Repeated Stay in Homestay Accommodation:
An Implicit Self-Theory Perspective

ABSTRACT

This study applies implicit self-theory as a theoretical lens to investigate whether guests' inclination to use homestays in future trips is contingent on their implicit beliefs of the reality. Based on an analysis of data obtained from 30 in-depth interviews, most of the homestay guests who are entity theorists will use homestays again because they had a positive previous experience and felt that they are receiving good value for their money. The primary reason of those who decide not to use homestays again is a poor prior experience. The homestay guests who are incremental theorists will use homestays again because homestays can offer learning opportunities. However, privacy concern is the key reason that inhibits their inclination to use homestays in future trips. The current research findings echo the tenets of implicit self-theory in the realms of risk sensitivity, outcome- versus process-orientation as well as reliance (or non-reliance) on past experience. It is recommended that homestay hosts gain a better understanding of their guests based on their implicit beliefs and thereby adaptively managing future visitations.

Keywords: homestay accommodation; implicit self-theory; entity theorist; incremental theorist; repeated stay.

1.   INTRODUCTION

Defined as the '*types of accommodation where tourists or guests pay to stay in private homes, where interaction takes place with a host and/or family usually living upon the premises, and with whom public space is, to a degree, shared*' (Lynch, 2005, p. 528), homestays are a form of customer-to-customer based tourist accommodations which have been gaining popularity among modern tourists (The World Bank Group, 2018). The increased visibility and convenience of booking homestays are possible reasons why more tourists are opting for homestays rather than conventional commercial accommodations. Unlike the past, many homestays are now found and reserved through different online distribution platforms like Airbnb.com, Tujia.com, and 9flats.com. Yasami, Awang, and Teoh (2017) echo and add that the growing popularity of homestays is partially ascribed to their capacity to create a relaxing experience in a homelike environment which allows guests to experience the host culture in a more authentic way.

In line with the phenomenal growth of the homestay sector, a growing body of research on homestays has emerged in recent years. While the volume of research studies has grown significantly, previous studies have predominantly focused on host-related or managerial issues, such as environmental impacts of homestay facilities (Tsai, Lin, Hwang, & Huang, 2014), socio-economic repercussions of developing homestay tourism at a destination (Bhalla, Coghlan, & Bhattacharya, 2016; Kontogeorgopoulos, Churyen, & Duangsaeng, 2015), host

attitudes towards homestay guests (Lynch, 1999), and hosts' perception towards the idea of converting their home into a commercialised entity (McIntosh, Lynch, & Sweeney, 2011). In contrast, guest-related studies are scarce and knowledge about factors affecting homestay guests' revisit intentions is particularly limited. As Manosuthi, Lee, and Han (2020) and Meng and Cui (2020) emphasise, understanding and increasing guests' revisit intentions are important goals in any hospitality business. Although the determinants of guests' revisit intentions for commercial hotels have been extensively researched (e.g., Kim, Lee, & Kim, 2020; Ren, Qiu, Wang, & Lin, 2016), their findings and implications cannot be generalised to homestays because the latter have distinctive features in terms of location, facilities, management, and service style (Lynch, 1999; McIntosh et al., 2011). Hence, there is a need to conduct further studies to thoroughly understand the factors that motivate and inhibit guests' repeated stays in homestays.

A number of studies have shown that repeated choice is contingent on beliefs (e.g. Meng, Ryu, Chua, & Han, 2020; Ryu & Han, 2010), which refers to the judgment of the probability that an object is positive or negative (Fishbein & Raven, 1962). Dweck (1999) shows that a person typically refers to his/her beliefs to formulate perception towards an issue or a subject. This induced perception will in return influence behavioural reactions and decisions made (Dweck, 1999). Given that beliefs are a dispositional variable that is less vulnerable to situational changes (Franiuk, Pomerantz, & Cohen, 2004), the predictive effects of beliefs on perception and behaviour are considered to be reliable.

Among the different types of belief systems, the implicit self-theory (or implicit mind-set; a theory which proposes that psychological attributes are either fixed or controllable) has been empirically demonstrated as a reliable measure to differentiate the perceptions and behaviours of individuals (Jain & Weiten, 2020; Junker & van Dick, 2014). Generally speaking, the implicit self-theory suggests that people differ based on whether they believe people, events, and objects can be changed. Entity theorists (i.e., those who believe the world cannot be changed) assume that reality is in principle fixed, and therefore unlikely to change over time. As such, their impression towards a person or an event tends to hold over time and across different situations (Carnevale, Yucel-Aybat, & Kachersky, 2018). Their fixed mind-set also means that they tend to avoid risk and are sensitive to negative outcomes. They also tend to form judgment based on outcomes and performance (i.e., outcome-oriented) (Rai & Lin, 2019). In opposite, incremental theorists (i.e., those who believe that the world can be changed) assume that reality is malleable and can be manipulated (Dweck, 1999). As incremental theorists have a more dynamic worldview and a growth mind-set (Jain & Weiten, 2020), they enjoy taking risks and are more concerned about the extent of increasing their own abilities while achieving a goal. Therefore, they value positive changes and learning opportunities. They also tend to find merits in processes (i.e., process-oriented) and can better adapt to situational changes or difficulties (Dweck, Chiu, & Hong, 1995).

Over the past decade, there have been a growing body of studies examining the influence of implicit beliefs on consumer behaviour, such as product choice (Mukhopadhyay & Yeung, 2010), brand personality judgment (Mathur, Jain, & Maheswaran, 2012), and financial decisions (Rai & Lin, 2019). Implicit self-theory research in the tourism and

hospitality sectors has recently emerged to explain for guests' predisposition to use the same mobile apps for hotel reservations (Fong, Chan, Law, & Ly, 2018) and consumer response to ethnically tailored hotel services (Fong, He, Chao, Leandro, & King, 2019). While implicit self-theory has been increasingly applied in tourism literature, to the best of the authors' knowledge, no previous study has examined whether one's implicit beliefs of the reality would influence his/her decision to re-consider using homestays in future trips. Following this emergent stream of tourism research, this study extends the application of implicit self-theory to explain for the inclination to use homestays again.

Unlike previous research which often adopted questionnaire survey approach, a qualitative approach was used in this study to thoroughly elucidate the role and functions of implicit self-theory in determining one's inclination to use homestays in future trips. To be specific, the threefold objectives of this study are: (1) to examine if guests' decision to re-consider using homestays again is contingent on their implicit beliefs of the reality; (2) to examine the underlying reasons that motivate and discourage entity and incremental theorists to use homestays again; and (3) to explore the homestay factors that entity and incremental theorists would like to see improved.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. *Homestay and Host-Guest Perspective*

Like other types of peer-to-peer accommodations, homestays are privately-owned homes in which unused rooms are rented out to generate additional income to the homestay hosts as well as allow guests to experience the local culture (Lynch, 2005; Musa, Kayat, & Thirumoorthi, 2010). Notwithstanding the evolution of the homestay business model, homestays generally have two unique characteristics. *First,* guests pay to stay, and therefore accommodations listed on platforms like 9flats.com and Xiaozhu.com are considered to be homestays. Peer-to-peer accommodations that are shared without incurring payment (e.g., those listed on Couchsurfing.com, Wwof.net, and Workaway.com) are not considered to be homestays. *Second*, guests stay with the host in the same flat or premises, which means there is shared space that hosts and guests jointly use, and as a result, there is interaction between the two parties (Kontogeorgopoulos et al., 2015). Depending on the creativity and resources, guests can choose from a variety of homestay models, such as farm stays in New Zealand (Moscardo, 2009), language learning homes in the United Kingdom (UK) (Tucker & Lynch, 2005), bed-and-breakfasts in Brazil (Marques & Gondim Matos, 2020), or community-based ecotourism projects in Nepal (Biswakarma, 2015).

Unlike other commercial establishments, Lynch (2005) emphasises the hybrid nature of homestays as this form of peer-to-peer accommodation integrates the public dimensions of 'hotels' with the private dimensions of 'home'. Homestay is found somewhere in between the purely commercial environments of conventional hotels and the domesticity of the home of a family member or friend (Kontogeorgopoulos et al., 2015). While homestays promote their novelty (Liu & Mattila, 2017), many scholars have emphasised that hosts and guests should not overlook the multifaceted dynamics of the homestay experience, which include the politics

of identity (of the hosts and guests), discourse, social control, attitudes, setting, artefacts, sequences, and shared space (Lynch, 2000, 2005; Moscardo, 2009). Indeed, the unique setting of homestays incites the mindfulness of both hosts and guests which starts with examining each other's profile. They are mindful of each other's privacy and carry out appropriate behaviour to avoid offending the other person and enjoy their homestay time together. Although host-guest matching may not ensure a more satisfying experience, the process helps to reduce the possibility of misunderstandings and conflicts (Lynch, 2000; Moscardo, 2009). Hence, having a good understanding of the host/guest profile as well as the perspectives of both host and guest is important (Lashley, Lynch, & Morrison, 2007).

Many of the studies on homestays are conducted based on the perspective of the host. The concerned topics include the lifestyle and psychographic characteristics of the host (Tucker & Lynch, 2005), role of homestays in community-based development or rural projects (Kwaramba, Lovett, Louw, & Chipumuro, 2012; Tavakoli, Mura, & Rajaratnam, 2017), commercialisation of authentic homes (Hochschild, 2012; Kontogeorgopoulos et al., 2015), and why entrepreneurs choose to participate in homestay business ventures (Ahmad, Jabeen, & Khan, 2014; McIntosh et al., 2011). There is also a large number of studies that focus on the managerial issues around homestays. However, studies on the perspective of the guests have been largely scarce. It can be observed in Table 1 that guest-related studies have mostly focused on how the decision to stay in a homestay is affected by demographics and perceptual factors such as perceived value and authenticity, and satisfaction. Other recent studies have also examined and demonstrated that the intention to use Airbnb again is influenced by the perceived authenticity (Liang, Choi, & Joppe, 2018), perceived risk (Mao & Lyu, 2017), and host-guest relationship (Wang & Jeong, 2018). Nevertheless, these studies have neglected the reasons and justification for repeated stays in homestays. To address this knowledge gap, this study examines the reasons leading guests to re-consider using/not using a homestay through the theoretical lens of implicit self-theory.

[Please insert Table 1 here]

2.2. Implicit Self-theory

2.2.1. Basic assumptions

Carol Dweck and her colleagues proposed two self-theories in the 1990s to explain for imbedded assumptions regarding the stability of self-judgements, and assumptions around events, objects, and the world (Jain & Weiten, 2020). The imbedded assumptions in turn define a person and his or her response patterns (Hong, Chiu, Dweck, & Sacks, 1997). Dweck et al. (1995) stated that people can be classified into entity or incremental theorists based upon how they construe their reality. Generally speaking, entity theorists have a fixed mind-set and believe that reality is predetermined, psychological attributes are fixed, and essential qualities cannot be controlled. Incremental theorists have a growth mind-set and believe that reality can be changed, psychological attributes are malleable and can develop in a gradual manner, and essential qualities can be controlled (Jain & Weiten, 2020).

2.2.2.   Cognitive and behavioural responses

The two implicit self-theories have been demonstrated as reliable means to predict cognitive and behavioural responses (Junker & van Dick, 2014). Take for example, risk. Individuals who are entity theorists are averse to negative outcomes of events (i.e., they have negativity bias). They prefer to refrain from risks and act conservatively, such as choosing well-known brands over new brands (Ahluwalia & Gürhan-Canli, 2000) and investing in low-risk funds (Rai & Lin, 2019). On the contrary, those who are incremental theorists focus on growth, and are motivated by learning goals and personal advancement. They are less concerned about whether an outcome is positive or negative (Jain & Weiten, 2020). Incremental theorists consider risk to be a vehicle that adds value to their future self so they are less concerned about uncertainty (Levy, Stroessner, & Dweck, 1998). Therefore, they are open to changes and willing to give others the opportunity to evolve.

2.2.3.   Psychological mechanism

Mathur, Chun, and Maheswara (2016) note that the differences in the cognitive and behavioural responses between entity and incremental theorists can be attributed to their outcome- and process-oriented tendencies, respectively. In short, the former are in general outcome-oriented. Before undergoing a task or participating in an event, they often recall and rely on past outcome or past experiences to help them make a judgement. If they have a good (bad) past experience, they tend to believe that they will have the same experience in the future (Jain & Weiten, 2020). Improvements do not interest entity theorists very much because they are not concerned about the process but the outcome. Besides relying on past outcome or past experience, entity theorists are found to make a judgement based upon their preconceived notions (Fiske & Ruscher, 1993; Stangor, Sullivan, & Ford, 1991). Sometimes, their inherent preconceived notions may even drive the corresponding persons to selectively find evidence that supports their judgment. In other words, if they think that something is positive (negative), they will search for positive (negative) elements to support their stance. This process reinforces their bias and reduces the dissonance that they will change their mind (i.e., they have a fixed mind-set). Hence, it is difficult to change how entity theorists think and their views (Jain, Mathur, & Maheswaran, 2009).

On the contrary, incremental theorists are process-oriented and tend to evaluate an issue or event more objectively (Hong et al., 1997). That is, even if an event and its outcome are negative, incremental theorists will focus on the factors that have led to the negative outcome and the improvements that could take place for a different outcome. Incremental theorists pay more attention to the way of becoming a better self rather than their existing self (Jain et al., 2009). As such, past experiences have less influence on their future behaviour. Yet, this also means that incremental theorists may not automatically re-consider buying or using the same product even if they had a very satisfactory experience with the product. Table 2 summarises the distinctive characteristics of entity and incremental theorists.

[Please insert Table 2 here]

2.3. *Implicit Self-theory and Repeated Stays in Homestays*

As mentioned earlier, the explanatory power of implicit self-theory has been well demonstrated in consumer behaviour literature. In recent years, this theory has been increasingly applied in the tourism and hospitality literature (e.g., Fong, Chan et al., 2018; Fong, He et al., 2019). Nevertheless, there is still a lack of studies on whether and how guests' implicit beliefs affect their repurchase intentions and particularly their inclination to re-consider using homestays in future trips.

Here, we argue that entity and incremental theorists will show different actions and behaviours, and have different judgments and preferences in terms of using homestay accommodations again. Specifically, past homestay experience is expected to play a decisive role in determining the future behavioural intentions of entity theorists. If their past homestay experience is in general unfavourable, the enjoyable episodes during the stay are less likely to entice entity theorists' interest and intention to re-use homestays in future trips. In contrast, incremental theorists might objectively evaluate their past experience. If the experience is favourable, they will consider using it again in future trips. Even if their past experience is unfavourable, incremental theorists will still recall the good times, fantasise about a better outcome and hope that the situation will improve in the future. Thus, their inclination to use homestay accommodations is expected to be higher than entity theorists do. To validate our proposition as well as to thoroughly understand the underlying reasons, a qualitative study was conducted and the details will be further elaborated in the next section.

3. METHODOLOGY

The target respondents of this study are entity and incremental theorists who have stayed in homestay accommodations. The recruitment efforts and interviews took place from October 2017 to March 2019. A variety of different sampling methods and channels were used to recruit the target respondents (Suri, 2011). The research team first applied purposive sampling by approaching their friends/colleagues/neighbours who have previously stayed in homestays. After completing tendency checks and follow-up interviews (will be discussed later), snowball sampling was carried out, and that is, the respondents were invited to recommend other potential interviewees. The number of interviewees was determined by following the principle of data saturation (Glaser & Strauss, 1967).

To verify respondents' implicit beliefs of the reality, following Dweck et al. (1995) and Hong et al. (1997), three questions were given to the shortlisted interviewees in order to verify whether they are entity theorists or incremental theorists. The three questions are: (1) '*The kind of person someone is, is something very basic about them and it can't be changed very much*'; (2) '*People can do things differently, but the important parts of who they are can't really be changed*'; and (3) '*Everyone is a certain kind of person and there is not much that can be done to really change that*'. The interviewees responded by using a six-point Likert scale, which ranged from 1 (strongly agree), to 2 (agree), 3 (mostly agree), 4 (mostly disagree), 5 (disagree),

to 6 (strongly disagree). The scores of the response to the three statements were averaged to derive an overall score. Only the interviewees who are clearly entity or incremental theorists were included for the analysis. Respondents with an average score of 3.0 or lower are classified as entity theorists, while those with an average score of 4.0 or higher are incremental theorists. Those with an average score from 3.01 to 3.99 were excluded from the study. After completing the tendency check, 30 respondents qualified for the study and an equal number of entity and incremental theorists was found; that is, there were 15 entity theorists and 15 incremental theorists. Table 3 lists their demographic information.

[Please insert Table 3 here]

The in-depth interviews were conducted after the tendency check. The interviews were guided by questions that related to: (1) the demographic information of the interviewees; (2) their inclination to use homestay accommodations in future trips and the underlying reasons for doing so; and (3) suggestions in areas of improvement for homestays. Each interview lasted for an average of thirty minutes. The interview contents were audiotaped after consent was given by the interviewees. The languages used for the interviews were Mandarin, Cantonese, and English. The interview contents were then transcribed and interviews that were in Mandarin and Cantonese were translated into English verbatim. To ensure the accuracy of the translation, the English version was back-translated into Cantonese and Mandarin and cross-compared by three experienced researchers. The accuracy of the transcription was also ensured by consulting with the interviewees to validate the results.

Since the nature of the research work is descriptive and explanatory, the data were subjected to a content analysis (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005). To gain familiarity with the data and ensure that the core meanings of all interview contents were retained, the research team read and re-read the interview transcripts right after the interviews were completed. They highlighted the distinctive parts and generated preliminary codes. They discussed the codes, looked for relationships among them, and highlighted the relevant text. Then the research team formulated the codes and applied them to the transcripts. A search was then implemented to identify the categories and/or themes from the codes to address our research objectives (Erlingsson & Brysiewicz, 2017). In order to obtain the codes, categories, and/or themes, the research team went through a reflective process iteratively and revisited the transcripts multiple times to draw deeper insights (Hennink, Hutter, & Bailey, 2011). To verify the accuracy and reliability of the data analysis, the team also showed the results to the interviewees for validation and ensure credibility, which are vital in maximising the utilisation of data to generate categories, themes, and theories (Hennink et al., 2011).

4.   FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This section discusses the findings about entity and incremental theorists' inclination to use homestay accommodations again, the reasons that drive their decisions, as well as the areas of improvement for homestays.

4.1. Inclination to Stay in Homestay Accommodations

Surprisingly, both entity and incremental theorists showed similar inclination to use homestays in future trips. Among those 15 entity theorists, 10 (66.7%) of them indicated that they would re-consider staying in a homestay in future trips while five of them would not do so. Of those 15 incremental theorists, 12 (80%) of them indicated that they would stay in homestay accommodations again while the other three would not do so.

4.2. Reasons for Using Homestay Accommodations Again: Entity Theorists

While the inclination to stay in homestay accommodations again between entity and incremental theorists is similar, their underlying reasons for doing so reflect their distinctive characteristics. Table 4 shows that many entity theorists are motivated by the high value-for-money perception towards homestays. One entity theorist from Hong Kong stated that the low price of homestays convince her to use homestays again. Another entity theorist from Hong Kong noted that homestay hosts and their neighbours sometimes offer more enhanced services (e.g., travel recommendations, facilities) than hotels to guests. Since entity theorists are outcome-oriented and often rely on expected or (previously) attained outcomes to make a judgement (Mathur et al., 2016; Rai & Lin, 2019), the value that they receive for their money and fringe benefits entice these entity theorists to use homestays again.

[Please insert Table 4 here]

Positive past experience is another reason leading entity theorists to re-consider using homestays again. An entity theorist from Macau said, '*After my first stay in a homestay, I felt that it was okay, so now I have another accommodation option for my future trips.*' An entity theorist from the UK would consider homestays again because '*I don't have any bad experiences so far*'. Another entity theorist from Macau would also use homestays again '*because my last experience was quite good. I am satisfied with what I received*'. Wheeler and Omair (2016) stated that entity theorists often behave conservatively because they are sensitive to risk. Given that they are inclined to choose risk-free or low-risk options, adding that they tend to assess a situation based on past experience (Jain & Weiten, 2020), it is not surprising that positive past experience is a key reason leading entity theorists to re-stay in homestays in the future.

4.3. Reasons for Using Homestay Accommodations Again: Incremental Theorists

Similar to entity theorists, eight incremental theorists reported that they will use homestays again because they receive good value for their money. An incremental theorist from Macau stated his strong preference for homestays over hotels because the '*price, location and hygiene*

are good'. Another incremental theorist from China also said that he would opt for homestays because they have more facilities (e.g., washing machines and kitchenware).

Unlike the entity theorists, six of the incremental theorists will re-consider staying in a homestay because there are learning opportunities (see Table 4). One incremental theorist from Macau stated that homestays give her the opportunity to '*experience the local culture*'. Another incremental theorist from Canada said that homestays allowed him '*to get to know the local culture better*'. Three other incremental theorists (one from the UK and two from Hong Kong) would use homestays again because they offer a unique setting (i.e., shared public space) so that they can make new friends from different countries easily. Given that incremental theorists are process-oriented individuals who value growth and learning opportunities (Dweck et al., 1995), homestays are logically an attractive option because they offer ample learning opportunities (through meeting new acquaintances, enriching the knowledge about local culture, and socialising with the locals).

Seeking novelty is another reason leading some incremental theorists to elect for homestays again. One incremental theorist from Hong Kong felt that homestays are fun '*since we (i.e. travellers) usually return to the accommodations in the evening, so homestays are less boring because: (1) their design and décor are often unique and, (2) we can talk to other homestay guests.*' Another incremental theorist from Canada echoed that hotel staff often follow standard procedures to serve guests. For example, '*if a customer wants a certain type of food, they will provide a standard answer and give out a restaurant name. But when you use a homestay, the hosts would cater to your needs and provide a local unique option.*' Again, incremental theorists are keen to seek opportunities that can contribute to personal development (Jain & Weiten, 2020), as exemplified by an incremental theorist from Hong Kong, who stated that homestays '*can make the trip unique and memorable*'.

4.4.   *Reasons for Not Using Homestay Accommodations Again*

The risk avoidance tendency of entity theorists is one of the main reasons that discourage their desire to stay in homestays again (see Table 5). One entity theorist from Hong Kong stated that even though his prior homestay experience was mostly positive, he would still opt for a hotel because it is safer. Two other entity theorists commented that they are not likely to choose a homestay again because hotels are generally '*safer*' and '*cleaner*' options. On the other hand, two entity theorists indicated that their interest in staying at a homestay again was low because they do not want to cause inconvenience to other people (e.g., the homestay hosts). One entity theorist from Macau declared that he was '*afraid of casing trouble*' and disliked inconveniencing his homestay hosts. Given that entity theorists are mostly risk averse and tend to choose low-risk options (Carnevale et al., 2018; Rai & Lin, 2019), staying in hotels is a better option for them because hotels are a safe and low-risk accommodation option. Finally, several other entity theorists would not use homestays again because they did not like having to interact with others while travelling.

[Please insert Table 5 here]

Among the reasons that discourage incremental theorists to use homestays again, it is surprising that privacy concern is the most frequently cited reason. One incremental theorist from Macau had doubts whether her homestay hosts took adequate precautionary measures to protect the private information of the guests. Two other incremental theorists from Macau also stated that sharing public spaces and facilities (e.g., bathroom) with strangers infringe their privacy. Therefore, they will consider hotels over homestays if the hotels are not very expensive. Previous studies have reported that incremental theorists are intent on protecting their self-esteem (Niiya, Brook, & Crocker, 2009). This might in turn result into lack of self-disclosure and the tendency to choose safe options (Cameron, Holmes, & Vorauer, 2009).

One observation, which is worth mentioning, is that both entity and incremental theorists respond to unfavourable past experiences differently. As shown in Table 5, several entity theorists claimed that they would not choose to stay in a homestay again because they had a bad experience. Two of them (one from Macau and one from Hong Kong) did not get along with the other guests or the host, another one from Macau had a bad experience because the homestay was located far away from the amenities. Since they had a poor experience, they felt that homestays in general would give them a similar bad experience. Thus, they have little intention to use homestays again. Some of the incremental theorists also had bad experiences (e.g., poor treatment by the host, noisy guests), but their behavioural responses differ drastically. A female incremental theorist from Macau said: '*I had a bad experience with a homestay host. He promised me something then he went back on his word. However, I think that this is an exceptional case. Some hosts will not care about you, but most of them are very warm and hospitable.*' Another male incremental theorist from Macau also stated that he would not generalise one bad experience to all homestays.

In fact, this difference in behavioural responses accords with the central tenet of implicit self-theory. As discussed earlier, entity theorists have a fixed mind-set and are outcome-oriented (Dweck et al., 1995; Rai & Lin, 2019). Since they emphasise on current outcomes and would not change their mind that future outcomes would be of difference, they believe that their current experience is reflective of future experiences. Hence, if they have an overall good experience, then they would choose to stay in a homestay again and vice versa. On the contrary, since incremental theorists are process-oriented (Dweck et al., 1995), negative outcomes are not predictive of future experiences since they believe that they might have a better experience next time. Hence, even if they have a bad experience, they believe that the host would do better and solve the problems and other hosts might not make the same mistakes.

4.5. *Areas of Improvement in Homestays*

The entity and incremental theorists shared many areas that they would like to see improved in homestays (see Table 6). Both suggested five common areas of improvement. *First*, hosts need to increase their transparency and integrity of their business. Specifically, hosts should use real photos for promotional purposes and provide accurate information (including size of the venue, payment method, and any extra fees) about their homestay accommodations. *Second*, hosts

should provide guests with more guidance and clearer instructions to find their premises. One interviewee from Macau mentioned his Kyoto homestay experience: '*It was very difficult to find the homestay. We drove to a nearby area to find it. As it was evening, nobody was around to ask for directions. Then we had to call the owner to ask for the location. The directions were not very clear.*' *Third*, several interviewees were concerned about the level of hygiene and felt that cleanliness of the accommodations should be addressed. One Chinese interviewee noted that '*It would be nicer if the owner can show that they have changed the bedsheets when I arrive at the homestay.*' *Fourth*, the hosts should offer more amenities (e.g., kitchenware, washing machine, common/shared areas) and services (e.g., pick-up services, self-check-in, late arrival accommodations). *Fifth*, the hosts can improve the visibility of their premises with more print advertisements in travel magazines or/and online advertisements on travel websites. An interviewee from Macau stated: '*I did not know that homestays are an accommodation option before. Then my friend told me about them and I tried it out with him. Since then, I fell in love with homestay accommodations. Now, every time I travel, homestays are my first choice. I think homestays need to promote themselves more.*'

[Please insert Table 6 here]

Apart from these common suggestions, the entity and incremental theorists shared one additional area of improvement respectively. Six of the entity theorists advised homestay hosts to provide guests with a full list of rules and regulations (such as the do's and don'ts) before arrival. This suggestion is in line with their risk avoidance tendency (Fiske & Ruscher, 1993). Rules and regulations in traditional hotels are generally standardised and thus foreseeable, whereas those of homestay accommodations may vary and create many uncertainties for the guests. These uncertainties would not be tolerable to risk-avoiders like entity theorists. Unlike entity theorists, incremental theorists are process-oriented and open to change. Since they need flexibility, they are more concerned about improvements to the reservation system which should allow for last minute cancellations and extra fees.

The tendency of the two theorists to share their opinions is another interesting result from this study. As shown in Table 6, entity theorists offer fewer feedback items than the incremental theorists (32 versus 54). Instead, they have more criticisms and complaints (entity: 22; incremental: 11). These findings are in line with the assertion that entity theorists put greater weight on negative outcomes (Rai & Lin, 2019). Conversely, as incremental theorists value learning processes and opportunities, they tend to offer suggestions to the hosts to improve their services and property environment. These results align with the findings in previous studies (e.g., Heslin, Latham, & VandeWalle, 2005; Heslin & VandeWalle, 2011).

5.   CONCLUSIONS

5.1.   *Summary*

This paper applies implicit self-theory as a theoretical lens to explain the decision of entity and incremental theorists to use homestay accommodations again. Generally speaking, our findings lend credence to the arguments of implicit self-theory. As such, the reasons motivate and discourage entity and incremental theorists to use homestays again reflect their different belief systems. The decision to use such accommodations again by entity theorists rests on a positive past experience and their high value-for-money perception towards homestays. Since entity theorists are sensitive to risk and assess based on past experience (Jain & Weiten, 2020), it is reasonable that positive past experience is a key reason for entity theorists to use homestays again in future trips. Similarly, as entity theorists are outcome-oriented (Rai & Lin, 2019), the high value-for-money perception towards homestays convince them to consider homestay accommodations again. Besides, as entity theorists are sensitive to risk and tend to choose low-risk options, their risk avoidance is key to discouraging them from staying at a homestay again.

In contrast, incremental theorists re-consider homestays because they receive valuable learning opportunities and life experiences by making new friends and learning about the local cultures from their homestay hosts. Given that incremental theorists are keen on seeking opportunities for personal development, homestays are an attractive option that provides them with a novel (rather than usual) experience. One interesting finding of this study is that entity and incremental theorists respond to unfavourable past experiences differently. The latter may not find negative experiences unacceptable since they believe that the situation may improve in the future. The entity theorists are adamant that their bad experience is reflective of all future stays. Hence, they will not re-consider homestays for future trips.

5.2.   *Managerial Implications*

As the first study to identify the underlying reasons that motivate and discourage entity and incremental theorists from using homestays again, the current findings provide important implications for homestay hosts to motivate their guests to return and use their accommodations again. As discussed in Section 4.5, the hosts need to provide a safe and clean environment for their guests. Although the guests expect homestays to be lower in price than hotels, the hosts still need to provide high quality services, with a local culture experience. If the location of the homestay has any deficiencies, such as an inconvenient location, the hosts should provide clear directions to access the venue. These suggestions are offered by both entity and incremental theorists.

The provision of actionable clues that identify the implicit self-theory of the homestay guests is another practical contribution of this study. Drawing on the analysis of areas of improvement (of homestays) shared by the entity and incremental theorists, this study finds that the former tend to have more criticisms while the latter tend to offer suggestions. In their confirmation email or upon arrival, the homestay hosts can ask guests to provide suggestions for areas of improvement in their reservation/confirmation process. If the responses are framed as complaints (suggestions), they are likely to be entity (incremental) theorists. Homestay hosts

can also identify the implicit beliefs of their guests by observing their willingness to mingle or socialize with them or other guests in public areas of the accommodations. Since incremental theorists would re-consider homestays because this accommodation option allows them to learn about the local culture from the hosts or/and other guests, those who are found lingering in the public areas and proactively interacting are likely to be incremental theorists.

The clues to identifying implicit self-theory of a guest will also be helpful for homestay hosts in tailoring resources to enhance the effectiveness of retaining such guests. If the guest is an entity theorist (and a first time customer), the hosts need to put forth extra effort and provide the best stereotypical/first impression because entity theorists judge on stereotypical/first impressions to make future decisions. Also, as entity theorists are risk-avoiders, the hosts need to provide all kinds of information or services that allow the guests to feel safe such as the contact information for different incidents and a safety deposit box. Rules and regulations should be provided and clearly explained to entity theorists upon their arrival. On the contrary, if the guest is an incremental theorist, rules and regulations are less important. Instead, flexibility, such as last-minute cancellations and ad-hoc requests with the payment of extra fees should be accommodated for this kind of guest. Moreover, given that incremental theorists are keen to socialise and learn new things from the hosts, the hosts are advised to be more sociable if available and highlight some unique factors of the accommodation when serving incremental theorists. Last but not least, as privacy is a major concern of incremental theorists, hosts need to clearly indicate in the written agreement that no surveillance system is installed in the accommodation if it is the case.

The findings also provide insights for the booking platforms (e.g., Airbnb). Using text-mining approach, the platform will be able to identify entity and incremental theorists based on guests' online reviews. If a guest complains (suggests) a lot, he or she is likely to be entity (incremental) theorists. When the guest books homestays again, the platform can provide additional service for the hosts by informing them that the guest is probably an entity or incremental theorist. Then, the hosts can better identify and satisfy the needs of these theorists.

5.3.   *Theoretical Implications*

Previous studies have indicated that one's implicit mind-set is crucial in tourism decision-making around hotel reservations (Fong et al., 2018). Following the implicit self-theory, Dweck and her colleagues (1995) have separated people into two groups according to the stability of their worldview. Entity theorists assume that people and events are eternally fixed and unlikely to change much over time. In contrast, incremental theorists assume that people and events are malleable and able to be changed or developed (Dweck et al., 1995; Dweck, 1999; Hong et al., 1997). This study adds new knowledge to the current literature on the use of implicit self-theory by extending its applicability to the inclination of repeated stays in homestay accommodations and information on consumer behaviour for tourism purposes.

Besides, while the empirical findings of this study are mostly based on the central tenet of implicit self-theory, this study is the first to find that privacy is a concern of incremental theorists. Based on our understanding from the literature, the concern for privacy may be

related to the need to protect their self-esteem. However, since existing knowledge about this phenomenon/issue is still limited at the moment of writing this paper, further research efforts are recommended to empirically validate our speculations.

The findings of this study prove the explanative power of the implicit-self theory of the perception and behaviour of tourists in the hospitality field, particularly in homestay settings. The two contrasting belief systems (i.e., entity and incremental theorists) affect and drive decision making towards the same phenomenon (Dweck, 1999). While the predictive effects of beliefs on perception and behaviour are considered to be reliable (Franiuk et al., 2004), scholars can extend the applications of the implicit self-theory to understand and explain how the in-depth belief systems of tourists influence their perception and behaviour toward other hospitality and tourism phenomena.

5.4. *Limitations and Future Research*

As with all studies, there are limitations and this study is no exception. First, the majority of the interviewees who participated in this study are from Hong Kong or Macau. There might be a cultural bias, and their views might not be generalisable to everyone. Second, as a qualitative approach is adopted, the number of interviewees is limited even though 30 is not a small sample size in qualitative research. With the findings drawn from the in-depth interviews in this study, it is recommended that future research uses a quantitative approach such as questionnaire surveys with large samples to validate our discussions of the findings, especially the privacy concern of incremental theorists, which has not been well addressed in previous studies on the implicit self-theories. Third, as this study concerns the repeated stays at homestay accommodations, all of interviewees have experienced homestays before. We do not know if the implicit self-theory matters for those who have never stayed in a homestay. It would be interesting for future studies to interview potential homestay users and compare their views with seasoned guests. Fourth, the findings in this study may not be applicable to other consumer products or services. A replication of this study can be conducted with the use of other products and services. Finally, homestay accommodations here do not include those that do not incur a payment for the stay. Thus, future studies are warranted in this area.

REFERENCES

Agyeiwaah, E., Akyeampong, O., & Amenumey, E. K. (2013). International tourists' motivations to choose homestay: Do their socio-demographics have any influence? *Tourism and Hospitality Research, 13*(1), 16–26.

Agyeiwaah, E., Akyeampong, O., Amenumey, E., & Boakye, K. A. (2014). Accommodation preference among international volunteer tourists in the Kumasi Metropolis of Ghana. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, *10*, 7–10.

Ahluwalia, R., & Gürhan-Canli, Z. (2000). The effects of extensions on the family brand name: An accessibility-diagnosticity perspective. *Journal of Consumer Research, 27*(3), 371–381.

Ahmad, S. Z., Jabeen, F., & Khan, M. (2014). Entrepreneurs choice in business venture: Motivations for choosing home-stay accommodation businesses in Peninsular Malaysia. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 36*, 31–40.

Bhalla, P., Coghlan, A., & Bhattacharya, P. (2016). Homestays' contribution to community-based ecotourism in the Himalayan region of India. *Tourism Recreation Research, 41*(2), 213–228.

Biswakarma, G. (2015). On the dimensionality of measuring tourist satisfaction towards homestay. *International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Systems, 8*(2), 51–63.

Cameron, J. J., Holmes, J. G., & Vorauer, J. D. (2009). When self-disclosure goes awry: Negative consequences of revealing personal failures for lower self-esteem individuals. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 45*(1), 217–222.

Carnevale, M., Yucel-Aybat, O., & Kachersky, L. (2018). Meaningful stories and attitudes toward the brand: The moderating role of consumers' implicit mind-sets. *Journal of Consumer Behavior, 17, e78-e89.*

Dweck, C. S. (1999). *Self–theories: Their role in motivation, personality, and development*. Philadelphia, PA: Psychology Press.

Dweck, C. S., & Leggett, E. L. (1988). A social-cognitive approach to motivation and personality. *Psychological Review, 95*(2), 256–273.

Dweck, C. S., Chiu, C., & Hong, Y. (1995). Implicit theories and their role in judgments and reactions: A world from two perspectives. *Psychological Inquiry*, *6*(4), 267–285.

Erlingsson, C., & Brysiewicz, P. (2017). A hands-on guide to doing content analysis. *African Journal of Emergency Medicine, 7*(3), 93–99.

Fishbein, M., & Raven, B. H. (1962). The AB scales: An operational definition of belief and attitude. *Human Relations*, *15*, 35-44.

Fiske, S. T., & Ruscher, J. B. (1993). Negative interdependence and prejudice: Whence the affect? In D. M. Machie & D. L. Hamilton (Eds.), *Affect, cognition, and stereotyping interactive processes in group perception* (pp. 239–268). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Fong, L. H. N., Chan, I., Law, R., & Ly, T. (2018). The mechanism that links the implicit theories of intelligence and continuance of information technology: Evidence from the use

of mobile apps to make hotel reservations. In B. Stangl & J. Pesonen (Eds.), *Information and communication technologies in Tourism 2018* (pp. 323–335). Switzerland: Springer.

Fong, L. H. N., He, H., Chao, M. M., Leandro, G., & King, D. (2019). Cultural essentialism and tailored hotel service for Chinese: The moderating role of satisfaction. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 31*(9), 3610–3626.

Franiuk, R., Pomerantz, E. M., & Cohen, D. (2004). The causal role of theories of relationships: Consequences for satisfaction and cognitive strategies. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 30*(11), 1494–1507.

Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. New York, NY: Aldine.

Hennink, M., Hutter, I., & Bailey, A. (2011). *Qualitative research methods*. London: Sage.

Heslin, P., & VandeWalle, D. (2011). Performance appraisal procedural justice: The role of a manager's implicit person theory. *Journal of Management, 37*(6), 1694–1718.

Heslin, P., Latham, G., & VandeWalle, D. (2005). The effect of implicit person theory on performance appraisals. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *90*(5), 842–856.

Hochschild, A. R. (2012). *The outsourced self: Intimate life in market times*. New York, NY: Metropolitan Books.

Hong, Y., Chiu, C., Dweck, C. S., & Sacks, R. (1997). Implicit theories and evaluative processes in person cognition. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *33*(3), 296–323.

Hsieh, H. F., & Shannon, S. E. (2005). Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qualitative Health Research, 15*(9), 1277–1288.

Hsu, S., & Lin, Y. (2011). Factors underlying college students' choice of homestay accommodation while travelling. *World Transactions on Engineering and Technology Education, 9*(3), 196-202.

Jain, S. P., & Weiten, T. J. (2020). Consumer psychology of implicit theories: A review and agenda. *Consumer Psychology Review, 3*(1), 60–75.

Jain, S. P., Mathur, P., & Maheswaran, D. (2009). The influence of consumers' lay theories on approach/avoidance motivation. *Journal of Marketing Research, 46*(1), 56–65.

Jamal, S. A., Othman, N., & Muhammad, N. (2011). Tourist perceived value in a community-based homestay visit: An investigation into the functional and experiential aspect of value. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, *17*(1), 5–15.

Jones, D. L., & Guan, J. J. (2011). Bed and breakfast lodging development in Mainland China: Who is the potential customers? *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research, 16*(5), 517-536.

Jones, D. L., & Millar, M. (2013). Exploring the potential market for the "commercial home" in mainland china: a comparison of domestic and international tourists. *Journal of China Tourism Research, 9*(3), 305-324.

Junker, N. M., & van Dick, R. (2014). Implicit theories in organizational settings: A systematic review and research agenda of implicit leadership and followership theories. *The Leadership Quarterly, 25*(6), 1154–1173.

Kim, W. H., Lee, S. H., & Kim, K. S. (2020). Effects of sensory marketing on customer satisfaction and revisit intention in the hotel industry: the moderating roles of customers' prior experience and gender. *Anatolia*. DOI: 10.1080/13032917.2020.1783692.

Kontogeorgopoulos, N., Churyen, A., & Duangsaeng, V. (2015). Homestay tourism and the commercialization of the rural home in Thailand. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, *20*(1), 29–50.

Kwaramba, H. M., Lovett, J. C., Louw, L., & Chipumuro, J. (2012). Emotional confidence levels and success of tourism development of poverty reduction: The South African Kwam eMakana home–stay project. *Tourism Management*, *33*(4), 885–894.

Lashley, C., Lynch, P. A., & Morrison, A. (2007). *Hospitality: A social lens*. Oxford: Elsevier.

Levy, S. R., Stroessner, S. J., & Dweck, C. S. (1998). Stereotype formation and endorsement: The role of implicit theories. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*(6), 1421–1436.

Liang, L. J., Choi, H. C., & Joppe, M. (2018). Exploring the relationship between satisfaction, trust and switching intention, repurchase intention in the context of Airbnb. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 69*, 41-48.

Liu, S. Q., & Mattila, A. S. (2017). Airbnb: Online targeted advertising, sense of power, and consumer decisions. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 60*, 33–41.

Lynch, P. A. (1999). Host attitudes towards guests in the homestay sector. *Tourism and Hospitality Research, 1*(2), 119–144.

Lynch, P. A. (2000). Networking in the homestay sector. *The Service Industries Journal*, *20*(3), 95–116.

Lynch, P. A. (2005). Sociological impressionism in a hospitality context. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *32*(3), 527–548.

Manosuthi, N., Lee, J. S., & Han, H. (2020). Predicting the revisit intention of volunteer tourists using the merged model between the theory of planned behavior and norm activation model. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing, 37*(4), 510-532.

Mao, Z., & Lyu, J. (2017). Why travelers use Airbnb again? *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 29*(9), 2464-2482.

Marques, L., & Gondim Matos, B. (2020). Network relationality in the tourism experience: staging sociality in homestays. *Current Issues in Tourism, 23*(9), 1153-1165.

Mathur, P., Chun, H., & Maheswaran, D. (2016). Consumer mindsets and self-enhancement: Signalling versus learning. *Journal of Consumer Psychology, 26*(1), 142–152.

Mathur, P., Jain, S. P., & Maheswaran, D. (2012). Consumers' implicit theories about personality influence their brand personality judgments. *Journal of Consumer Psychology, 22*(4), 545–557.

McIntosh, A. J., Lynch, P., & Sweeney, M. (2011). "My home is my castle": Defiance of the commercial homestay host in tourism. *Journal of Travel Research, 50*(5), 509–519.

Meng, B., & Cui, M. (2020). The role of co-creation experience in forming tourists' revisit intention to home-based accommodation: Extending the theory of planned behaviour. *Tourism Management Perspectives, 33*, 100581.

Meng, B., Ryu, H., Chua, B., & Han, H. (2020). Predictors of intention for continuing volunteer tourism activities among young tourists. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research, 25*(3), 261-273.

Moscardo, G. (2009). Bed and breakfast, homestay and farmstay accommodation: Forms and experience. In P. Lynch, A. J. McIntosh & H. Tucker (Eds.) *Commercial homes: An international perspective* (pp. 25-37). Oxon: Routledge.

Mukhopadhyay, A., & Yeung, C. (2010). Building character: Effects of lay theories of self-control on the selection of products for children. *Journal of Marketing Research, 47*(2), 240–250.

Mura, P. (2015). Perceptions of authenticity in a Malaysian homestay - A narrative analysis. *Tourism Management*, *51*, 225–233.

Musa, G., Kayat, K., & Thirumoorthi, T. (2010). The experiential aspect of rural home-stay among Chinese and Malay students using diary method. *Tourism and Hospitality Research, 10*(1), 25-41.

Niiya, Y., Brook, A. T., & Crocker, J. (2010). Contingent self-worth and self-handicapping: Do incremental theorists protect self-esteem? *Self and Identity, 9*(3), 276–297.

Rai, D., & Lin, C. W. (2019). The influence of implicit self-theories on consumer financial decision making. *Journal of Business Research, 95*, 316–325.

Rasoolimanesh, S. M., Dahalan, N., & Jaafar, M. (2016). Tourists' perceived value and satisfaction in a community–based homestay in the Lenggong Valley World Heritage Site. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, *26*, 72–81.

Ren, L., Qiu, H., Wang, P., & Lin, P. M. C. (2016). Exploring customer experience with budget hotels: Dimensionality and satisfaction. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 52*, 13–23.

Ryu, K., & Han, H. (2010). Predicting tourists' intention to try local cuisine using a modified theory of reasoned action: The case of New Orleans. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing, 27*(5), 491-506.

Stangor, C., Sullivan, L. A., & Ford, T. E. (1991). Affective and cognitive determinants of prejudice. *Social Cognition*, *9*(4), 359–380.

Suri, H. (2011). Purposeful sampling qualitative research synthesis. *Qualitative Research Journal, 11*(2), 63–75.

Tavakoli, R., Mura, P., & Rajaratnam, S. D. (2017). Social capital in Malaysian homestays: Exploring hosts' social relations. *Current Issues in Tourism, 20*(10), 1028–1043.

The World Bank Group (2018). *Tourism and the Sharing Economy: Policy & Potential of Sustainable Peer-to-Peer Accommodation*. Washington, DC: The World Bank Group.

Tsai, K. T., Lin, T. P., Hwang, R. L., & Huang, Y. J. (2014). Carbon dioxide emissions generated by energy consumption of hotels and homestay facilities in Taiwan. *Tourism Management, 42*, 13–21.

Tucker, H., & Lynch, P. (2005). Host–guest dating. *Journal of Quality Assurance in Hospitality & Tourism*, 5(2–4), 11–32.

Wang, C. R., & Jeong, M. (2018). What makes you choose Airbnb again? An examination of users' perceptions toward the website and their stay. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 74*, 162-170.

Wheeler, S. C., & Omair, A. (2016). Potential growth areas for implicit theories research. *Journal of Consumer Psychology, 26*(1), 137–141.

Yasami, M., Awang, K. W. B., & Teoh, K. (2017). Homestay tourism: From the distant past up to present. *People: International Journal of Social Sciences, 3*(2), 1251–1268.

Table 1. Studies on homestay from perspective of guests

Reference	Research objective(s)	Research subject(s)	Factors discussed
Agyeiwaah, Akyeampong, and Amenumey (2013)	To examine the influence of socio-demographics that motivate use of homestays in the Kumasi Metropolis of Ghana	International tourists who have stayed in Kumasi, Ghana	• Socio-demographic variables (e.g., sex, age, and income)
Agyeiwaah, Akyeampong, Amenumey, and Boakye (2014)	To examine accommodation preferences among international volunteer tourists focusing on homestay facilities in Ghana	Volunteer tourists in Kumasi, Ghana	• Low price • Cultural immersion • Security and warmth of home • Community service and development • Social interaction
Hsu and Lin (2011)	To understand choice of homestay of college students while travelling	Taiwanese college students	• Activities arrangement • Quality of services • Attractions • Social demands and facilities • Price • Sanitation and comfort • Specialties • Leisure and relaxation • Transportation
Jamal, Othman, and Muhammad (2011)	To examine functional and experiential aspects of perceived value of tourists of community-based homestays in Malaysia	General tourists who used Malaysia community homestays	• Homestay establishment • Price • Host-guest interaction • Activity, culture and knowledge • Emotional value
Jones and Guan (2011)	To assess willingness of potential customers to utilise a B&B and/or homestay while visiting Mainland China	Hong Kong residents	• Socio-demographic variables (e.g., age, income, and education)
Jones and Millar (2013)	To examine receptivity of domestic and interactional tourists to staying in different types of commercial homes in Mainland China	Tourists visiting Mainland China	• Clean, comfortable, friendly • Ambience and setting • Luxurious, fashionable • Experience local customs • Quality bathroom amenities • Family, neighbour like • Local advice • Personal, privacy
Mura (2015)	To address the gap in narratives of guests on authenticity in a Malaysian homestay experience	Bloggers who have visited Malaysian community homestays	• Perception of authenticity

Rasoolimanesh, Dahalan, and Jaafar (2016)	To examine the effects of perceived value on the satisfaction of tourists staying at a community-based homestay in Malaysia	General tourists stayed in Malaysia community homestays	• Functional value • Emotional value • Social value

Table 2.   Behavioural characteristics of entity and incremental theorists

Personal trait	Entity theorist	Incremental theorist
Basic assumption	• The reality is fixed and unlikely to change over time	• The reality is malleable and can be developed over time
Cognitive and behavioural responses	• Risk avoidance • More sensitive to negative outcomes (i.e., negativity bias) • More loyal to known and well-established brands • Tend to choose low-risk options or alternatives	• Risk seeking • More sensitive to positive outcomes, but negative outcomes are acceptable at certain level • Less loyal to known and well-established brands • Willing to take risks for self-improvement and keen on seeking options for personal advancement
Psychological mechanism	• Outcome-oriented • Rely on past outcome, past experiences, and preconceived notions to judge people, issues, or events • Tends to look for evidence that supports their stance	• Process-oriented • Uses an objective manner to judge people, issues, or events • Tends to focus on becoming a better self rather than the existing self

Table 3.   Demographic information of respondents

Group by Implicit self-theory	Number of interviews	Average Score on the three tendency-check questions	Average Age	Gender	Country/Place of Residence
Entity theorist	15	2.27	32.5	Male: 4 Female: 11	Belarus: 1 Hong Kong: 4 Macau: 5 Mainland China: 2 Malaysia: 1 UK: 1 USA: 1
Incremental theorist	15	4.53	29.3	Male: 4 Female: 11	Canada: 1 Hong Kong: 4 Macau: 7 Mainland China: 3

Table 4.   Reasons that motivate entity and incremental theorists to use homestays again

	Rank *(by frequency)*	Entity theorist (*N = 15*) Will use homestay again (*n = 10*)	Incremental theorist (*N = 15*) Will use homestay again (*n = 12*)
Reason *(Frequency)*	1	**- Value for money** *(9)* • Lower price than hotel *(6)* • More services and facilities *(2)* • Highly accessible location *(2)* • Rich hospitality *(1)*	**- Value for money** *(8)* • Lower price than hotel *(6)* • More services and facilities *(1)* • Highly accessible location *(1)* • Good hygiene *(2)* • Rich hospitality *(2)*
	2	**- Positive past experience** *(5)*	**- Learning opportunities** *(6)* • Able to experience local culture *(4)* • Able to make new friends *(3)*
	3	**- Learning opportunities** *(1)* • Able to experience local culture *(1)*	**- Novelty seeking** *(5)* • Able to acquire unique/novel experience *(3)* • Able to receive personalised recommendations from hosts *(3)*
	4	**- Novelty seeking** *(1)* • Able to experience new things *(1)*	**- Positive past experience** *(2)* **- Rationalising negative past experience** *(2)* • Inhospitable host *(1)* • Noisy guests *(2)*

Table 5. **Reasons that discourage entity and incremental theorists to use homestays again**

	Rank *(by frequency)*	Entity theorist (*N = 15*) Will not use homestays again (*n = 5*)	Incremental theorist (*N = 15*) Will not use homestays again (*n = 3*)
Reasons *(Frequency)*	1	**- Risk avoidance** *(5)* • Homestays are not as safe as hotel *(3)* • Avoid troubling others *(2)*	**- Privacy** *(3)* • Do not want to share house with strangers *(2)* • Concern about the leakage of personal information *(1)*
	2	**- Dislike social interaction** *(4)* • Not a sociable person *(3)* • Dislike dealing with host and guests *(2)*	
	3	**Negative past experience** *(4)* • With host/or other guests *(2)* • Safety and security *(1)* • Remote location *(1)*	

Table 6. Areas of improvement of homestays suggested by entity and incremental theorists

Group	Number of criticisms / complaint	Number of areas of improvement	Areas of improvement of homestays (*Frequency*)
Entity theorist	22	32	- Show accurate information of homestay (e.g., size, payment method, and extra fees) (*5*) - Provide clearer directions to locate premises (*4*) - Improving cleanliness (*4*) - Offering more facilities and services (*11*) - Placing more advertisements to improve the visibility of their premises (*2*) - Offering a full list of rules and regulation (do's and don'ts) (*6*)
Incremental theorist	11	54	- Show accurate information of homestay (e.g., size, payment method, and extra fees) (*8*) - Provide clearer directions to locate premises (*6*) - Improving cleanliness (*2*) - Offering more facilities and services (*25*) - Placing more advertisements to improve the visibility of their premises (*10*) - Improving host supervision system (last minute cancellations and extra fees) (*3*)