growth in research on the response of consumers to UGC, there has only been very limited study of the responses of managers and particularly owner–operators, such as B&B operators, who are likely to have higher levels of emotional involvement in their business.

Within this context, the study has identified four groups of B&B operators based on their perceptions of online UGC and profiled these groups on the basis of their felt emotions when reading positive and negative online comments. By doing so, the study has contributed to the dearth of literature on the relationship between perceptions and emotions of small hospitality operators and the entrepreneurial emotion literature in the context of UGC. However, the study is not without limitations. First, both the sampling frame and number of useable questionnaires are small for this study compared to traditional consumer segmentation studies, which impacts on the sample size requirements for effective segmentation (Dolnicar, Grun, Leisch, & Schmidt, 2014). Second, potential survey response bias must be acknowledged, given that there is a possibility that businesses that did not answer may be different in their perceptions of UGC. Further research must also be carried with a larger sample size and extended to perceptions of social media in general. In the case of the latter, future studies should not only examine how different businesses and individuals react to positive and negative UGC but also how they may seek to more actively influence it during both the service encounter and online.

References

- Allen, C. T., Machleit, K. A., & Kleine, S. S. (1992). A comparison of attitudes and emotions as predictors of behavior at diverse levels of behavioral experience. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 18 (4), 493–504. doi:10.1086/jcr.1992.18.issue-4
- Ayeh, J. K., Au, N., & Law, R. (2013). “Do we believe in TripAdvisor?” Examining credibility perceptions and online travelers’ attitude toward using user-generated content. *Journal of Travel Research*, 52 (4), 437–452. doi:10.1177/0047287512475217

- Banerjee, S., & Chua, A. Y. (2014, January 9–11). A study of manipulative and authentic negative reviews. In *Proceedings of the 8th international conference on ubiquitous information management and communication*. Siem Reap, Cambodia, New York, NY: Association for Computer Machinery. doi: [10.1145/2557977.2557984](https://doi.org/10.1145/2557977.2557984)
- Basarani, S. (2011). *Electronic Word of Mouth: Managing online guest reviews in the hospitality industry* (Doctoral dissertation). Södertörn University, Huddinge, Sweden.
- Bed and Breakfast Association New Zealand. (n.d.). *Book your B&B with confidence*. Retrieved from <http://bandbassociation.co.nz/travellers>
- Bensemann, J., & Hall, C. M. (2010). Copreneurship in rural tourism: Exploring women's experiences. *International Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship*, 2 (3), 228–244. doi:[10.1108/17566261011079224](https://doi.org/10.1108/17566261011079224)
- Bigné, J. E., & Andreu, L. (2004). Emotions in segmentation: An empirical study. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 31 (3), 682–696. doi:[10.1016/j.annals.2003.12.018](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2003.12.018)
- Bigné, J. E., Andreu, L., & Gnoth, J. (2005). The theme park experience: An analysis of pleasure, arousal and satisfaction. *Tourism Management*, 26 (6), 833–844. doi:[10.1016/j.tourman.2004.05.006](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2004.05.006)
- Cardon, M. S., Foo, M. D., Shepherd, D., & Wiklund, J. (2012). Exploring the heart: Entrepreneurial emotion is a hot topic. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 36 (1), 1–10. doi:[10.1111/j.1540-6520.2011.00501.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6520.2011.00501.x)
- Chen, A., Peng, N., & Hung, K. P. (2015). The effects of luxury restaurant environments on diners' emotions and loyalty: Incorporating diner expectations into an extended Mehrabian-Russell model. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 27 (2), 236–260. doi:[10.1108/IJCHM-07-2013-0280](https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-07-2013-0280)
- Cox, C., Burgess, S., Sellitto, C., & Buultjens, J. (2009). The role of user-generated content in tourists' travel planning behavior. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, 18 (8), 743–764. doi:[10.1080/19368620903235753](https://doi.org/10.1080/19368620903235753)
- Crawford, A., & Naar, J. (2016). A profile of American bed and breakfast entrepreneurs: Bridging the gap to retirement. *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality & Tourism*, 15 (1), 103–117. doi:[10.1080/15332845.2015.1041006](https://doi.org/10.1080/15332845.2015.1041006)
- Del Chiappa, G., Alarcón-Del-Amo, M. D. C., & Lorenzo-Romero, C. (2016). Internet and user-generated content versus high street travel agencies: A latent gold segmentation in the context of Italy. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, 25 (2), 197–217. doi:[10.1080/19368623.2014.1001933](https://doi.org/10.1080/19368623.2014.1001933)
- Del Chiappa, G., Andreu, L., & G. Gallarza, M. (2014). Emotions and visitors' satisfaction at a museum. *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 8 (4), 420–431. doi:[10.1108/IJCTHR-03-2014-0024](https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCTHR-03-2014-0024)
- Del Chiappa, G., Lorenzo-Romero, C., & Alarcón-del-Amo, M. D. C. (2015). Profiling tourists based on their perceptions of the trustworthiness of different types of peer-to-peer applications. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 1–18. doi:[10.1080/13683500.2015.1077208](https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2015.1077208)
- Dijkmans, C., Kerkhof, P., & Beukeboom, C. J. (2015). A stage to engage: Social media use and corporate reputation. *Tourism Management*, 47, 58–67. doi:[10.1016/j.tourman.2014.09.005](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2014.09.005)
- Dolnicar, S. (2002). A review of data-driven market segmentation in tourism. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 12 (1), 1–22. doi:[10.1300/J073v12n01_01](https://doi.org/10.1300/J073v12n01_01)
- Dolnicar, S. (2004). Beyond 'commonsense' segmentation: A systematics of segmentation approaches in tourism. *Journal of Travel Research*, 42 (3), 244–250. doi:[10.1177/0047287503258830](https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287503258830)
- Dolnicar, S., Grun, B., Leisch, F., & Schmidt, K. (2014). Required sample sizes for data-driven market segmentation analyses in tourism. *Journal of Travel Research*, 53 (3), 296–360. doi:[10.1177/0047287513496475](https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287513496475)
- Ekinci, Y., Dawes, P. L., & Massey, G. R. (2008). An extended model of the antecedents and consequences of consumer satisfaction for hospitality services. *European Journal of Marketing*, 42 (1/2), 35–68. doi:[10.1108/03090560810840907](https://doi.org/10.1108/03090560810840907)
- Ernst, D., & Dolnicar, S. (2017). How to avoid random market segmentation solutions. *Journal of Travel Research*. doi:[10.1177/0047287516684978](https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287516684978)

- Foo, M. D. (2011). Emotions and entrepreneurial opportunity evaluation. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 35 (2), 375–393. doi:[10.1111/j.1540-6520.2009.00357.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6520.2009.00357.x)
- Gössling, S., Hall, C. M., & Andersson, A.-C. (2016). The manager's dilemma: A conceptualization of online review manipulation strategies. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 1–20. doi:[10.1080/13683500.2015.1127337](https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2015.1127337)
- Gössling, S., & Lane, B. (2015). Rural tourism and the development of Internet-based accommodation booking platforms: A study in the advantages, dangers and implications of innovation. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 23, (8–9), 1386–1403. doi:[10.1080/09669582.2014.909448](https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2014.909448)
- Gursoy, D., Boylu, Y., & Avci, U. (2011). Identifying the complex relationships among emotional labor and its correlates. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 30 (4), 783–794. doi:[10.1016/j.ijhm.2010.10.009](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2010.10.009)
- Hall, C. M. (2009). Sharing space with visitors: The servicescape of the commercial exurban home. In P. Lynch, A. McIntosh, & H. Tucker (Eds.), *The commercial home* (pp. 60–72). London, UK: Routledge.
- Hall, C. M., & Rusher, K. (2004). Risky lifestyles? Entrepreneurial characteristics of the New Zealand bed and breakfast sector. In R. Thomas (Ed.), *Small firms in tourism: International perspectives* (pp. 83–97). Oxford, UK: Elsevier.
- Hall, C. M., & Rusher, K. (2005). Entrepreneurial characteristics and issues in the small-scale accommodation sector in New Zealand. In E. Jones, & C. Haven (Eds.), *Tourism SMEs, service quality and destination competitiveness: International perspectives* (pp. 143–154). Wallingford, UK: CABI.
- Hillenbrand, C., & Money, K. (2009). Segmenting stakeholders in terms of corporate responsibility: Implications for reputation management. *Australasian Marketing Journal*, 17 (2), 99–105. doi:[10.1016/j.ausmj.2009.05.004](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ausmj.2009.05.004)
- Hills, R. J., & Cairncross, G. (2011). Small accommodation providers and UGC web sites: Perceptions and practices. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 23 (1), 26–43.
- Holbrook, M. B., & Batra, R. (1987). Assessing the role of emotions as mediators of consumer responses to advertising. *Journal of consumer research*, 14(3), 404–420.
- Hosany, S., & Prayag, G. (2013). Patterns of tourists' emotional responses, satisfaction, and intention to recommend. *Journal of Business Research*, 66 (6), 733–737.
- Hsieh, Y. C. (2010). Bed-and-breakfast innkeepers in the united states: When the boundary between work and personal life is blurred. *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality & Tourism*, 9 (2), 200–217.
- Ip, C., Lee, H. A., & Law, R. (2012). Profiling the users of travel websites for planning and online experience sharing. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 36 (3), 418–426.
- Jang, S. S., & Namkung, Y. (2009). Perceived quality, emotions, and behavioral intentions: Application of an extended Mehrabian–Russell model to restaurants. *Journal of Business Research*, 62 (4), 451–460.
- Kline, S. F., Morrison, A. M., & John, A. S. (2005). Exploring bed & breakfast websites: A balanced scorecard approach. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 17 (2–3), 253–267.
- Ladhari, R. (2009). Service quality, emotional satisfaction, and behavioural intentions: A study in the hotel industry. *Managing Service Quality: An International Journal*, 19 (3), 308–331.
- Lazarus, R. S. (1991). *Emotion and adaptation*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Lee, C.-K., Lee, Y. K., & Lee, B. (2005). Korea's destination image formed by the 2002 World Cup. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 32 (4), 839–858.
- Levy, S. E., Duan, W., & Boo, S. (2013). An analysis of one-star reviews and responses in the Washington, D. C. lodging market. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*, 54, 49–59.
- Li, J., Canziani, B. F., & Barbieri, C. (2016). Emotional labor in hospitality: Positive affective displays in service encounters. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*. doi:[10.1177/1467358416637253](https://doi.org/10.1177/1467358416637253)
- Lin, I. Y. (2004). Evaluating a servicescape: The effect of cognition and emotion. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 23 (2), 163–178.
- Litvin, S. W., Goldsmith, R. E., & Pan, B. (2008). Electronic word-of-mouth in hospitality and tourism management. *Tourism Management*, 29, 458–468.

- Litvin, S. W., & Hoffman, L. M. (2012). Responses to consumer-generated media in the hospitality marketplace: An empirical study. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 18, 135–142.
- Lo, A., Wu, C., & Tsai, H. (2015). The impact of service quality on positive consumption emotions in resort and hotel spa experiences. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, 24 (2), 155–179.
- Lo, I. S., McKercher, B., Lo, A., Cheung, C., & Law, R. (2011). Tourism and online photography. *Tourism Management*, 32 (4), 725–731.
- Lu, W., & Stepchenkova, S. (2015). User-generated content as a research mode in tourism and hospitality applications: Topics, methods, and software. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, 24 (2), 119–154.
- Lynch, P., McIntosh, A., & Tucker, H. (Eds.). (2009). *Commercial homes in tourism: An international perspective*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Lynch, P. A. (1994). Demand for training by bed and breakfast operators. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 6 (4), 25–31.
- Mauri, A. G., & Minazzi, R. (2013). Web reviews influence on expectations and purchasing intentions of hotel potential customers. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 34, 99–107.
- McCarthy, L., Stock, D., & Verma, R. (2010). How travelers use online and social media channels to make hotel-choice decisions. *Cornell Hospitality Report*, 10 (18), 6–18.
- Monroe, M. C., & Adams, D. C. (2012). Increasing response rates to web-based surveys. *Journal of Extension*, 50 (6), 6–7.
- Nawijn, J., Mitas, O., Lin, Y., & Kerstetter, D. (2013). How do we feel on vacation? A closer look at how emotions change over the course of a trip. *Journal of Travel Research*, 52 (2), 265–274.
- Nummedal, M., & Hall, C. M. (2006). Local food in tourism: An investigation of the New Zealand south island's bed and breakfast sector's use and perception of local food. *Tourism Review International*, 9 (4), 365–378.
- Nyer, P. U. (1997). A study of the relationships between cognitive appraisals and consumption emotions. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 25 (4), 296–304.
- O'Connor, P. (2010). Managing a hotel's image on TripAdvisor. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing and Management*, 19 (7), 754–772.
- Pantano, E., & Corvello, V. (2013). The impact of experience on companies' reactions to negative comments on social networks. *Journal of Direct, Data and Digital Marketing Practice*, 14 (3), 214–223.
- Pappas, N. (2016). Risks and marketing in online transactions: A qualitative comparative analysis. *Current Issues in Tourism*. doi:[10.1080/13683500.2016.1187586](https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2016.1187586)
- Park, D. B., & Yoon, Y. S. (2009). Segmentation by motivation in rural tourism: A Korean case study. *Tourism Management*, 30 (1), 99–108.
- Patzelt, H., & Shepherd, D. A. (2011). Negative emotions of an entrepreneurial career: Self-employment and regulatory coping behaviors. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 26 (2), 226–238.
- Prayag, G., & Hosany, S. (2014). When Middle East meets West: Understanding the motives and perceptions of young tourists from the United Arab Emirates. *Tourism Management*, 40, 35–35.
- Presi, C., Saridakis, C., & Hartmans, S. (2014). User-generated content behaviour of the dissatisfied service customer. *European Journal of Marketing*, 48 (9/10), 1600–1625.
- Racherla, P., Connolly, D. J., & Christodoulidou, N. (2013). What determines consumers' ratings of service providers? An exploratory study of online traveler reviews. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, 22 (2), 135–161.
- Ram, Y. (2015). Hostility or hospitality? A review on violence, bullying and sexual harassment in the tourism and hospitality industry. *Current Issues in Tourism*. doi:[10.1080/13683500.2015.1064364](https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2015.1064364)
- Rupp, C., Kern, S., & Helmig, B. (2014). Segmenting nonprofit stakeholders to enable successful relationship marketing: A review. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 19 (2), 76–91.
- Sarigollu, E., & Huang, R. (2005). Benefits segmentation of visitors to Latin America. *Journal of Travel Research*, 43 (3), 277–293.

- Schmallegger, D., & Carson, D. (2008). Blogs in tourism: Changing approaches to information exchange. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 14, 99–110.
- Singh, J. (1990). A typology of consumer dissatisfaction response styles. *Journal of Retailing*, 66 (1), 57–100.
- Sluka, K. (2015). Holiday rentals: Home and away. *Consumer*, 562 (October), 8–10.
- Smyth, P. C. B., Wu, G., & Greene, D. (2010). *Does TripAdvisor make hotels better?* Technical Report UCD-CSI-2010-06. Dublin: School of Computer Science & Informatics, University College Dublin, Ireland.
- Sohn, H. K., & Lee, T. J. (2012). Relationship between HEXACO personality factors and emotional labour of service providers in the tourism industry. *Tourism Management*, 33 (1), 116–125.
- Sparks, B. A., & Browning, V. (2011). The impact of online reviews on hotel booking intentions and perception of trust. *Tourism Management*, 32 (6), 1310–1323.
- Starkov, M., & Mechoso, M. (2008). *Best practices on monitoring hotel review sites*. Hospitality eBusiness Strategies, New York, August. Retrieved from http://www.hebsdigital.com/articles/pdf/2008/HeBS_Digital_Article_BP_on_Monitoring_Hotel_Sites.pdf
- Tussyadiah, I., & Zach, F. (2013). Social media strategy and capacity for consumer co-creation among destination marketing organizations. In L. Cantoni, & Z. Xiang (Eds.), *Information and communication technologies in tourism 2013* (pp. 242–253). Berlin, Germany: Springer.
- Ward, J. H. (1963). Hierarchical grouping to optimize an objective function. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 58 (301), 236–244.
- Warhurst, C., & Nickson, D. (2007). Employee experience of aesthetic labour in retail and hospitality. *Work, Employment & Society*, 21 (1), 103–120.
- Xu, S., Martinez, L. R., Van Hoof, H., Tews, M., Torres, L., & Farfan, K. (2015). The impact of abusive supervision and co-worker support on hospitality and tourism student employees' turn-over intentions in Ecuador. *Current Issues in Tourism*. doi:10.1080/13683500.2015.1076771
- Ye, Q., Law, R., & Gu, B. (2009). The impact of online user reviews on hotel room sales. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 28 (1), 180–182.
- Ye, Q., Law, R., Gu, B., & Chen, W. (2011). The influence of user-generated content on traveler behavior: An empirical investigation on the effects of e-word-of-mouth to hotel online bookings. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 27 (2), 634–639.
- Yoo, K. H., & Lee, W. (2015). Use of Facebook in the US heritage accommodations sector: An exploratory study. *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, 10 (2), 191–201.
- Zhang, Y., & Vásquez, C. (2014). Hotels' responses to online reviews: Managing consumer dissatisfaction. *Discourse, Context & Media*, 6, 54–64.