

Winery owners' perceptions and motivations towards wine tourism: Discourses of winery owners in Langhe, Northern Italy
Dr. Magali Canovi & Dr. Andy Lyon

Word count 6458 including references

1. Introduction

Residents' perceptions and motivations towards tourism and future tourism development have received considerable attention from academics since the 1960s; and is still a topic that is one of the most studied in the tourism literature (Xu et al., 2016). Such attention is hardly surprising given the crucial role of the host community in the success of tourism planning and development. Tourism development projects and activities are likely to be threatened if designed and implemented without the support of local communities (Gursoy et al., 2002). Scholars largely agree that understanding local communities' perceptions and motivations is beneficial for tourism planners and policy-makers in order to identify and address major concerns, maximise benefits as well as minimise potential resistance (Ribeiro et al., 2017). From the local community perspective, tourism studies have primarily focused not only on investigating residents' attitudes towards tourism in general but also on their perceptions of tourism impacts in particular (Chen et al., 2018), while other stakeholder groups have been largely overlooked, particularly business owners (Sánchez Cañizares, et al 2016). In part, this study addresses that general need while focusing on winery owners' perceptions and motivations towards tourism development in a particular geographical context.

Numerous stakeholders operate within the tourism development system and have various positions, influence and power. Not all stakeholders are equal in the development process, some having more influence and power over development than others. Stakeholders can be split into two main groups, namely active and passive. Active stakeholders are those who affect decisions or actions, while passive stakeholders are those who are affected (either positively or negatively) by those decisions (Grimble and Wellard, 1997). If stakeholders can affect decisions or actions regarding development concerns, then that makes them active in

development outcomes. Winery owners are active stakeholders in that they can affect outcomes relating to economic, social and environmental concerns in the region. Understanding and analysing the discourses of these active stakeholders can therefore help to further the debate around tourism development both conceptually and empirically (Lyon et al., 2017).

Using qualitative evidence from a sample of 20 winery owners this chapter examines their perceptions of and attitudes towards tourism in the North Italian wine region of *Langhe*, a region long renowned for its wine, and which is increasingly popular as a tourist destination. Langhe is characterised by traditional 'old world' winemaking practices and traditions in which its wine produce and its producers are rooted in and synonymous with the place itself. With this, coupled to the fact that World Heritage status was awarded to Langhe by UNESCO in 2014, over the past decade Langhe has developed as a wine tourism destination that is increasingly popular internationally (DMO Piemonte, 2018). The steady rise in tourist numbers to the area has led to an increased awareness amongst wine business owners about the potential benefits of tourism development, and a number of them have introduced various tourism-related activities at their wineries: notably wine tastings, winery visits, cellar-door sales, B&B accommodation and restaurants. Others, however, have resisted wine tourism as being antithetical to their core activity and identity.

This chapter examines winery owners' perceptions of and motivations towards wine tourism as a business and a regional rural tourism diversification option. The research objectives are:

- To understand the reasons for diversification into wine tourism in the Langhe region
- To analyse the discourses of winery owners to better understand their business motivations in wine tourism,
- To make recommendations to planners and marketers of wine tourism regions regarding sense of place development.

2. Literature

2.1. Active stakeholders

One of the principal themes of the sustainable development of tourism destinations is the involvement of the local community in decisions about and the implementations of social and economic change (Sharpley, 2014). There has been a growing body of literature on this subject since the early works of Cohen (1984) and Murphy (1985). Local communities are a key stakeholder in tourism development and can affect or are affected by their involvement in the planning of the industry (Simpson, 2001; Sook et al., 2014). Residents within a community (including business owners) will demonstrate behaviours that either support or do not support tourism depending on their perceptions of the positive and negative impacts of tourism on themselves and the communities in which they reside (Ribeiro et al., 2017). Focusing specifically on rural tourism development, Wilson et al. (2001) conclude that success cannot be achieved without the participation and collaboration of the business community both directly and indirectly in tourism development.

2.2. Rural tourism development/diversification

Rural tourism, as a particular diversification strategy, originated during the early twentieth century in the Alps and the UK, and progressively expanded across Europe (Canoves et al., 2004). During the agricultural crisis in the 1980s, national governments and municipalities promoted tourism as an efficient rural development strategy (Farmaki, 2012). While the initial intention of promoting tourism was to develop a side activity that allowed rural business owners to strengthen their economic position, tourism in rural areas rapidly became a sector of its own (Barlybaev et al., 2009). There is a general belief that tourism, as a strategy of economic growth and diversification, can act as a potential economic panacea in rural areas, both at the local and individual farm level (Sharpley and Vass, 2006) and that diversification is a successful survival strategy for rural businesses (Barbieri & Mshenga, 2008). It can help to avoid uncertainty and reduces the risk of the overall return through developing and adopting additional, mostly unrelated farm business activities (Culas and Mahendrarajah 2005).

Initially, the main research theme in rural tourism development focused on examining and revealing the economic motives and benefits driving business owners to engage in tourism. Key economic reasons for engaging in diversification are centred on the generation of additional income (Barbieri and Mahoney, 2009), long-term security in farming (Sharpley and Vass, 2006) and new employment opportunities (Yang, 2012). Within a wine-producing context, it is suggested that tourism is a short-term, beneficial strategy to increase cellar-door sales (Charters and Menival, 2011). However researchers found that after having engaged in tourism diversification, personal and social goals tend to be highly accomplished, whereas economic drivers (e.g. additional income) showed much lower levels of accomplishment, even though these motives were initially ranked as most significant (Barbieri, 2010). Hence, tourism diversification has increasingly been recognised as consisting of a complex web of both economic and noneconomic goals (Flanigan et al., 2015; Hansson et al., 2013)

Limited academic attention however, has been paid to the family unit and to how family involvement in the business affects rural tourism diversification (Hansson et al., 2013). This is quite surprising given that most rural businesses are family-owned and managed (Fitz-Koch et al., 2018). Neglecting the direct role of the family on diversification in the rural sector might limit our understanding of the motives driving family rural businesses to exploit entrepreneurial opportunities (Fitz-Koch et al., 2018). Hansson et al.'s (2013) research on farmers' motives for diversifying their farm business in Sweden criticised this approach. They highlight the context-dependency of farmers' motivations for diversification and emphasise the need to consider the social context, notably the context of the farm family. Similarly, Tew and Barbieri (2012) note that some motivations are family-centred, as respondents in their study indicated that agritourism diversification was important for the farm family, particularly for enhancing their quality of life and for keeping the farm in the family.

2.3. Family-centred motivations

Within the family business literature, it is now well understood that the involvement of the family in the firm leads to a complex set of goals and motivations (Sharma et al., 1997). Family businesses tend to predominantly value noneconomic goals and affective endowments, which have been grouped together under the concept of socioemotional wealth (SEW). SEW has

been defined as the “non-financial aspects of the firm that meet the family’s affective needs, such as identity, the ability to exercise family influence, and the perpetuation of the family dynasty” (Gomez-Mejia et al., 2007, p.106). The SEW model implies that family firms are predominantly motivated to sustain their socioemotional wealth. Hence, family firms are believed to be fundamentally different from nonfamily firms, since they are predominantly concerned about family-centred noneconomic goals (Berrone et al., 2012).

The SEW model encompasses five dimensions, which are likely to influence family firms’ decision-making process, notably family control and influence; family members’ identification with the firm; binding social ties; emotional attachment; and renewal of family bonds to the firm through dynastic succession (Berrone et al., 2012). The first dimension is concerned with family members’ desire to keep control and have influence over the firm to preserve their socioemotional wealth. Agritourism diversification is likely to reduce SEW, “by having to appoint nonfamily members to various business units, reducing family influence over the units, decreasing centralization of decision making, and the like” (Berrone et al., 2012, p.260). It might require family firms to hire external employees and/or managers who might be more educated and possess enhanced managerial knowledge and skills and could threaten family control (Schmid et al., 2015). The second dimension relates to the family’s identification with the firm. Organisational identification is especially prominent if family members are intimately tied to the firm. It is believed that a family’s identity is closely linked to the family firm if it carries the family name (Berrone et al., 2012). The third dimension of ‘binding social ties’ is concerned with family firms’ social relationships, whereas the fourth dimension expresses the importance of emotions linked and attached to the family business. The final dimension of SEW – the renewal of family bonds to the firm through dynastic succession – relates to the family’s intention to transfer the firm to the next generation (Berrone et al., 2012).

The importance of these five dimensions is however likely to vary for each family. While some families may put increased emphasis on the continuity of the family business by transferring business control to the next generation, other families might stress the emotional attachment to the business (Cennamo et al., 2012). Thus, family firms’ decisions (as in this case wine tourism diversification decisions) are not driven by an economic logic, but are taken in the light of their SEW (Berrone et al., 2012).

Place identity

Furthermore, within a rural context, research has revealed that people living and/or working in a rural environment tend to have stronger place bonds than people living in urban environments (Anton & Lawrence, 2014). It is believed that “people self-define through places, thereby developing a place identity. Such an identity arises from particular values, attitudes, and beliefs about the physical world as well as direct experiences with this environment” (Strzelecka et al. 2017, p.63). Consequently, individuals’ motivations, attitudes and perceptions are likely to be influenced and shaped by their place identity (Hallak et al., 2012). Bonaiuto et al. (2002, p.636) refer to place identity as “that part of people’s personal identity which is based on or built upon the physical and symbolic features of the places in which people live”. Fundamental to place identity is an individual/personal construction, a substructure of one’s sense of self (Hauge, 2007), while at the same time it is influenced by social values and beliefs (Devine-Wright and Lyons, 1997). Thus, as individuals start to develop an emotional attachment and become socially and psychologically invested in a particular place, that place becomes part of their sense of self (Anton and Lawrence, 2014) and is a therefore fundamental element to the construction of self-identity.

To summarise, business owners (in this case winery owners) are active stakeholders in tourism development and as such are key members of the community. Diversification into tourism is done for a variety of reasons, involving family and SEW motivations. Place attachment and self-identity are also important factors in determining the motives and actions regarding tourism development. The following case study explores these aspects in relation to wine tourism in Langhe, Italy.

3. Methodology

3.1. Case study

The North Italian wine region of *Langhe* is used as a case study to explore the motivations underlying winery owners’ decisions to engage in tourism. *Langhe*, situated in the southern part of the Piedmont region, has been recognised for its long-standing tradition in winemaking,

its interaction with the environment and the aesthetic qualities of the area. The region secured its reputation during the early 1990s when *Barolo* was recognised as ‘one of the world’s great wines’ (Rosso 2014), which led to an increased interest by tourists to visit these places of wine production. The inscription on the UNESCO World Heritage List in 2014 generated increased international visibility and further enhanced Langhe’s reputation as an internationally renowned tourism destination. The region has continued to attract wine tourists from around the world – as demonstrated by an 81% growth of tourist arrivals to the region between 2006 and 2016 (DMO Piemonte 2018).

It could however be argued that this significant and unexpected increase in tourist numbers meant residents and winery owners, were not prepared, or even unwilling, to accommodate tourists. One reason being that wineries in Langhe generate their income from wine/grape sales and wine export and are not dependent on tourism for their economic survival. While this situation initially led to opposition and resistance on the part of winery owners, over the years the region witnessed a steady rise in agritourism facilities, as well as in the number of wineries developing tourism-related activities on site. These include wine tastings, winery visits, cellar-door sales, B&B accommodation and restaurants. Others, however, have resisted wine tourism, seeing it as antithetical to their core activity and identity as Langhe winemakers.

3.2. Methods chosen

A case study approach is adopted to examine winery owners’ perceptions of and motivations towards wine tourism. This qualitative approach is the best way to respond to *what*, *how*, and *why* questions, when investigating a contemporary phenomenon in depth and within its real-life context. The main objective of this research is to gain an in-depth understanding of the fundamental assumptions influencing winery owners’ perceptions to engage in and pursue wine tourism activities.

The winemaking system in Langhe is largely based on small-sized, family-owned wineries (exclusively run and managed by family members), with an annual wine production ranging between 30,000 and 100,000 litres. The criteria for the sampling strategy were as follows. First,

winery owners were contacted who have recently engaged in wine tourism activities. A snowballing sampling approach was adopted in which a small number of winery owners led the researchers to others through their personal contacts. This allowed the researchers to meet and interact with a numerous winery owners, as well as reach owners who opposed and/or limited wine tourism activities at their winery. Family owners, who hold the decision-making power and actively run the family business on a daily basis, were selected for this research (see table 1). Qualitative, semi-structured interviews were conducted with family owners from 20 family wine firms, which have diversified to a greater or lesser extent into tourism (see table 2).

Table 1: Interview sample

Case Nr.	Location	Foundation of Winery	Current Generation	Annual Wine Production (in litres)
1	Barolo	1919	3 rd	30000
2	Barbaresco	1958	2 nd	30000
3	Barolo	1885	4 th	80000
4	Mondovì	1990	2 nd	50000
5	Barbaresco	1978	2 nd	70000
6	Dogliani	1924	3 rd	65000
7	Neive	1950	2 nd	21000
8	Neive	1964	5 th	120000
9	Barbaresco	1948	4 th	20000
10	Monforte d'Alba	1982	2 nd	150000
11	Neive	1965	3 rd	65000
12	La Morra	1941	3 rd	45000
13	Serralunga d'Alba	1957	3 rd	110000
14	Monforte d'Alba	1878	2 nd	90000
15	Novello	1991	4 th	85000
16	Serralunga d'Alba	1953	3 rd	85000
17	Diano d'Alba	1927	3 rd	30000
18	Castiglione Falletto	1979	2 nd	180000
19	Barbaresco	1971	3 rd	50000
20	La Morra	1959	6 th	120000

Table 2: Diversification Activities

Case Number(s): 1-20	Wine tastings	Winery Visits	Cellar Sales	Door	B&B	Other
3	✓	✓	✓		✓	Restaurant
9, 16, 19, 20	✓	✓	✓		✓	
12, 13	✓	✓	✓			Restaurant
4, 11	✓	✓	✓			Sightseeing tours
6	✓	✓	✓			Camping
5, 7, 8, 10, 14, 15, 17, 18	✓	✓	✓			
2	✓		✓		✓	
1	✓	✓				

3.3. Data analysis

Thematic and discourse analysis were used to analyse the data. While thematic analysis revealed the content of participants' discourses and was considered the first step of the analysis process, discourse analysis allowed for a deeper understanding of what was said as it is "the study of language in use" (Gee, 2014, p.17), thereby allowing understanding of participants' multiple realities (Crotty, 2015) with a particular focus on how and why respondents were producing what they said in their particular contexts. This approach is also sensitive to reflexivity and considers the fact that the interaction between researchers and participants plays an important part in the construction of discourses (Phillips and Hardy, 2002). Considering the socio-cultural, historical and geographical context of winery owners allows researchers to interpret discourses differently and analyse why certain things have been said. Winery owners' discourses are strongly embedded in their particular contexts. Thus place attachment, the local community, the history of the winery and the family play a major role in how owners manage their winery and how they deal with wine tourism development.

4. Findings

4.1. Resistance to wine tourism and place identity

Although all participating winery owners had engaged to some extent in wine tourism, most winery owners (65%) revealed their reluctance to pursue diversification and invest in additional tourism-related activities. The empirical data shows that due to wineries' high export level, which can reach up to 85% for some wineries, winery owners are economically stable and diversification into tourism is not recognised a necessity, and therefore not primarily linked to financial motives. In addition, one can observe that these winery owners' strongly identify with their occupation/profession. Winery owners' lifestyles, as well as their passion for the job, and their attachment to the local place of production (Groth and Curtis 2017), result in a strong identification with their occupation and the construction of a *producer* identity. Interestingly, the results show that these owners engaged in tourism diversification solely by providing winery visits, wine tastings and cellar door sales. Larger tourism-related investments, such as B&Bs and restaurants were not considered.

The analysis shows that communities who live and work on the land develop a strong attachment and identification to that land and place. Winery owners in Langhe have generally grown up there, and their passion for making wine typically plays a central role in their everyday lives. It is also typical that children help their parents in the vineyards and cellars and listen to stories about the family traditions and histories. These include tales of ancestors' successes and sacrifices made to drive their wine business forward, or the contribution of each generation to the business, as well as the family's secret winemaking traditions and processes. Wine tourism, however, provides a new dimension to these ongoing (hi)stories and our empirical data shows that the development of the tourism industry in Langhe has led to conflicting views and perceptions amongst business owners regarding their support for and involvement in tourism.

Our work is to do wine not hospitality (Case 10).

Our primary activity, and it is important never to forget that is winemaking (Case 17).

This is **not a public institution** but it is a business (Case 20).

They strongly identify with their winemaking profession, whereas wine tourism is not regarded as a profession and is likely to threaten owners' sense of self. In some cases, owners display their commitment to being a conventional wine producer. They focus on their agricultural role (e.g. '*you are what you produce*'), the place attachment (e.g. '*we've grown up in these surroundings*'), as well as their passion for the job (e.g. '*we are in love with what we are doing*'). In this instance, winery owners narrate stories about the family, the place, and their passion for the winemaking profession:

We don't sleep at night because we're concerned about the harvest; is it going to be compromised by the rain, the season, hail storm? You are doing everything possible so that you have the highest quality wine, because it is **our ambition, our passion** (Case 4).

Winery owners have generally grown up in this rural environment and have been exposed to winemaking from a young age. The winery owner in case 4 emphasises her commitment to the winemaking profession. She aspires to produce '*the highest quality wine*' and continuously strives to live up to her expectations. She does not consider wine tourism as a viable option and concentrates on her core winemaking activity, as she desires to be recognised as a 'real' winemaker.

This is a winery **not a tourism business**. I wouldn't be able to also run an agritourism business, because that would be **too much**. I believe that you have to make choices, if you want your work to be done correctly. It would **disturb the other work** (Case 8).

This winery owner indicates his reluctance to pursue wine tourism activities. His statement regarding choices implies his priority for the winemaking profession. He assumes that engaging in tourism diversification requires a considerable amount of time and would interfere with being a professional winemaker – meaning that he would not be able to practice his profession '*correctly*'. In this instance, business decisions are taken in the light of the winemaking profession.

It [*tourism diversification*] might work as we have the facilities, but ... opening a restaurant, not at all. So that's **not our profession**, so we are **not interested** in doing that (Case 18).

This owner admits to having adequate facilities to either invest in the construction of a wine tourism business or the development of a restaurant, however, his statement '*this is not our profession*' implies his priority for the winemaking profession, indicating that they are '*not interested*' in engaging in wine tourism. Accordingly, these findings show that owners strongly identify with the winemaking profession and actively construct a producer identity when highlighting their reluctance to engage in wine tourism.

4.2. Family-centred motivations

We also found evidence that winery owners' motivations for engaging in wine tourism are driven by family-centred goals and SEW. Family owners' accounts are underpinned by the importance of the family unit. The majority of participating family wineries are managed and controlled by the nuclear family. Family owners express their desire to exercise and maintain full control of the family winery, manage the day-to-day activities and hold the decision-making power.

This is a **family business** we are only 5 people and **we** take care of all the business, also with the vineyards... **My wife** helps out if she has time, she does also take care of the B&B... Also [name] is **my brother-in-law**, my wife's brother; **he** is the winemaker; so he is more in the vineyards. When I'm not here, **he** takes care of some visits. So **we** try to arrange **ourselves**. It is only **family**. There is also an older woman, that is my **mother-in-law** and [name], my **father-in-law** is working in the vineyards. (Case 19)

This quote highlights pertinent pronouns and winery owners' reference to family business in bold. This shows that the family is perceived as the dominant coalition, influencing the decision-making process and demonstrates the importance of the family in managing and keeping control of the winery. Sometimes, the dominant coalition of the firm includes the involvement of the extended family, as in this case the in-laws. The extended family manages

every aspect of the business, including the wine production, vineyards, winery visits, tastings, the B&B accommodation as well as the commercial and marketing aspects of the winery.

The notion of control plays a major role in the construction of these discourses, by expressing their reluctance to employ outside personnel and delegate authority to nonfamily members. The appointment of nonfamily members to various business units, as in this case wine tourism-related areas of the business, is likely to reduce family influence over these units and decrease centralization of decision-making (Berrone et al., 2012) and thus affect SEW. The inclusion of family members in the winery, rather than nonfamily employees, is emphasised on multiple occasions as a way of safeguarding the tradition and keeping family control.

We **don't have the intention to grow** bigger. I think as we are now with the agritourism business, the winery, the wine tastings and visits, that is **the maximum we can do** for it to **stay a family business**. We run from the morning to the evening though. But it is very satisfying as we still have **direct contact** with guests and clients from the winery (Case 9).

Families generally express their desire to stay in control of the various tasks in the winery, including the tourism-related activities. The statements in bold relate to family owners' lack of entrepreneurial spirit. In this instance, pursuing agritourism diversification is likely to result in the loss of family control over wine tourism-related activities. Families tend to preserve personal control over the business and avoid delegation and decentralisation of authority and decision-making. The level of families' engagement in agritourism diversification is thus influenced and guided by the need to keep family control, linking into SEW motivations. In this case, the majority of wine-producing families have taken the decision to limit wine tourism activities at their winery to a level where they are still able to remain in control.

Furthermore, we found that emotions are likely to influence family firms' activities.

My grandfather built this winery in 1964, he decided straight away to create a space for hospitality, for receiving clients/tourists; which was inaugurated in 1967. So for us it was normal to receive tourists (Case 8).

Highlighting the importance of the family history as well as the family tradition reveals family members' emotional attachment to the firm. Every generation has contributed to the success of the family firm. Ancestors' success stories play an important role in the construction of winery owners' accounts. The fact of running the family wine firm at the present time means that ancestors have taken the right decisions and have managed the winery successfully.

I'm **proud** to be able to drive the company forward and follow in the footsteps of my ancestors. So I'm feeling **proud** (Case 20).

The positive emotion of *pride* is evident in winery owners' accounts. Emotions pervade every aspect of people's life and more often than not dominate over reason and guide their decision-making process. Positive emotions, as in this case *pride*, have been found to encourage flexibility and openness in decision-making (Baron, 2008). Winery owners' sense of pride and respect demonstrate a strong emotional attachment to the family firm.

I have 2 sisters so we are 3 from the new generation. So for them [*the parents*] it was important whoever decided to join the company that we would have our specific role in order to avoid any fights between my 2 sisters and me. So everyone has his or her own space to be able to express him- or herself. So the business aims to grow, we're currently investing, for example in the construction of the restaurant, we're looking for new vineyards, we're looking for new countries to sell our wines. We're always looking to grow (Case 20).

In this particular case, the family took the decision to engage in wine tourism by opening a wine shop next to the winery and an agritourism business on the outskirts, to include the new generation in the family firm. Each family member would thus occupy a distinct position within the business. One of the daughters is in charge of the agritourism business, the son is responsible for the wine shop and the youngest daughter follows the oenological part of the winery. The importance of succession resulted in the expansion of the business, through developing wine tourism activities. These findings are consistent with other studies' empirical findings that show how engagement in wine tourism provides employment opportunities for

family members (Barbieri and Mahoney, 2009). This shows the family's priorities are to keep the family together and avoid internal conflicts to guarantee the continuity of the family wine firm and again linking into Family SEW which is developed further below.

Likewise, the importance of succession and the involvement of the subsequent generation lead to the adoption of long-term projects (Sirmon and Hitt, 2003).

In 10 years I would like to finish the extension, finish the B&B, finish the restaurant and that would be already a big project... and frankly this would be what I set for myself to do **in the future** ... and then leave it for my son what I will be constructing **in the next 10 years**. Already this project is very ambitious. It's not a small project for us (Case 13).

Winery owners tend to adopt a long-term orientation (in bold above) with the desire to pass on the family firm to the next generation. As is evident in the above excerpt, the family's future projects are ambitious and require a significant amount of investment. The subsequent generation plays an important part in the current development plans. Current investments in the family wine business serve as future opportunities for subsequent generations, thus highlighting the importance of a generational change. Many winery owners express their desire to engage in agritourism diversification to guarantee employment for new family members. Family wine firms diversify into agritourism through investing in the construction of wine tasting facilities, B&Bs and restaurants to offer the subsequent generation distinct areas of responsibilities within the firm. The subsequent generation thus plays an important role in family wine firms' development plans. Current investments in diversification activities serve as future opportunities for subsequent generations.

5. Conclusions & Research Implications

This research set out to examine the perceptions and motivations underlying winery owners' decisions to engage in wine tourism. The paper has established that the motivations for engaging in wine tourism are considerably more complex when the family context, winery

owners' identification with their profession and their affective attachment to the place of production are considered.

Our findings have potential practical implications for rural development policy (e.g. Common Agricultural Policy) at the European level, as well as for governments and destination management organisations (DMOs) at the regional level. First, tourism diversification is recognised as a central objective of the rural development policy across European Union member states, as a means for enhancing the quality of life of rural communities (Hansson et al., 2013). In this instance, our findings provide policy makers with valuable insights on the motivations underlying rural business owners' decisions to engage or resist diversification. Particularly, we show how their motivations for diversification are inextricably linked to their place attachment/ place identity and the situation of the family.

Second, at the regional level, findings of this study are likely to have implications for governments and DMOs when promoting and presenting diversification initiatives for rural regeneration. When pursuing economic regeneration, regional governments primarily aim for social cohesion, sustainability and economic growth. As active stakeholders, the business community have an important role to play in developing the tourism industry and their views should be sought as key community players. We have shown that the development of the tourism industry in Langhe led to conflicting views and perceptions developed by wine-producing families regarding their involvement in tourism. Regional government officials need to take into consideration the complexity of rural families' motivations for diversification and position their message accordingly to ensure receptivity. While government officials might highlight the economic benefits of diversification at the individual, societal and regional level, including increased profits, generation of additional income, as well as employment creation and retention, the findings of this study clearly indicate that a more refined approach is needed, emphasising the family benefits of tourism diversification.

Third, the findings of this study have shown that some rural business owners still limit or resist tourism diversification based on an anticipated loss of identity. In this instance, tourism planners and DMOs need to take into consideration rural business owners' strong identification with their profession, as well as their affective attachment to the place of

production. In this instance, tourism planners and managers would benefit greatly from understanding which forms/activities of tourism diversification do not threaten winery owners' place identities.

Finally, in order to achieve the right balance between tourism prosperity and rural communities' wellbeing, local authorities and DMOs should offer continuous support and guidance in terms of training and education programs. These programs should provide rural business owners with an in-depth understanding of tourism planning and development at the local level and highlight not only the economic benefits of tourism, but also the enjoyment and satisfaction this particular type of diversification can bring, without threatening their core activities and occupational identity.

References

- Anton, C. E., & Lawrence, C. (2014). Home is where the heart is: The effect of place of residence on place attachment and community participation. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 40, 451-461.
- Barbieri, C. 2010. An Importance-Performance Analysis^{[1][2]} Of the Motivations Behind Agritourism and Other Farm Enterprise Developments in Canada. *Journal of Rural and Community Development*, 5, 1-20.
- Barbieri, C. and Mahoney, E. 2009. Why is diversification an attractive farm adjustment strategy? Insights from Texas farmers and ranchers. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 25, 58-66.
- Barbieri, C., and Mshenga, P. M. 2008. The role of the firm and owner characteristics on the performance of agritourism farms. *Sociologia ruralis*, 48, 166-183.
- Barlybaev, A.A., Akhmetov, V.Y. and Nasyrov, G.M. 2009. Tourism as a Factor of Rural Economy Diversification. *Studies on Russian Economic Development*, 20, 639–643.
- Baron, J., Somogyi, S., Hall, D. and Carrington, A., 2008. Wine marketing online. In *Proceedings of the BbWorld Asia Pacific 2008 Conference*.
- Berrone, P., Cruz, C., and Gomez-Mejia, L. R. (2012). Socioemotional wealth in family firms theoretical dimensions, assessment approaches, and agenda for future research. *Family Business Review*, 25, 258-279.
- Bonaiuto, M., Carrus, G., Martorella, H., & Bonnes, M. (2002). Local identity processes and environmental attitudes in land use changes: The case of natural protected areas. *Journal of economic psychology*, 23(5), 631-653.
- Canoves, G. Villarino, M., Priestley, G.K. and Blanco, A. 2004. Rural tourism in Spain: an analysis of recent evolution. *Geoforum*, 35, 755-769.
- Cennamo, C., Berrone, P., Cruz, C., and Gomez-Mejia, L. R. 2012. Socioemotional Wealth and Proactive Stakeholder Engagement: Why Family-Controlled Firms Care More About Their Stakeholders. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 36, 1153-1173.
- Charters, S. and Menival, D. 2011. Wine Tourism In Champagne. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research*, 35, 102-118.
- Chen, N., Hsu, C. H., & Li, X. R. (2018). Feeling superior or deprived? Attitudes and underlying mentalities of residents towards Mainland Chinese tourists. *Tourism Management*, 66, 94-107.
- Cohen, E. (1984). The sociology of tourism: approaches, issues, findings, *Annual Review of Sociology*, 10, 373-392.

Culas, R., & Mahendrarajah, M. (2005). *Causes of diversification in agriculture over time: evidence from Norwegian farming sector*. In 11th International Congress of the European Association of Agricultural Economists, Copenhagen (Denmark): EAAE

Crotty, M. (2015). *The Foundations of Social Research*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Devine-Wright, P., & Lyons, E. (1997). Remembering pasts and representing places: The construction of national identities in Ireland. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 17(1), 33-45.

DMO Piemonte (2018). Rapporti Statistici dei flussi turistici in Piemonte (accessed on 03/03/2018) <http://www.piemonte-turismo.it/documenti/market-research-statistics/rapporti-statistici-dei-flussi-turistici-in-piemonte/>

Farmaki, A. 2012. An exploration of tourist motivation in rural settings: The case of Troodos, Cyprus. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 2, 72-78.

Fitz-Koch, S., Nordqvist, M., Carter, S., and Hunter, E. 2018. Entrepreneurship in the agricultural sector: A literature review and future research opportunities. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 42, 129-166.

Flanigan, S., Blackstock, K., and Hunter, C. 2015. Generating public and private benefits through understanding what drives different types of agritourism. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 41, 129-141.

Gee, J. P. 2014. *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method* (4th edition) Routledge, London.

Gomez-Mejia, L. R., Haynes, K. T., Núñez-Nickel, M., Jacobson, K. J., and Moyano-Fuentes, J. 2007. Socioemotional wealth and business risks in family-controlled firms: Evidence from Spanish olive oil mills. *Administrative science quarterly*, 52, 106-137.

Grimble, R. & Wellard, K. (1997). Stakeholder methodologies in natural resource management: A review of principles, contexts, experiences and opportunities, *Agricultural Systems*, 55(2), 173-193.

Groth, T. M., & Curtis, A. (2017). Mapping Farmer Identity: why, how, and what does it tell us?. *Australian Geographer*, 48, 365-383.

Gursoy, D., Jurowski, C., and Uysal, M. (2002). Resident attitudes: A structural modeling approach. *Annals of tourism research*, 29 (1), 79-105.

Hansson, H., Ferguson, R., Olofsson, C. and Rantamäki-Lahtinen, L. 2013. Farmers' motives for diversifying their farm business - The influence of family. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 32, 240-250.

Hallak, R., Brown, G., & Lindsay, N. J. (2012). The Place Identity–Performance relationship among tourism entrepreneurs: A structural equation modelling analysis. *Tourism Management*, 33(1), 143-154.

Hauge, Å. L. (2007). Identity and place: a critical comparison of three identity theories. *Architectural science review*, 50(1), 44-51.

Lyon, A., Hunter-Jones, P., & Warnaby, G. (2017). Are we any closer to sustainable development? Listening to active stakeholder discourses of tourism development in the Waterberg Biosphere Reserve, South Africa. *Tourism Management*, 61, 234-247.

Murphy, P. (1985). *Tourism: a community approach*. London: Routledge.

Phillips, N., & Hardy, C. (2002). *Discourse analysis: Investigating processes of social construction* (Vol. 50). Sage Publications.

Ribeiro, M. A., Pinto, P., Silva, J. A., & Woosnam, K. M. (2017). Residents' attitudes and the adoption of pro-tourism behaviours: The case of developing island countries. *Tourism Management*, 61, 523-537.

Rosso, M. (2014). *Barolo – The Jewel of the Langa*. Turin, Italy: Omega Edizioni

Sanchez Cañizares, S. M., Castillo Canalejo, A. M., & Núñez Tabales, J. M. (2016). Stakeholders' perceptions of tourism development in Cape Verde, Africa. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 19(10), 966-980.

Schmid, T., Ampenberger, M., Kaserer, C., and Achleitner, A. K. 2015. Family Firm Heterogeneity and Corporate Policy: Evidence from Diversification Decisions. *Corporate Governance: An International Review*, 23, 285-302.

Sharma, P., Chrisman, J. J., and Chua, J. H. 1997. Strategic management of the family business: Past research and future challenges. *Family business review*, 10, 1-35.

Sharpley, R. and Vass, A. 2006. Tourism, farming and diversification: An attitudinal study. *Tourism Management*, 27, 1040-1052.

Sharpley, R. (2014). "Host Perceptions of Tourism: A Review of the Research." *Tourism Management* 42:37–49.

Simpson, K. (2001). Strategic planning and community involvement as contributors to sustainable tourism development. *Current issues in Tourism*, 4(1), 3-41.

Sirmon, D. G., and Hitt, M. A. 2003. Managing resources: Linking unique resources, management, and wealth creation in family firms. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 27, 339-358.

Sook, F., May, L., Songan, P., & Nair, V. (2014). The impact of local communities' involvement and relationship quality on sustainable tourism in rural. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 144, 60– 65.

Strzelecka, M., Boley, B. B., & Woosnam, K. M. (2017). Place attachment and empowerment: Do residents need to be attached to be empowered?. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 66, 61-73.

Tew, C., and Barbieri, C. 2012. The perceived benefits of agritourism: The provider's perspective. *Tourism Management*, 33, 215-224.

Wilson, S., Fesenmaier, D.R., Fesenmaier, J. & Van Es, J.C., (2001). Factors for success in rural tourism development. *Journal of Travel research*, 40(2), pp.132-138.

Xu, S., Barbieri, C., Anderson, D., Leung, Y. F., & Rozier-Rich, S. (2016). Residents' perceptions of wine tourism development. *Tourism Management*, 55, 276-286.

Yang, L., 2012. Impacts and challenges in agritourism development in Yunnan, China. *Tourism Planning & Development*, 9(4), pp.369-381.