

Co-creating Communities of Place in Second Home Tourism

Jørgensen, Matias Thuen; Sundbo, Jon; Fuglsang, Lars

Published in:
Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism

DOI:
[10.1080/15022250.2023.2298454](https://doi.org/10.1080/15022250.2023.2298454)

Publication date:
2024

Document Version
Early version, also known as pre-print

Citation for published version (APA):
Jørgensen, M. T., Sundbo, J., & Fuglsang, L. (2024). Co-creating Communities of Place in Second Home Tourism. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism, latest articles*.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/15022250.2023.2298454>

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain.
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact rucforsk@kb.dk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

This is an original manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism* on 05 Jan 2024, available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/15022250.2023.2298454>.

PLEASE USE THE FOLLOWING WHEN CITING:

Jørgensen MT, Sundbo J, Fuglsang L. 2024. Co-creating Communities of Place in Second Home Tourism. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15022250.2023.2298454>

TITLE:

Co-creating Communities of Place in Second Home Tourism

AUTHORS:

Dr. Matias Thuen Jørgensen, Associate Professor (corresponding author)
Department of Social Sciences and Business, Roskilde University, Denmark
Universitetsvej 1, 4000 Roskilde, Denmark
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6202-1654>
Email: matiaastj@ruc.dk

Dr. Jon Sundbo, Professor
Department of Social Sciences and Business, Roskilde University, Denmark
Universitetsvej 1, 4000 Roskilde, Denmark
Email: sundbo@ruc.dk

Dr. Lars Fuglsang, Professor
Department of Social Sciences and Business, Roskilde University, Denmark
Universitetsvej 1, 4000 Roskilde, Denmark
Email: fuglsang@ruc.dk

KEYWORDS:

Community of place, Co-creation, Second home tourism, Custodian, Holiday Consumer, Innovator

FUNDING DETAILS:

Part of the data collection for this paper was funded by the Danish Board of Business Development

DISCLOSURE STATEMENT:

The authors report there are no competing interests to declare.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT:

We would like to acknowledge that all the authors have contributed equally to the paper.

Title:

Co-creating Communities of Place in Second Home Tourism

Abstract:

The paper contributes to extant research by conceptualising and extending our understanding of communities of place and particularly the role of second home owners in the co-creation of these. Previous research has dealt with how translocated residents, such as second home owners, participate in co-creation activities with permanent residents. Despite considerable attention given to second home owners impacts on local communities, research that delves into the intricacies of their participation is missing. Specifically, there is a gap in understanding the diverse ways second home owners engage in the co-creation, and sometimes co-destruction, of communities of place. Utilizing longitudinal data gathered from 2016 to 2022 in two second home areas in Denmark, this paper explores the defining aspects of these dynamics, synthesizing them into distinct roles that second home owners can assume in these co-creation processes. Three overlapping co-creative/co-destructive roles of second home owners in communities of place that transcend places and contexts are defined and explored: custodians, holiday consumers and innovators. Contrary to prior assumptions, our research challenges the notion that specific groups of second home owners inherently contribute more positively to a community, as we find that each role carries the potential for both co-creative and co-destructive outcomes.

Keywords:

Community of place, Co-creation, Second home tourism, Custodian, Holiday consumer, Innovator

Introduction

Second homes are recognized as an important element of tourism (Müller, 2011). In many countries, including those in the Nordics (e.g. Reeh, 2017; Rye, 2011; Tress, 2002), there is a strong tradition of having a second home in the countryside. Second homes have been described as sources of economic and social value creation in rural and peri-urban areas (e.g. Farstad, 2013; Gallent, 2014). Despite this, research have emphasized the separated perspectives of locals and second home owners (e.g. Müller, 2011; Rye, 2011).

It is suggested that second home owners have a different sense of place than rural residents, seeing it from the “outside” and being disembedded and mobile, that they develop few and sparse relationships with locals, who, by contrast, have less mobility, form part of the production system, and have deep roots and relationships in the community. It is also noted that second home owners may hinder in-migration off or displace permanent inhabitants because they buy up the houses and thereby raise prices (Farstad, 2013; Volo, 2011). However, the challenges to or displacement off potential residents have also been disproven in some contexts (Marjavaara, 2007; Overvåg & Berg, 2011) and research has shown that second home owners contribute to community development, especially in deprived areas, through the economic and social capital they bring to an area (e.g. Farstad, 2013; Gallent, 2014; Rye, 2015; Tuulentie & Kietäväinen, 2020).

Similarly, some researchers posit that residents are frequently portrayed as victims residing in underprivileged areas, mistreated by affluent urban residents who encroach upon their homes, whereas they may just as well be seen as ‘place monopolists’, controlling exclusive access to desirable locations (Flognfeldt, 2002; Marjavaara, 2007). These different positions illustrate that second home tourism is indeed a contested practice, which calls for a deeper understanding of the various actors, positions and relationships.

Overvåg and Berg (2011) argued that this contestedness mainly stems from the fact that second home owners and residents “share the same spaces but use them for different purposes” (p. 419). Recognizing this, we consider ‘communities of place’ —defined as a local community where residents and second home owners share a physically, geographically, and culturally defined local place in which they engage—as an important concept and potential in this regard, as it enables and allows an understanding of second home owners and residents as co-creators of a broad set of economic, social, and experiential value outcomes (Bærenholdt et al., 2021). Therefore, this paper aims to create a better understanding of the dynamics at play when residents and second home owners engage and thereby co-create, or co-destroy value in communities of place (Echeverri & Skålén, 2011; Plé & Chumpitaz Cáceres, 2010). It takes a particular focus on the role of second home owners, leaving deeper investigations of the roles of residents as a topic for future research. Importantly, it should also be noted that the paper focusses on the engagement between these actors and as such it is delimited from the perspectives of those residents who in no way (directly or indirectly) engages with tourism related issues in their community.

Our research focuses on the study of tourism development in two distinct Danish local communities. One of these communities, Lildstrand, is situated in a rural area in Western Jutland, while the other, Odsherred, is located in a peri-urban region just outside a metropolitan area. Both communities are affected by second home ownership and can be characterized as ‘communities of place’. We explore the following research question: How do second home owners become engaged with residents as co-creators of communities of place and what are the value co-creative and co-destructive consequences of different types of engagement?

Literature Review

Second Home Definition

In the literature, there is consensus about the lack of consensus when it comes to a broadly accepted definition of second homes. Alonsopérez et al. (2022) summarised the various definitions that have been introduced and concluded by suggesting their own definition, which we subscribe to with this study: “a property which homeowners use as an alternative destination away from their primary homes, mostly used for leisure purposes, or/and tourist accommodation rental purposes.” (p. 18). A key point of contention has been whether mobile homes should be included in definition of second homes. Hall and Müller (2004) included mobile homes in their definition, however, both the contributions to their edited book, where this was presented, and the research in general has focussed on privately owned, nonmobile second homes, located in rural and peri-urban areas (Volo, 2011).

As we will clarify further in this paper, we believe that the permanency of the second home in a community is exactly what allows for and lead to potentials for the co-creation of a community of place. Therefore, we subscribe to a definition of second homes that separate them from mobile homes, but include for example sedentary caravans (Leivestad, 2020). For the same reason, our understanding of second homes also excludes any that are exclusively used for rental purposes.

Resident and Second Home Owner Interactions

Literature on second homes have dealt with various issues including climate change impacts (e.g. Demiroglu et al., 2023; Xue et al., 2020), planning and policy issues (e.g. Back & Marjavaara, 2017), and owner characteristics and motivations (e.g. Norris & Winston, 2010; Tuulentie, 2007) Focusing on for example contestedness, displacement and residents attitudes, some research has also dealt with the relationship between second home owners and permanent residents (e.g. Kaltenborn et al., 2008; Marjavaara, 2007; Overvåg & Berg, 2011; Volo, 2011).

In terms of research on second home owners in the Nordic context, Broegaard et al., (2019) and Larsen et al., (2019) dealt with a broader group of part-time inhabitants and how they participate in so-called translocation co-operations with permanent residents. Some second home owners that are engaged in local community activities are included in this group, but it also extends to people such as those that work in the local rural community but have their main residence elsewhere. These researchers found that part-time residents contribute to the local community in a variety of ways, for example as entrepreneurs who establish new enterprises or other activities in the local rural

community. Examples of co-operation between residents and part-time inhabitants include organizing activities such as festivals, political participation to develop the local community in a particular direction or setting up and running social networks. They can also bring networks, experience and sometimes enthusiasm to the community, however, they can easily move or withdraw their engagement.

Halfacree (2012) has contributed to the idea of counterurbanization which is integrated in the theory of translocation. He focusses on heterolocalisation, which like the concept of translocalisation, expresses that people are leading increasingly mobile lives with many having partly migrated to their second homes. As a result, second homes are increasingly transformed from places of escape, where people relax away from urban life to homes where they live part of their life. Halfacree (2012) presents a model of different types of counterurban or translocal populations, namely occasional visitors, commuters and second home owners. Second home owners are then subdivided into irregular and regular users.

Xue et al. (2020) confirm this finding as they find two different mobility and housing consumption patterns of non-primary dwelling owners/users, the 'traditional' and the 'modern'. The traditional pattern involves smaller-sized non-primary dwellings with simpler technical standards, characterized by lower visitation frequency. In contrast, the modern pattern features larger, medium- to high-standard dwellings that are utilized more frequently and for longer durations. Xue et al. (2020) argue that there has been a transition from traditional to modern mobility and consumption patterns. Further, they argue that this had led to a larger strain on second home localities which also includes negative climate implications. To this we add the perspective that it may also lead to a larger and broader impacts – positive and negative – on local communities.

In terms of interactions between residents and different actors engaging in translocation, it can be argued that regular second home owners have specific characteristics and thus specific potentials and challenges in terms of community co-creation. The characteristics of second home owners as opposed to residents, including their different degrees of embeddedness in a community, their diverging production versus consumption foci, or their different intensities of attachment (Hall & Müller, 2004), have already been outlined. But the way they are different from other translocated groups also include that they have a more long-term interest in the place, since they have a (second) home here.

As outlined in the introduction, extant research has pointed to second home owners as both a potential force for good in local communities, because they bring economic and social capital and may be active participants in the community, and potentially as a source of disturbance or even destruction, because they may be disembedded, self-interested, may hinder in-migration or deepen local conflicts. Particularly conflicts relating to land use have been highlighted as a contentious issue (Farstad, 2013; Kaltenborn et al., 2008; Overvåg & Berg, 2011; Rinne et al., 2015; Rye, 2011; Tuulentie & Kietäväinen, 2020; Volo, 2011). Overvåg and Berg (2011) highlighted that the ways in which second home owners influence an area and potentially lead to conflict is highly place

dependent and thus differs between rural and what has since been termed peri-urban areas. Recognizing this, our study focusses on both a rural and peri-urban case, and seeks to find out whether certain characteristics may transcend geographical differences.

Hall (2005) emphasized that the sharpest contrast in tourism development is between entrepreneurs whose primary goal is profit and local residents, including second home owners. Overvåg and Berg (2011) confirmed that this was also largely the case for second home tourism. While this may be true in a broad sense, it implies a separation between entrepreneurs and second home owners that do not ring true in many cases. This implies a need for a more nuanced understanding of second home owners and the roles they may play in a community.

Related to this, Huijbens (2012) sub-divides second home owners into two distinct groups. The “homesick”, who isolate themselves with their family, and the “creative leisure” group, who integrate themselves with the local community, implying that the latter group holds larger potential for a community. However, based on our findings, we will argue that both of these groups can contribute to the community of place in both co-creative and co-destructive ways. The “homesick” group may be disembedded from the local community, which does not allow for co-creative involvement, but at the same time, it may also limit the potential for co-destructive behavior. The “creative leisure” group, can be a force for good, but can also be a force for implementation of activities, policies etc. that benefit second home users’ more than local residents. Marjavaara (2007) highlighted how the issue of second homes is controversial and that the debate is often “infected and highly influenced by beliefs rather than facts” (p. 298). There is therefore a need to further understand the ways in which second home owners and local residents relate and engage, and the challenges they face in such processes. We suggest the concept of communities of place as a useful outset to create a better understanding of the relationship between second home owners and local residents.

Co-creating and Co-destroying Value in Communities of Place

Based on Hansen and Olsen (2022), we define ‘community of place’ as a local community where residents and second home owners share a physically, geographically, and culturally defined local place in which they engage. Places act as ‘maps’ of the landscape, culture and economy, which to some extent prefigure or impact actions (what to do, where to go), but the term also covers the performance of the various actors involved through everyday actions (how to do it, with whom and when). In classical sociology and anthropology, the term community was an unambiguous concept characterizing a physically and geographically limited social group with a common social system – the ancient village in agrarian society (cf. Tönnies' (1887) “*gemeinschaft*”). This phenomenon has been studied in modern times under the term local community (e.g. Frankenberg, 1994). However, the term community is now also used to describe social groups that are not geographically defined, such as online communities.

We therefore use the term community of *place* to emphasize that we refer to a shared physically, geographically, and culturally defined local place. Another reason for using the term is that second

home owners, as we have defined them, always have a relationship with a place (where their second home is located), but not *necessarily* with the social group around the second home location – the local community. As such, communities of place necessitate not only a shared space, but also some form of direct or indirect engagement, which explains why we have added this as a part of the definition.

The concept of a community of place differs significantly from the traditional destination model due to its bottom-up and community-centered approach. In contrast to for example second home destinations, which are often defined top-down based on market-oriented consumer needs, a community of place is collaboratively shaped by local actors actively participating in community co-creation and is not necessarily market oriented.

Particularly we suggest a better understanding of how residents and second home owners engage in co-creation of such communities of place. In the Danish context, Hansen and Olsen (2022) have argued that communities of place that involve both residents and second home owners, are mutually beneficial. They point to specific examples of destinations in Denmark and argue that such communities are better off than communities that use traditional tourism development to attract short-term visitors. They therefore argue that communities of place should be the future of tourism development for many destinations in Denmark and beyond. Their findings mirror some of the arguments made in the literature that have outlined the advantages of second home tourism (e.g., Tuulentie and Kietäväinen, 2019; Farstad 2013; Gallent 2014; Rye 2015), as they note that second home owners often are active in the local rural community and thus contribute to improving the social lives of the permanent inhabitants and to growth of the local economy.

At the same time Hansen and Olsen (2022) argue that traditional tourism often mostly leads to trouble for the permanent residents and change (or even destruction) of the natural and built environment. It may bring jobs to a community, but often these jobs are occupied by people from outside. It may bring income, but this is not worth it when compared to the negative consequences and, they argue, can just as well come from second home owners. As such, they take a very optimistic perspective on the potentials of communities of place as a way forward for tourism development.

This paper aims to critically explore these claims in relation to other researchers' claims that second home tourism is a breeding ground for potential tensions, because it happens in contested space (Hall, 2005; Müller et al., 2004). In doing so, we suggest distinguishing between different roles that second home owners may play in communities of place, and how each of these roles may both co-create and co-destroy value. Co-creation is more likely to happen when actors agree on certain aspects including for example what the place should be or how it should develop, and therefore work together from the same broad ideas and visions of the place. Co-destruction is more likely to occur when actors have incompatible or opposing understandings of place, meaning that the commonality of the community of place is undermined (Echeverri & Skålén, 2011).

Thus, our research expands Huijbens (2012) conception of second home owners as part of either a “creative leisure” or “homesick” group; nuances the implied separation between second home owners and entrepreneurs (Hall, 2005; Overvåg & Berg, 2011); and challenges the suggested place dependency of second home owners’ influence on an area (Overvåg & Berg, 2011), as it shows that some characteristics of second home owners and their relation to residents transcend geographical divides.

In terms of mobility and housing consumption, we focus mainly on modern and regular users (Halfacree, 2012; Xue et al., 2020), because they are more likely to engage with the community, and thus provide opportunities for co-creation of communities of place, but may also potentially do more harm to a community than traditional irregular users, simply because they are more present and actively involved in the community.

Methodology

Given the goal of exploring and understanding a phenomenon within its real-life context—specifically, how second home owners are involved in the co-creation of communities of place—a case-study method was deemed suitable (Yin, 2014). The research approach resembles qualitative longitudinal research (QLR) (Holland et al., 2006; Thomson & McLeod, 2015) and applied what O’Reilly (2012) has termed “iterative-inductive” analysis, which is the “practice of doing research, informed by a sophisticated inductivism, in which data collection, analysis and writing up are not discrete phases, but inextricably linked” (p. 180). QLR allows the researcher to capture abiding aspects over time thereby increasing the validity of the claims made. In tourism research, it has been highlighted as a fitting alternative to other qualitative data collection methods, which rely on data collected at one point in time and thus potentially suffer from retrospective framings of experiences (Crossley, 2020).

We focus on two cases, one rural, and one peri-urban, respectively Lildstrand and Odsherred in Denmark (see Figure 1). The cases were chosen because they represent extreme and compelling examples of how second home owners engage in tourism transitions, as both cases have a relatively high concentration of second homes with owners that are actively involved in the community. Extreme cases can “reveal more information because they activate more basic mechanisms in the situation studied” (Flyvbjerg, 2006, p. 229). The aim of the study was to investigate situations where second home owners played a clear role in the creation of tourism. Hence, we chose to focus on only two extreme cases and to zoom in on the people actively involved in tourism creation in these areas to better analyse the phenomenon. This methodological choice limits generalizability but allows us to provide more detailed and careful analysis of a phenomenon that, due to its complexity and therefore need for deep integration to generate understandings, is otherwise not easy to explore.

In accordance with the QLR approach, data was collected over seven years between 2016 and 2022. It combines participant *observation* at seminars co-organised by the researchers and at meetings of local associations (n=10); passive observation during field visits (n>60); formal and informal

interviews during field visits (n>20); and systematic collection of *documentary material* that demonstrates changes in strategies and policies and tourism development efforts over time, also beyond the seven-year period. Whereas some data sources mainly provided information on the strategic and business side of things, the seminars, field visits and interview data also allowed for specific insights on the second home owners and permanent residents' perspectives.

Examples include the seminars in Lildstrand, which involved around 30 permanent residents (out of a total of around 50) in meetings with a similar number of second home owners, and observations at meetings of the association 'Rørvig Township and Rural Area' in Odsherred, where half of the 600 members are permanent residents, who meet with second home owners through this association (Rørvig has 1,050 inhabitants). In both cases these residents represent a wide variety of people with different socio-demographic backgrounds, types of employment, political affiliations etc.

We recognize that while we do have relevant insights into the perspectives of a wide variety of residents, we do not include the perspectives of those residents that do not directly or indirectly involve themselves in tourism development efforts in their community. This can be considered as a limitation of the study; however, it should also be recognized that co-creation processes can rarely include all actors in a given situation and favors those more inclined to participate in the process, no matter their intentions. In other words, it can be expected that those not involved in a process exerts less influence over its outcome, no matter if this is co-creation or co-destruction. A relevant point here is that not all actors are in the same position to participate. More economically or socially privileged people may for example have better opportunities to do so. However, this fact does not change our conclusions about how value is co-created or co-destroyed in communities of place. Therefore, we regard this more as a characteristic of social dynamics in communities than something specific to this research.

[Figure 1: Case locations in Denmark]

The three types of data allowed for data triangulation, which according to Denzin (2017) heightens validity and reliability of the findings, because weaknesses in parts of the data can be compensated by strengths in other data. Thus, the different data sources supplemented one another, broadening the insights on each case, while also supporting one another, thereby bolstering the validity of the findings. A seven-year period was deemed adequate for capturing key challenges, developments and potentials, so as also to ensure that they are not only fleeting but persist over time, although we recognise that "Longitudinal qualitative data are intimidating in that there is no closure of analysis and the next round of data can challenge interpretations" (Thomson & Holland, 2003 p. 237). Together, the data represents perspectives from tourism providers, municipalities, permanent residents, second home owners and destination management/marketing organisations (DMOs) on second home owners and their (changing) roles for the co-creation of communities of place. These perspectives give us knowledge of the two places in their historical and systemic context. The process of documenting data from the cases over time and in their respective contexts via the data

collection methods mentioned can be considered as the ‘writing down’ aspect of the data analysis (O’reilly, 2012).

The ‘writing up’ aspect of the data collection began after the data collection had concluded and was more systematic. Based on the accumulated data, our analysis inductively sought answers to the research question presented in the introduction. Following a direct coding for themes as described by Bailey (2017) we first organized the data into a set of themes and sub-themes (See table 1). Next, we sought a better understanding of the different commitments of stakeholders to the place and their motivation to create coalitions between second home owners and permanent residents. We went through the data material and extracted information as needed to answer the research question. As presented in the findings section, we conceptualise this as three roles with inherent value co-creation and co-destruction potentials in terms the creation of communities of place.

It is important to acknowledge the substantial volume of data generated by the QLR approach, which presents a challenge in terms of synthesis and presentation in a journal format (Crossley, 2020). To address this challenge while maintaining a comprehensive perspective and avoiding bias toward interview data, we have adopted a specific format. Similar to other longitudinal studies published in SJHTR (e.g. Lindström, 2020), we summarize and refer to our observations gathered throughout the data collection process, rather than relying solely on select interview quotes. This approach allows us to encompass a broader range of content while maintaining a strong analytical focus. While we recognize that this approach may potentially obscure some nuances and reduce transparency to some extent, we have taken care to ensure that our analysis provides sufficient detail to hopefully mitigate any major concerns.

Findings

The initial thematic analysis provided a series of themes and sub-themes relevant to the research question. In combination, these led to the conceptualisation of three second home owner roles, whose contribution to value co-creation and co-destruction in the community of place was then analysed. This process is summarised in table 1.

The three roles are: 1) Second home owners as custodians, 2) Second home owners as holiday consumers and 3) Second home owners as innovators. The presentation of the findings is structured around these roles, although each of them involve aspects from the themes and sub-themes mentioned in Table 1. For each role we state the co-creative and co-destructive potentials between second home owners and residents.

Table 1: Thematic and synthesised analysis overview

Thematic analysis	Synthesised analysis		
Theme - Sub-themes	Second home owner roles	Value...	
Tourism development broadly - Challenges to tourism development - Second homes are physically changing - Effect on/off seasonality - Effect location (rural vs. peri-urban)	Custodians	Co-creation	
Second home owners - Effect of socio-demographics - Attachment to second home - Unwillingness to rent - Place attachment/protection vs. hedonism - Creating product/service demand - Role in local relations (power relations) - Encouraging involvement - Word of mouth			
Community - The role of associations - The role of second home owners in local identity formation - Focus on development vs. preservation - Ecological impacts - Perceptions of different types of second home owners - Value creation vs. perceived value creation - Permanent residents' mutual relations (collaboration-conflict)			Consumers
Second home owner contributions to the community - Income and buying power - No voting power - Competencies, resources, ideas - Political clout - Networks - Establishment of or create a basis for business - Make the area more attractive - Raising house prices			Innovators
Second home owner conflicts with the community - Dominate decision-making informally - Focus on own rather than community interests - Hinder development - High resource use - Hedonistic behavior - Raising house prices - Create a basis for business irrelevant to community			

Second Home Owners as Custodians

Custodians are caretakers of values, traditions, and institutionalized practices (Dacin et al., 2011, 2019; Fuglsang, 2024; Scares, 1997). They interact with locals with a sense of community, endorsing behaviours that seem meaningful and appropriate to local actors.

In the two areas in question, custodians’ holiday homes are in fact ‘second homes’ affiliated with personal belongings and memories, and there is no habit of renting out the homes to tourists. Previously, the owners had traditional consumption patterns, using the houses mainly during summer. In recent years, however, they have started to resemble modern regular users (Halfacree, 2012; Xue et al., 2020) with homes being better insulated and furnished with modern equipment. Thus, they may well and often do function as year-round houses. In both our cases, it is evident that some second home owners see themselves as emotionally attached to the place and engage in positive discourse about the place and community, to family, friends and acquaintances based on

the values, traditions, developments and practices of the place. As such, these second home owners become custodians for nature experiences, fishing, gastro experiences, the history of the place, and love of place. The destination manager in Odsherred, explains that the majority of the second home owners have no intention of renting them out and that in recognition of this, the municipality is changing its tourism strategy from trying to attract foreign and domestic tourists via short-term second home rentals to involving the second home owners in the development of the local community – in other words developing a community of place that encompass both residents and second home owners.

Co-creative Consequences:

Custodians care for local values and traditions and co-develop a sense of community. They act as co-creators of the value of the place and the local community, for example they participate in local community life and help preserve and promote the qualities of nature and local culture assets. An example of such action, in both our cases, is that several associations have been set up in which both permanent residents and second home owners are represented. The aim of these associations is to preserve the existing natural and cultural heritage, while enhancing the environment in ways that works for both residents and second home owners.

One example is “Rørvig Township and Rural Area” in Odsherred, an association that works to protect the natural landscape and to prevent industrial tourist constructions (e.g. large hotels, amusement parks etc.) in the area. Another example, in Lildstrand, is a local community development movement, centred around a local association (“Hawboerne”), where second home owners and permanent residents have worked together over several years to develop a strategic development plan and actions to improve the local environment.

Custodians use local craftsmen and shops, which they value. In doing so, they provide a value co-creation context for local businesses and help build local identity. In such cases, custodians and residents may enter a mutual process to preserve shared values, traditions, and institutionalized practices of the place. In Lildstrand, the custodians and the more conservative residents share the same values of preserving the nature and the old fishing industry (keeping at least some fishing boats and not letting large tourism facilities emerge). A wish to preserve nature and heritage buildings is also common among some (but far from all) second home owners and residents in Odsherred.

Co-destructive Consequences

Based on their love of the place as it is, including its natural and cultural resources, custodians may be more conservative than permanent residents, who may be more income, market- and employment driven in their approach to the place. This tension has also been highlighted in previous research (Müller et al., 2004; Overvåg & Berg, 2011). As such, custodians may work against the interest of the local residents, if their interests would require the place to change in significant ways, as also suggested by a number of previous studies (e.g. Hall et al., 2003; Müller et al., 2004).

An example of this is found in Odsherred, where a company wanted to expand its local production facility. Residents were overwhelmingly in favour, as it could provide employment opportunities and draw in other businesses. However, the second home owners were working against this. They ran media and social media campaigns, objected to local plans, and won a ruling from an appeals board that the plans were illegal. At a later stage, however, the local plan was approved anyway, but the factory said it had no concrete plans to expand. This has created uncertainty about the site and subsequently to an erosion of the community of place. This example showcases a potential challenge in terms of co-creation of communities of place between second home custodians and residents, because they do not share the same ideas about what the place is or should be. Custodians may value the status quo or inherent recreational values of keeping the place as is, keeping other people away from it etc., while residents may value development and the types of value that may result from this, such as income, job creation and more people in the area.

Second Home Owners as Holiday Consumers

Holiday consumers undertake a somewhat more hedonistic behaviour than custodians, as they aim to use second homes for pleasure and fun, being less embedded in everyday obligations allowing for a more pleasurable approach to living, less worried about everyday problems, and opportunistically choosing the most convenient options (cf. Fuglsang, 2024).

While many second home owners are passionate about local life and culture, they also represent a more casual and consuming lifestyle than the residents. They are less oriented towards everyday constraints and community life, but more towards their own family, other second home owners and local leisure activities, as such they are more in line with Huijbens's (2012) idea of the "homesick" second home users. They provide the basis for gastronomy, street food and nature walks, and benefit cultural institutions and events, including museums, theatres, and music festivals, especially in the high season. This includes the owners of the second homes themselves as well as family members and friends who borrow the house. They want above all to be happy and have a good holiday. These second home owners consequently play a more alienated role in relation to the local environment and mutual empathy is not always strong.

In Odsherred, second home owners contribute significantly to the local economy. Tourism accounts for 17% of the value added and 16% of employment in Odsherred municipality (Visit Denmark, 2021), and by far the majority of these tourists are second home owners. Second home owners have also provided the basis for various shops, local food production, restaurants, cultural institutions and events, recreational harbour facilities and other activities that benefit both permanent residents and second home owners have been established. Many of these facilities and activities close in the winter when fewer of the second home owners are present. As holiday consumers, second home owners can help small local shops and supermarkets survive. In one village in Odsherred, the only supermarket was about to close because the owner chain could not find a new manager. Here, the presence and pressure from second home owners as an important customer group was able to

influence the decision, as the chain was persuaded to wait and see if there were opportunities to continue.

Co-creative Consequences

While opportunities for co-creation are somewhat limited, holiday consuming second home owners provide a consumer market for local businesses. Their demand drives up the quantity of services such as restaurants, street food, amusement, shopping, or special attractions. In this way they become passively engaged in co-creating local business models. As mentioned, following broader trends (Xue et al., 2020), many second home owners in Odsherred have transitioned from a more traditional to a more modern second home consumption pattern, allowing them to use their second home more in the winter. This has led to more shops being open all year. Thus, in cases where the interests of residents and holiday consuming second home owners align, they may leverage their numbers, network, or (social) capital to support establishing or prevent the closure of shops and other services or facilities. While less engaged, second home consumers are also potentially less intruding into local decision-making processes, which may be perceived as a positive for some residents, who prefer that permanent residents steer the development of the place.

Co-destructive Consequences

Like other second home users, holiday consumers have a high resource use in terms of waste, sewage etc (Demiroglu et al., 2023; Xue et al., 2020). Additionally, they may create a larger strain on the place in terms of noise and claim on public space, because of their less connected, more hedonistic approach to the place. Perceived value can be understood as the relationship between what you 'get' and what you 'give' (Itani et al., 2019). Because holiday consumer second home owners are less involved with the local community and thus ostensibly gives less to the community, residents may perceive that they are not getting what they should from this group of second home owners. Thus, there can be a perceived imbalance between the contributions this group has to the place and the strain that they inflict on it, leading to value co-destruction in the eyes of some local residents, who are attached to their home and may come to dislike more commercial touristic behaviour.

However, both in Odsherred and Lildstrand second home owners pay property taxes to the municipality, and they pay for waste disposal, water supply and other services, thus severe negative consequences were not found in the data. The average price of homes in Odsherred has risen by much more than the country average, which could be explained by increased attractiveness of and activity in second homes in the area. However, while Farstad (2013) argued this may have negative consequences in terms of relocation to the area, it can also be argued that this has contributed to the awareness and attractiveness of the area, which could improve permanent relocation, supporting Marjavaara's (2007) argument of a so-called displacement myth in second home tourism research.

Second Home Owners as Innovators

Somewhat overlapping with Huijben's (2012) "creative leisure" category, innovators may contribute to develop the community by setting up and implementing plans for the local area through collaboration and coalitions with locals (Bærenholdt et al., 2021).

Innovators often have competencies or resources such as education, political clout or networks, business acumen, knowledge of law or a particular craft. They may for example activate these resources and competencies in the local community by participating in local associations, establishing new businesses, contributing ideas to local plans, and by taking part in initiatives aimed at developing and transforming the place. In doing so, they become a force for co-creation of value and co-innovation of new activities and services. In Lildstrand, the second home owners and residents engaged in a long-term collaboration to develop the place, a kind of living lab facilitated by themselves partly with outside assistance. Together residents and second home owners co-created and ensured funding for a lunch house for tourists, a visitor-friendly coastal shelter, as well as a creativity house, improvements to a walking route, cycling routes, bridle paths and orienteering courses among other things. All of which contributed to the transformation of the place from a stagnating fishing community to a moderate tourism site and an interesting place to live for residents, newcomers and second home owners alike.

Co-creative Consequences

Innovators contribute to the place by bringing resources and competences, as they engage in various activities that may create or contribute to community development. They may do this on their own or as a part of co-creation processes with residents, for example initiated through engagement in local associations etc. As such, they may help to drive up the value of the place for residents as well as second home owners and visitors, by actively participating in and contributing to community development. In Odsherred, second home owners have been entrepreneurs and have started several local businesses, especially in the experience industries (for example street food, shops, restaurants, and festivals). In Lildstrand two second home owners, a couple, both town planning architects, have developed a Master Plan for development of the village, which has been used for various things including for funding applications and in negotiations with the municipality, nature park organisations and other authorities.

Co-destructive Consequences

Local communities may not be able to match the unique resources or competences that second home innovators bring to a place. This can give second home innovators more power over decision making processes in the local community than residents think is warranted. As such, innovators may dominate development processes in local communities, resulting in a detachment from residents, who act on a parallel development path. In such instances, innovators may objectively create certain kinds of value at a destination, but the process is not recognised, nor influenced by residents, resulting in perceived value co-destruction for residents, as they feel detached from the development of their own community. Some of the businesses in Odsherred that have been established by second home owners such as restaurants (including two with Michelin stars) and

lifestyle shops are perceived to cater to the “second home owner class”. Some locals are proud of this development, few of them frequent them, and for some, especially the working class, this is somewhat alienating.

Discussion

Figure 2 summarises the findings as it illustrates that second home owners may be involved in co-creating a community of place in different ways, and that their role can be both as value co-creators and as value co-destroyers.

[Figure 2: The roles in and co-creative and co-destructive value contributions of second home owners to communities of place]

As argued, second home owners can take on at least three different roles. If there is compatibility between these roles and the residents’ ideas and visions of place, their activities can lead to value co-creation in a community of place. As visualised, they may for example be co-engaged in compatible activities of (re-)valuing the place (the role of custodians), when promoting common discourses and sense-making activities; be co-involved in developing various new consumer practices that spur local business models by means of their purchasing power and demand for products and services (the role of consumers); and they can co-transform the meaning and significance of the place by initiating developments or activities implicating co-creation of value between them (the role of innovators).

Contrastingly, if the intentions and actions are incongruent, their activities can entail experiences of co-destructed commonality between second home users and permanent residents. As visualised, they may for example co-destroy value by warding off development, hindering new business models and job/income generation (the role of custodians); through frivolous and hedonic (ab)use of the place, as sensed by residents (the role of consumers); and through detachment of residents from decision making processes that concern their own community (the role of innovators).

Importantly, these roles are not mutually exclusive, and many second home owners represent an overlap of these. For some, their engagement may simultaneously have both positive and negative value outcomes, and value contribution may thus be ambivalent or paradoxical. As such, the involvement of second home owners in the co-creation of community of place creates tourism practices that can be contradictory and multi-faceted.

Overall, the findings show that local communities can benefit from value creation activities of second home owners, as argued by Broegaard et al. (2019) and Hansen and Olsen (2022). Second home owners bring competences, enthusiasm and innovation to local communities, which is helpful for developing tourism and thus jobs and economic prosperity in rural communities at risk of stagnating. Value co-creation activities can also create a richer social and cultural life for the permanent residents and thereby indirectly help to attract new permanent residents who may find such a community of place interesting to live in.

Communities that may benefit from co-creation beyond economic benefits such as increasing home prices are those where both second home owners and residents are open to co-creation and where there are congruent ideas and visions for the place. This often requires a catalyst event to create a sense of urgency such as initiation and facilitation of external actors, the threat of closure of local shops and facilities, or a joint effort spurred by a specific ambition to make bigger or smaller changes. For custodians this may also be joint efforts to keep the place and the community as it is (non-innovation) and to keep out short-term tourists, if both parties wish to do so.

However, attempts at value creation between second home owners and permanent residents can also lead to value co-destruction through all three roles that second home owners may play. Whereas the consumer role is more neutral and therefore less influential in terms of both value co-creation and value co-destruction, custodians and innovators have a strong capacity for both. For these roles specifically, value co-destruction may stem from imbalances created by the role of second home owners in terms of dominating the community, restricting community membership or imbalanced socio-economic development. This may lead to unconstructive antagonisms between second home owners and residents. Furthermore, in the absence of associations such as Hawboerne in Lildstrand and the various associations in Odsherred that bring together residents and second home owners, it can be difficult to articulate preferences in a constructive way and to resolve conflicting or incongruent views and practices between the parties.

Theoretical implications

Research has shown how translocation residents, such as second home owners, participate in co-creation activities with permanent residents (Larsen et al. 2019, Broegaard et al. 2019).

This paper has contributed to our understanding of communities of place and provided insights on some of the intricacies of how these are co-created by residents and second home owners. As such, this paper has expanded Huijbens (2012) conception of second home owners as either part of a “creative leisure” or “homesick” group, by demonstrating the dynamic roles that second home owners may play in the value co-creation or co-destruction relative to a community of place.

Existing studies have focused on second home owners’ attitudes towards the local community and permanent residents (e.g Halfacree, 2012; Rye, 2011). These are conceived as regular users (Halfacree, 2012), that engage with the community because they are more present and actively involved in the community in contrast to irregular users. By focusing on actions instead of attitudes, our research highlights how second home owners and permanent residents may work together to co-create the development of the local community. We have shown how second home owners can act as custodians, holiday consumers and innovators. Crucial to our analysis was that, in each of these roles, second home owners can play both a co-creative and co-destructive role in the co-creation process (sometimes simultaneously), and therefore it is not possible to say that “regular users” or a “creative leisure” group is, per definition, more useful for a community than “irregular users” or the “homesick”.

Instead, we argue, that second home owners should be considered as dynamic contributors to a community of place who may take on different roles in value co-creation, with potentially both co-creative and co-destructive outcomes. A fruitful relationship requires mutual trust and openness to the co-creation process on both parties, as well as a certain level of congruence in terms of vision for the place, and approaches to its development. However, in many cases this can be difficult to establish. In our cases we have seen how co-creation was triggered by certain catalytic events, and how local associations played a role in bringing people together to avoid unconstructive antagonisms between them, as such we find that activities and structures are needed that can resolve the potential conflicts and incongruences of the parties.

Finally, previous research has suggested that the influences of second home owners on a place is highly place dependent and for example differ between rural and peri-urban areas (Overvåg & Berg, 2011). Our theoretical contribution transcends these differences in place and context, as we show how the roles of second home owners and their contribution to the co-creation and/or co-destruction of value relative to communities of place are similar across at least the two geographies and contexts that we have focused on.

All in all, our contribution to extant research on second home owners are first, to position them as part of a community of place, second, to investigate their roles as such and categorise their engagement into three overlapping roles, which transcend geographical and contextual differences, and third, to show the ambiguous dynamics of the involvement of second home owners in co-creating communities of place.

Practical Implications

Local communities can take advantage of the capacity and capital of second home owners to develop their communities if they consider these as contributors to a shared community of place rather than visitors to their community. Ideally, this can create a good life for both permanent residents and second home owners, and good experiences for short-term tourists. Municipalities, DMOs and other planning and policy makers should be aware of these potentials for co-creation of a community of place, instead of or in addition to attraction of tourist from outside the destination. Co-creating a community of place can be supported, for example, by inviting residents and second home owners to co-operative activities such as development seminars and planning activities and by taking planning activities of local parties seriously. However, the relevant policy actors should be aware of the risk of the process ending in co-destruction. This requires attention to the local social processes and the maintenance and expansion of local associations so that they bear potential to bring people together and to remedy incongruent practices and expectations.

Limitations and Future Research

There are several limitations to this study. Firstly, we have outlined, but not explored in depth, how antagonistic co-creating actors can be reconciled, how new relationships and trust can be built as a basis for co-creating communities of place, and what role local associations can play in resolving conflicts over time. Future research could well explore in detail the characteristics of associations as

mechanisms for resolving potential conflicts arising from co-creation between second home owners and residents. Secondly, we have only examined two cases in this paper, so future research can explore what aspects of these cases can be generalised to other cases to make the model more robust, including a better understanding of the contextual factors for co-creation of communities of place. Third, our study has concentrated on delineating the distinct roles and characteristics of second home owners as active contributors to the creation of communities of place. While our focus has been on their involvement, it is presumptive to think that other stakeholders, such as permanent residents, exhibit uniformity in their roles within these processes. Future research could adopt a similar approach, delving into the diverse roles played by other stakeholder groups, including residents, thereby providing a more comprehensive understanding of the concept. Finally, there are many other questions to be explored with regard to communities of place, including whether or to what extent co-creation activities contribute to particular communities, under what conditions and for whom.

6. REFERENCES

- Alonsopérez, M. J., Brida, J. G., & Rojas, M. L. (2022). Second homes: A bibliometric analysis and systematic literature review. *Journal of Tourism, Heritage & Services Marketing*.
<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6581499>
- Back, A., & Marjavaara, R. (2017). Mapping an invisible population: The uneven geography of second-home tourism. *Tourism Geographies*, 19(4), 595–611.
- Bærenholdt, J. O., Fuglsang, L., & Sundbo, J. (2021). A coalition for ‘small tourism’ in a marginal place: Configuring a geo-social position. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 87, 169–180.
- Bailey, C. R. (2017). *A Guide to Qualitative Field Research* (3rd edition). SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Broegaard, R. B., Larsen, K. T., & Larsen, L. H. (2019). Translocal communities and their implications for place branding. In C. Cassinger, A. Lucarelli, & S. Gyimóthy (Eds.), *The Nordic Wave in Place Branding* (pp. 109–123). Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Crossley, É. (2020). Temporality and biography in tourism: A qualitative longitudinal approach. *Journal of Qualitative Research in Tourism*, 1(1), 93–111.
<https://doi.org/10.4337/jqrt.2020.01.05>
- Dacin, M. T., Dacin, P. A., & Kent, D. (2019). Tradition in organizations: A custodianship framework. *Academy of Management Annals*, 13(1), 342–373.
- Dacin, M. T., Dacin, P. A., & Tracey, P. (2011). Social Entrepreneurship: A Critique and Future Directions. *Organization Science*, 22, 1203–1213. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1100.0620>
- Demiroglu, O. C., Müller, D. K., Back, A., & Lundmark, L. (2023). Impacts of climate change on Swedish second home tourism. In B. A. Adie & C. M. Hall (Eds.), *Second Homes and Climate Change*. Routledge.
- Denzin, N. K. (2017). *The research act: A theoretical introduction to sociological methods*. Transaction publishers.

<https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=UjcpxFE0T4cC&oi=fnd&pg=PA1&dq=the+research+act&ots=TsSy470-Fj&sig=frYkpvjh82YtKBMoVRzy7LIRTAM>

Echeverri, P., & Skálén, P. (2011). Co-creation and co-destruction: A practice-theory based study of interactive value formation. *Marketing Theory*, 11(3), 351–373.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1470593111408181>

Farstad, M. (2013). Local residents' valuation of second home owners' presence in a sparsely inhabited area. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 13(4), 317–331.

Flognfeldt, T. (2002). Second-Home Ownership: A Sustainable Semi-Migration. In C. M. Hall & A. M. Williams (Eds.), *Tourism and Migration* (Vol. 65, pp. 187–203). Springer Netherlands. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-3554-4_10

Flyvbjerg, B. (2006). Five Misunderstandings About Case-Study Research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 12(2), 219–245. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800405284363>

Frankenberg, R. (1994). *Communities in Britain: Social Life in Town and Country* (New edition). Gregg Revivals.

Fuglsang, L. (2024). Comeback tourism: A critical research approach. In J. R. Bryson, L. Andres, A. Ersoy, & L. Reardon (Eds.), *Pandemic Recovery?* Cheltenham: Edward Elgar. https://scholar.google.com/citations?view_op=view_citation&hl=en&user=eLdXelAAAAAJ&sortby=pubdate&citation_for_view=eLdXelAAAAAJ:QsaTk4IG4EwC

Gallent, N. (2014). The social value of second homes in rural communities. *Housing, Theory and Society*, 31(2), 174–191.

Halfacree, K. (2012). Heterolocal Identities? Counter-Urbanisation, Second Homes, and Rural Consumption in the Era of Mobilities. *Population, Space and Place*, 18(2), 209–224. <https://doi.org/10.1002/psp.665>

- Hall, C. M., & Müller, D. K. (2004). *Tourism, Mobility, and Second Homes: Between Elite Landscape and Common Ground*. Channel View Publications.
- Hall, D., Mitchell, M., & Roberts, L. (2003). Tourism and the countryside: Dynamic relationships. In D. Hall, L. Roberts, & M. Mitchell (Eds.), *New directions in rural tourism* (pp. 3–15). Ashgate. <https://www.cabdirect.org/cabdirect/abstract/20043025075>
- Hall, M. (2005). *Tourism: Rethinking the social science of mobility*. Pearson Education.
- Hansen, E., & Olsen, H. J. (2022). *Stedsfællesskaber. Nøglen til vækst og stolthed i Kystdanmark [Place commonalities. The key to growth and pride in Coastal Denmark]*. Eskild Hansen Publishing.
- Holland, J., Thomson, R., & Henderson, S. (2006). *Qualitative longitudinal research: A discussion paper*. London South Bank University London.
- Huijbens, E. H. (2012). Sustaining a village's social fabric? *Sociologia Ruralis*, 52(3), 332–352.
- Itani, O. S., Kassar, A.-N., & Loureiro, S. M. C. (2019). Value get, value give: The relationships among perceived value, relationship quality, customer engagement, and value consciousness. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 80, 78–90. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2019.01.014>
- Kaltenborn, B. P., Andersen, O., Nellemann, C., Bjerke, T., & Thrane, C. (2008). Resident attitudes towards mountain second-home tourism development in Norway: The effects of environmental attitudes. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 16(6), 664–680. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.2167/jost792.0>
- Larsen, K. T., Broegaard, R. B., & Larsen, L. H. (2019). Translokalt engagement i landdistrikterne: Den mobile elites nye legeplads? *Dansk Sociologi*, 30(4), 59–79.

- Leivestad, H. H. (2020). *Caravans: Lives on wheels in contemporary Europe*. Routledge.
<https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/mono/10.4324/9781003084877/caravans-hege-h%C3%B8yer-leivestad>
- Lindström, K. N. (2020). Ambivalence in the evolution of a community-based tourism sharing concept: A public governance approach. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 20(3), 302–315. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15022250.2020.1786455>
- Marjavaara, R. (2007). The Displacement Myth: Second Home Tourism in the Stockholm Archipelago. *Tourism Geographies*, 9(3), 296–317.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14616680701422848>
- Müller, D. K. (2011). Second homes in rural areas: Reflections on a troubled history. *Norsk Geografisk Tidsskrift-Norwegian Journal of Geography*, 65(3), 137–143.
- Müller, D. K., Hall, C. M., & Keen, D. (2004). Second Home Tourism Impact, Planning and Management. In C. M. Hall & D. K. Müller (Eds.), *Tourism, Mobility and Second Homes* (pp. 15–32). Channel View Publications. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781873150825-004>
- Norris, M., & Winston, N. (2010). Second-Home Owners: Escaping, Investing or Retiring? *Tourism Geographies*, 12(4), 546–567. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616688.2010.516401>
- O’reilly, K. (2012). *Ethnographic methods*. Routledge.
- Overvåg, K., & Berg, N. G. (2011). Second Homes, Rurality and Contested Space in Eastern Norway. *Tourism Geographies*, 13(3), 417–442.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14616688.2011.570778>
- Plé, L., & Chumpitaz Cáceres, R. (2010). Not always co-creation: Introducing interactional co-destruction of value in service-dominant logic. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 24(6), 430–437.

- Reeh, H. (2017). Summerhouse dialogues between Mobilier and Immobilier. *Home Cultures*, 14(1), 51–72.
- Rinne, J., Paloniemi, R., Tuulentie, S., & Kietäväinen, A. (2015). Participation of second-home users in local planning and decision-making – a study of three cottage-rich locations in Finland. *Journal of Policy Research in Tourism, Leisure and Events*, 7(1), 98–114.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/19407963.2014.909818>
- Rye, J. F. (2011). Conflicts and contestations. Rural populations' perspectives on the second homes phenomenon. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 27(3), 263–274.
- Rye, J. F. (2015). Moving to the countryside? The case of second home users in Norway. *Norsk Geografisk Tidsskrift-Norwegian Journal of Geography*, 69(3), 166–177.
- Scares, J. A. (1997). A reformulation of the concept of tradition. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, 17(6), 6–21.
- Thomson, R., & Holland, J. (2003). Hindsight, foresight and insight: The challenges of longitudinal qualitative research. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 6(3), 233–244.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1364557032000091833>
- Thomson, R., & McLeod, J. (2015). New frontiers in qualitative longitudinal research: An agenda for research. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 18(3), 243–250.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13645579.2015.1017900>
- Tönnies, F. (1887). Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft. In F. Tönnies (Ed.), *Studien zu Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft* (pp. 231–255). VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-531-94174-5_13
- Tress, G. (2002). Development of second-home tourism in Denmark. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 2(2), 109–122.

- Tuulentie, S. (2007). Settled Tourists: Second Homes as a Part of Tourist Life Stories. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 7(3), 281–300.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/15022250701300249>
- Tuulentie, S., & Kietäväinen, A. (2020). New rural community? Narratives from second home owners about everyday life in a tourist region in Finnish Lapland. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 60(2), 357–374.
- Visit Denmark. (2021). *Turismens økonomiske betydning i Odsherred Kommune [The economic importance of tourism in Odsherred municipality 2019]*. Visit Denmark.
- Volo, S. (2011). Comity or conflict? A qualitative study on host–guest relationship in second home tourism. *Tourism Analysis*, 16(4), 443–460.
- Xue, J., Næss, P., Stefansdottir, H., Steffansen, R., & Richardson, T. (2020). The hidden side of Norwegian cabin fairytale: Climate implications of multi-dwelling lifestyle. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 20(5), 459–484.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/15022250.2020.1787862>
- Yin, R. K. (2014). *Case study research: Design and methods* (5. edition.). Sage.