# A TYPOLOGY OF AUSTRALIAN TOURISM BASED CONDOMINIUMS

Kelly Cassidy
Service Industry Research Centre, School of Tourism, Leisure and Sport
Management
Griffith University, Gold Coast Campus, PMB 50 GCMC,QLD 9726, Australia
K.cassidy@griffith.edu.au

and

Chris Guilding
Service Industry Research Centre, School of Tourism, Leisure and Sport
Management
Griffith University, Gold Coast Campus, PMB 50 GCMC,QLD 9726, Australia
c.guilding@griffith.edu.au

### A TYPOLOGY OF AUSTRALIAN TOURISM BASED CONDOMINIUMS

#### **Structured Abstract**

**Purpose:** To develop a typology of the organisational forms comprising the Australian condominium tourism accommodation sector.

**Methodology/Approach:** Thirty four exploratory interviews were conducted with interviewees representing a cross-section of interests in condominium tourism accommodation operations.

**Findings:** An original hierarchical typology is developed. The structuring criteria employed for the hierarchy include: whether a condominium complex is in a hotel or apartment complex, whether it is branded and whether the condominiums are serviced.

**Implications:** The findings reported will greatly advance the capacity to provide a meaningful commentary on the nature of condominium tourism accommodation complexes and to understand key issues associated with different forms of condominium tourism accommodation services provided.

**Limitations:** The study suffers from the normal limitations associated with the subjective interpretation of qualitative data. In addition, the fast evolving nature of the condominium tourism accommodation sector signify that the typology advanced should be viewed as somewhat time specific.

**Originality:** Despite the huge growth in condominium based tourism accommodation worldwide, there has been a scarcity of research directed to the phenomenon. The study can thus be seen to be highly original.

**Keywords:** strata-title accommodation, management, condominiums.

#### A TYPOLOGY OF AUSTRALIAN TOURISM BASED CONDOMINIUMS

#### 1.0 Introduction

In Australia, condominiums are referred to as "strata titled units". In order to be sensitive to local legal terminology, in this paper the term "strata title" will be used in the same way that the term "condominium title" would be used in the USA. Strata titled real estate represents a 'subdivision of land and / or buildings into units, which can be owned separately, and common property, which is owned communally.' (Ball, 1984). In Australia (consistent with the USA), strata titled schemes fall within the jurisdiction of state based legislation such as Queensland's Body Corporation and Community Management Act 1997 (Ardill et al, 2004).

It was estimated that in March 2005 serviced apartments represented 21% of Australia's tourism accommodation room stock (Jones Lang LaSalle Hotels, 2005). Most Australian serviced apartments are strata titled. The serviced apartment sector's growth in recent years has resulted in an estimate that it will represent 63% of Australian new room stock in the short term (Jones Lang LaSalle Hotels, 2005). When we consider these observations in the context of the highly idiosyncratic management issues arising in the strata titled tourism accommodation (STTA) sector (Guilding, Warnken, Ardill, and Fredline 2005), the minimal degree to which research has been directed towards this sector is surprising (Pizam, 2006). This is particularly the case when it is recognised that accommodation is a fundamental component of the tourism product (Goss-Turner, 1996; Sharpley, 2000), the biggest sub-element of the tourism industry (Cooper et al., 1998) and STTA constitutes an increasingly common (in some areas dominant), mode of tourist accommodation ownership (National Tourism Investment Strategy Consultative Group, 2006; Jones Lang LaSalle Hotels, 2005; Warnken, Guilding and Cassidy, 2008).

To provide an important building block for subsequent STTA research and also to facilitate greater understanding of the STTA sector, the objective of this study is to develop a typology of the organisational forms comprising the Australian STTA sector. The remainder of the paper is structured as follows. The next section provides an overview of the most pertinent literature. Following this, details regarding the research method used to collect the data that has informed the typology's development are outlined. The typology is then developed and a commentary on its relative merits provided. The paper concludes with an outline of the limitations of the study together with some suggestions for further avenues of STTA research enquiry.

### 2.0 Literature review

It has already been noted that the literature relating to the STTA sector is minimal. In one of the first STTA studies, Warnken et al (2003) comment on Australia's rapidly growing STTA sector and discuss the tourism planning challenges arising from STTA growth, due to the number of stakeholders involved in STTA properties relative to the number of stakeholders involved in the hotel management sector. Warnken et al (2003) note that the multiplicity of these stakeholders constitutes a problem if seeking to achieve destination rejuvenation in an area dominated by

STTA complexes. Warnken et al (2003) also discuss specific tourism destination challenges associated with STTA property aging. Some of these themes are further developed in Cassidy and Guilding (forthcoming) who provide a detailed review of the stakeholders involved in STTA and raise a concern over the understated tourism orientation apparent amongst most STTA stakeholders.

Both of these studies can be sent to adopt a macro tourism management perspective on STTA. Guilding, Warnken, Ardill and Fredline (2005) represents a study that is more managerially focused at the individual STTA property level. This study draws on agency theory to identify distinct contracting challenges arising in STTA properties managed by a resident manager. The paper also explores the challenges arising as a result of the conflicting interests of resident and investor owners in STTA properties. Cassidy and Guilding (2007) also adopt a property level perspective by documenting room pricing practices adopted by resident managers in South East Queensland STTA properties. They conclude that pricing practices tend to be unsophisticated and largely intuitive. They also note a tendency for managers in complexes located close to the beach to exhibit more of a "price making" than a "price taking" philosophy.

Most recently, Warnken, Guilding and Cassidy (2008) outline the nature of the new STTA paradigm, provide an analysis of building and management characteristics in STTA properties of varying sizes, comment on STTA complex growth internationally and identify and discuss factors accounting for this growth. Warnken et al (2008) note the breadth of distinct forms that multiple ownership of tourism accommodation can assume. In addition to high-rise apartment complexes, multiple tourism accommodation ownership can be found in branded hotels, golf resort communities and cruise ships (Weaver, 2005). While timeshare ownership may appear to resemble STTA, Warnken et al (2008) highlight five points of differentiation between the two forms of tourism accommodation. At a fundamental level of distinction, unlike the case with STTA, timeshare investors rarely acquire a property title (Woods, 2001). Also, unlike the STTA unit owner, a timeshare property owner has right of access to their unit for very limited time periods within a year.

Two studies pertaining to Australian strata title issues have a legal orientation. Ardill, Everton-Moore, Fredline, Guilding and Warnken (2004) provide a commentary on the Queensland community titles legislation with particular focus on amendments to the *Body Corporate and Community Management Act 1997*. It is noteworthy that this paper promotes the notion of a new regulation module for strata titled properties used predominantly for tourism accommodation. Everton-Moore, Ardill, Guilding, and Warnken (2006) provide a cross-state comparison of legislative provisions applying to Australian strata titled properties.

Relative to the research directed to management issues arising in the conventional hotel management sector, the volume of research directed to the plethora of management issues arising in the STTA sector is negligible. Further, no research has been found that documents the various organizational forms that STTA complexes can assume. This observation highlights the significance of the classificatory study reported herein.

#### 3.0 Research Method

This study was initially informed by a series of meetings held with a strata title sector reference group. This reference group comprised mainly of Queensland (a state in Australia) representatives of the STTA sector. It included representatives drawn from the Queensland Resident Accommodation Managers Association, the Unit Owners Association of Queensland, Gold Coast City Council, Pacific International Hotels, the office of the Commissioner of Body Corporate Queensland, Queensland Department of Tourism, Fair Trading and Wine Industry Development, Tourism Queensland, and the Western Australia Tourism Commission. This group met on three occasions and subsequent contact has been on-going on an ad hoc basis by way of email and telephone communication.

This reference group provided key contacts enabling the development of an initial sample of subjects targeted for exploratory interviews. This approach was considered appropriate, as industry experts were informing the researchers of additional contacts with many years of experience (without these recommendations, the researchers would not have had access to these participants). Thirty four exploratory interviews were conducted, of which eighteen were tape recorded and transcribed. An overview of the interviewees is provided in Table 1. The tape-recorded interviews all took place at the participants' places of work. Confirmation of any ambiguous information and other data was secured by follow up phone calls lodged with the interviewees subsequent to the initial meeting.

### **Insert Table 1 about here**

The interviewees selected represented a cross-section of interests in STTA operations. The conduct of the early interviews yielded further contacts who were well equipped to provide useful insights and perspectives that could inform the study. No particular challenges were encountered in terms of generating the sample of interviewees. It appeared that the lack of prior academic investigation of STTA resulted in the interviewees welcoming, and exhibiting considerable goodwill towards, the conduct of the study.

Given the nature of the STTA information sought, and the status of academic understanding of the phenomenon under examination prior to the conduct of this study, it appeared that an interactive data collection approach that enabled clarification of ideas and opinions expressed by the interviewees was most appropriate. Accordingly, a reflexive and relatively non-directive (Fontana and Frey, 1994) qualitative data collection technique was employed. This provided scope for the researcher to seek clarification of ideas and opinions expressed by the interviewees. This data collection approach was also employed because of variability in the ways that STTAs can operate.

Interview questions designed to elicit factors relating to the effectiveness of the delivery of management services in STTA complexes were posed. These questions prompted extensive discussion of the different organisational forms that STTA

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> As some meeting venues were not conducive to tape-recording, not all interviews were transcribed, however notes were taken during and after every interview.

complexes can assume. Validation of the organisational forms identified in the early interviews was achieved in the latter interviews. The overall approach taken signifies that data collection and analysis occurred contemporaneously (Merriam, 1988; Marshall and Rossman, 1989).

### 4.0 Findings

Classificational schemata have been described as the primary means for organizing phenomena and they are considered extremely important for theory development (Hunt, 2002). Logical partitioning starts with a careful specification of the phenomena to be categorized (Hunt, 2002). This was the initial approach taken in preparing the hierarchical typology advanced herein. Following Hunt's recommendation, the process of delineation of categorical terms (the properties or characteristics on which the classification schema is to be based) took place contemporaneously with the development of labels for the defined categories which have emerged.

Although the interview data collected highlights the extent to which STTA organizational forms in Australia are diverse and varied, sufficient commonalities across the organizations have been observed to facilitate the typology's development. The typology advanced is presented as Figure 1. The most fundamental distinction drawn out by this typology concerns a dichotomy between strata titled hotels and strata titled apartment complexes. Subordinated to this dichotomy are further tiers of classification based on whether a STTA complex is branded and the extent of service that it provides. In developing this typology, particular attention has been directed towards achieving a minimalist classification system that captures broad generic subgroups that account for the majority of STTA providers in Australia.

# **Insert Figure 1 about here**

It should be acknowledged that a degree of subjectivity is bound to be exercised when developing a classification scheme such as that depicted in Figure 1. Also, the rapid nature of the expansion and evolution of the sector suggests that further new structures, not referred to in the current analysis, can be expected to evolve.

Hunt (2002) provides three observations which are directly applicable to Figure 1. The first is that logical partitioning should result in monothetic classifications, ie, all members of a category possess all the characteristics that are used to identify the category. Secondly, the procedure can result in single or multi-level schemata. Common in multilevel schemata is hierarchical ordering such as that evident in Figure 1. It should also be noted that hierarchical classifications have greater power to systematically organize the phenomenon under investigation. Thirdly, Hunt notes that there may exist empty classes, as is the case in Figure 1.

# 4.1 Description of the STTA hierarchical typology

STTA can be seen to comprise two main categories, strata titled apartments and strata titled hotels. The differential being more living space, and self-catering facilities provided by the apartment sub-category. Strata titled apartments operate under a range of management structures. Factors affecting the choice of

management structure include, but are not limited to, the state location of the complex and nature of the ownership of the business. The management rights structure, which sees an entity buying the right to run a STTA complex's letting pool and secure a financial return for providing maintenance services (explained further in Guilding et al, 2005), has been the preferred form in Queensland, while only a few examples of STTA complexes adopting the management rights model have been observed in Western Australia.

The organizational types that make up the STTA hierarchical typology (Figure 1) are now discussed. The primary structuring vehicle in this discussion is the distinction between Type As (Mum and Dad independent owner operators), Type Bs (strata title hotels) and Type Cs (multiple apartment site organizations).

### 4.1.1 Type A - Mum and Dad independent owner operators

These businesses are widely referred to by practitioners as 'Mum and Dad' operators, and for this reason the label has been adopted here. This is the archetypal small management rights business. These types of STTA business are usually located in regional tourism destinations catering to the leisure / family holiday market. The "Mum and Dad" label derives from the large number of husband and wife teams that purchase the management rights. 'Mum' generally attends to administration matters (reservations, check-ins and check-outs, enquiries and accounts); whilst 'Dad' tends to focus on facilities management and maintenance. Many owner operator couples employ casual staff to assist with the completion of operational tasks associated with their complex, particularly during peak periods. The 'Mum and Dad' owner operators are independent and unbranded. The only business affiliation that they may hold is membership in a regional tourism association to assist in marketing and promotion.

The owners of this type of business appear to derive considerable pride from the provision of a highly personalized service. Many of these operators see the purchase of a management rights business as a lifestyle decision to settle into semi-retirement in a tourism oriented destination while providing the job-satisfaction attributes that are generally associated with owner-managed businesses.

# **4.1.2** Type B - Strata titled hotels

Strata titled hotels offer either the full service of a traditional hotel or limited services, marketed with or without a brand name. In the past, these businesses tended to be located in central business districts and cater primarily to the corporate market. More recently, the location of strata titled hotels has expanded to city fringe locations and regional areas. This migration has seen an expansion of the markets served to include holiday, VFR (visiting friends and relatives) and the leisure markets. Strata titled hotels offer a traditional suite of hotel services, with the result that most guests are unaware that they are not staying at a conventionally owned hotel.

Some examples of branded serviced strata title hotels (type H) include the Radisson, Palazzo Versace, Sheraton (all on the Gold Coast), Sebel, and Medina. An example of a branded, limited service STTA organization (type J) is Pacific International Hotels. No example of an unbranded, serviced hotel (type I) has been identified

from the data collected. Unbranded, limited service hotels (type K) are, however, represented by various independent operators.

Factors that appear to be stimulating the development of strata titled hotels include hotel developers' desire to access a larger pool of potential owners, as well as the enhanced capacity to 'sell off the plan' provided by strata titled ownership (Warnken et al, 2008). It is also notable that increased popularity of this form of real estate ownership has coincided with the considerable growth in individual investor wealth that occurred around the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

# **4.1.3** Type C - Multiple Apartment Site Organization (MASO)

This is a new and rapidly evolving sub-group of STTA providers. The MASO classification represents a broader and less narrowly defined grouping than the 'Mum and Dad' and hotel classifications already discussed. While organizations subsumed within this grouping can exhibit differences in organizational structure, management and strategy, they appear to exhibit sufficient similarities to warrant identification as a distinct grouping.

At the individual property complex level, the operating model of an MASO can be similar to a Mum and Dad operated complex, however the distinguishing feature of an MASO is that the property level structure is replicated to produce a chain of properties. Factors that appear to be stimulating the development of MASOs include the opportunity for MASO owners to expand their property portfolio into a range of destinations, 'brand' their complexes and centralize operations such as reservation systems. Centralization provides cost savings, while economies of scale are reaped through greater purchasing power.

The MASO phenomenon has seen the growth of corporations focused on purchasing a suite of management rights. It appears commonplace for the directors of such companies to have come from a 'Mum and Dad' operated complex where they have gained owner-operator experience and developed an appreciation of benefits that can derive from single company management of several STTA complexes. The growth of some MASOs in the current decade has been such that some have become publicly listed on the Australian stock exchange.<sup>2</sup>

MASOs encompass publicly listed companies which can manage STTA complexes that represent branded (D) or unbranded chains (E). An example of a branded MASO is Stella Resorts and an example of an unbranded MASO is S8. There are also consortia of multiple businesses that form either branded or unbranded chains. Examples of these include Oaks Hotels and Resorts (D) and Dreamtime Resorts (E). All of the above examples are managed utilizing the management rights structure. The non-management rights structure chains identified were branded, serviced apartments (D) and examples of this classification are Broadwater Resorts and Hotels and Quest Apartments. No non-branded chain of apartments (E) operating under a non-management rights structure has been identified in this study.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Two significant players, Breakfree and S8, have subsequently been amalgamated within a single property development company.

One hybrid classification formed by a MASO was based on a branded chain. The operation uses a non-management rights structure for its properties with the exception of one property in the portfolio that operated under the management rights structure. This entity was therefore considered an anomaly, as all other MASO's either exclusively use a management rights structure or a non-management rights structure in their operations. As this was an individual case, it has not been accorded a separate grouping in the hierarchical typology developed (Figure 1).

# 4.2 Main differences between the three key generic types

At a fundamental level of conceptual abstraction, Figure 1 can be usefully collapsed into three primary generic types: 'Mum & Dad', strata titled hotels and MASO complexes. Given the absence of any prior work attempting a classification of different STTA organizational forms, this relatively aggregated level of abstraction appears appropriate as a point of focus, to facilitate broad appreciation of some of the significant distinguishing characteristics evident across various organizational manifestations of STTA.

### **Insert Table 2 about here**

Most 'Mum & Dad' and MASO complexes are located in Queensland. Strata titled hotels are fairly extensively represented throughout Australia. Size appears to be a distinguishing facet across these three types. 'Mum & Dad' complexes are at the smaller end of the scale, typically with between 12 and 80 units. MASOs, although also focused on serviced apartment management, are at the larger end of the scale (a recent trend amongst MASO's has seen them targeting buildings with a minimum of 60 - 80 units), with their complexes typically ranging from 80 to 140 units. The size of strata titled hotels varies depending upon location. In regional areas they appear to average between 50 and 80 units, and in central business districts they range between 80 and 150 units.

The majority of 'Mum & Dad' complexes are located in regional areas and this also applies to MASOs, however, in recent years there has been a noticeable trend for MASO organizations to buy management rights businesses located in CBDs. Strata titled hotels, which have traditionally been catering to the corporate market and located in CBDs, have recently started to diversify into regional areas. This diversification of locations carries implications for the nature of the market served, with MASOs gaining corporate market entry and strata titled hotels combining their traditional corporate market with a growing foothold in the family and leisure markets.

The level of personalized service appears to be highest in the 'Mum & Dad' complexes, due to the owner-operators' close contact with guests. Strata titled hotels and MASOs are similar, as both have employee managers who do not possess the type of personal commitment that appears to characterise the 'Mum & Dads'. Due to this personalized service, repeat visitation is high in Type A operations. Strata titled hotels can also exhibit high degrees of repeat visitation that is frequently linked to customer brand loyalty. MASO's return visitation levels appear to be low relative to the other two types.

The range of service offerings are highest in strata titled hotels, as they represent the closest model to traditional hotels. Although this signifies that 'Mum & Dads' and MASOs are more limited in the range of services that they offer (reflecting their self contained accommodation product), it is notable that some are increasing these services in an effort to compete with hotels and meet consumer demand and expectations. For an increasing number of complexes, we are beginning to see a blurring of the boundary between conventional serviced apartment offerings and conventional hotel service offerings.

The managers in strata titled hotels and MASOs are employees, whereas 'Mum & Dads' have made a substantial personal investment in purchasing the management rights business in their complex. Many owner operators in Type As have had no prior accommodation management experience and there appears to be a significant proportion of ex-government employees owning the management rights in these complexes. Similarly, managers in MASOs appear to be characterized by limited experience and a broad range of prior occupational backgrounds. Strata titled hotel managers have the highest levels of hospitality management experience, with the majority of managers recruited as traditional hotel managers.

Where rated, 'Mum & Dad' complexes tend to have an average of a 3 star rating, strata titled hotels and MASOs range from 4 to 5 stars, with the hotels generally holding the higher star ratings. It should be noted, however, that the majority of 'Mum & Dad' complexes and MASOs do not carry a star rating.

An interesting distinguishing characteristic of the three generic types is how and why units in the complex are sold. Units in 'Mum & Dad' and MASO complexes are sold by real estate agents primarily as lifestyle products, with muted emphasis often attached to projected investment returns. It appears that the decision to purchase these units is frequently strongly influenced by emotional factors (Warnken et al, 2008). The sale of strata titled hotel units occurs in a distinctly different manner and legislative context. Units in these properties are sold as investment products under the auspices of the Managed Investments Act (1998). These units are generally not sold by real estate agents, they are sold by financial planners/advisors (authorized representatives of a licensed Australian financial services organisation) that are registered with the Australian Security Investment Commission. This distinction arises because strata titled hotels contain investment units only, ie, unit purchasers are not able to live in their unit. While owners of units in 'Mum & Dad' and MASO complexes are generally allowed to live in the unit that they have purchased, there can be exceptions where restrictive zoning prohibits residential use.

As strata titled hotels constitute an investment product, there is usually a mandatory furniture, fittings and equipment (FF&E) replacement levy. Refurbishment in these complexes is conducted across all units in a regular and consistent manner with the result that all units are refurbished in the same style and to the same standard (thereby facilitating star ratings). By contrast, 'Mum & Dad' and MASO complexes usually have no provision for an FF&E levy. The management contract typically does not enable the management entity to require unit owners to maintain their units to a particular standard. This appears to be a particular disadvantage of these operating models, although managers can encourage owners to adequately maintain

their units as they have discretion over which units will be let. This inconsistency of levels of refurbishment signifies that 'Mum & Dad' and MASO complexes are severely compromised with respect to the group bookings market.

### 5.0 Conclusion and discussion

This paper carries considerable novelty as it is the first to attempt the development of a hierarchical typology relating to strata titled tourism accommodation provision. Such a study appears warranted given the growth of strata title internationally (Warnken at al, 2008) and the importance of accommodation in the tourism product (Sharpley, 2000). Transcribed interview data with key STTA stakeholders representing industry experts, unit owners and STTA managers has enabled the development of an understanding of the main organizational forms assumed in the delivery of STTA management and the subsequent construction of a STTA hierarchical typology.

Hunt's (2002) five classificational criteria can be drawn on as a checklist enabling an appraisal of the robustness and completeness of the typology developed.

- 1) It is believed the schema adequately specifies the phenomena to be classified within the bounds of this particular research project. The phenomenon under enquiry is tourism accommodation facilities owned by way of strata title.
- 2) The schema adequately specifies the properties that provide the basis of the classification advanced. Table 2 underscores the extent of the differences between the three main observed STTA organizational forms. The properties that facilitate the classification are the characteristics listed and described in the first column of the table.
- 3) The schema has categories that are mutually exclusive. The organizations and accommodation complexes that have been identified to illustrate the classification cannot be allocated into another category in the hierarchical schemata. One possible exception to this claim concerns one branded chain MASO that used non-management rights structure for all its properties with the exception of one. In the interests of parsimony, it was felt that this single observation did not warrant the inclusion of a new "hybrid" grouping, although should this model be found in many STTA organizations, a new grouping would be warranted.
- 4) The schema has categories that are collectively exhaustive i.e. every STTA complex can be classified accordingly and does have a 'home' in the hierarchy. All forms of STTA complexes can be incorporated within the typology advanced.
- 5) The schema is useful. As the concepts embodied in the schema have provided the structure that has facilitated the description of different forms of STTA, it appears reasonable to claim that the schema is useful.

Despite these claims, it is nevertheless important that the limitations of the typology are acknowledged. Hunt's first criterion concerns the extent to which a tight definition of the phenomena to be classified exists. This study has remained within the confines of considering strata titled apartment and hotel complexes. A case could be made, however, that the schemata should be broadened to include other forms of tourism accommodation that are based on strata titled ownership.

Examples of such other forms include caravan parks and youth hostels, although the incidence of these alternative forms of strata titled tourism accommodation is believed to be relatively small when compared to apartments and hotels.

In any future studies that focus on further developing the schemata, consideration could be given to according a distinct grouping to the growing number of 'integrated' resorts. Integrated resorts usually involve a branded hotel operator running a conventional hotel that has a distinct wing or precinct that is owned by way of a strata titling arrangement. In the hierarchical typology provided herein, these types of property would be most closely associated with Type H or J.

The limitations of the typology are also apparent when the evolving nature of the industry is considered. For this reason, the typology and supporting discussion should be viewed as somewhat time specific. While the typology does represent an original perspective of the organizational forms involved in delivering STTA in Australia, it is only a first step and classification will likely become more difficult as the defining characteristics and lines of separation between the types continue to merge. It should also be noted that although the above discussion relates to the whole hierarchical typology, the primary focus of much of the commentary in this paper has concerned the three generic types 'Mum & Dad', strata titled hotels and MASO complexes, as they appear to represent the most profound lines of demarcation when providing a first overview of STTA organizational forms.

Despite its limited robustness, the classification does appear to carry several meritorious aspects:

- 1) It enhances our understanding of the nature and mix of organizations currently managing the STTA product in Australia. For this reason it will act as a useful point of reference in subsequent research on STTA. Given the growth of STTA (Warnken et al., 2008), this research appears to be overdue.
- 2) The typology carries the potential to assist government in the formulation of zoning and regional development plans, legislation, statistical data collection and destination management. Private enterprises, including financial institutions, developers, real estate personnel and potential unit owners will also benefit from a deeper understanding of the range of forms that STTA can assume. The typology will also serve as an important pedagogical concept for the increasing number of educational institutions that will likely recognise a need to acknowledge STTA growth by introducing it as a taught topic in their tourism and hospitality management curricula.
- 3) The MASO classification provides the typology with some flexibility enabling accommodation of some yet to be conceived STTA organizational forms.
- 4) By specifically addressing the nature of STTA organizational forms, the hierarchical typology may stimulate further debate and research concerning the relative advantages and shortcomings of the types identified.
- 5) In such research, the typology can usefully serve as a contextual reference point.

In further research that builds on the initiative reported herein, an attempt could be made to identify elements of best practice in the delivery of STTA. Associated with this, it would likely be revealing to conduct a survey of the satisfaction levels of both STTA owners and consumers (tourists staying in STTA properties). Such a study could focus on relative satisfaction levels across the different forms of STTA delivery identified in the typology advanced. Such findings could inform legislative and tourism policy making with respect to what forms of STTA are desirable and what modifications can be made to the management and governance models currently adopted.

#### References

Ardill, A., Everton-Moore, K., Fredline, L., Guilding, C., & Warnken, J. (2004). Community titles reforms in Queensland: A regulatory panacea for commercial, residential and tourism stakeholders, *The Queensland Lawyer*, 25, 13-27.

Ball R. (1984). What is a Strata Title? Law Institute Journal, August, 924-925.

Cassidy, K., & C. Guilding. (2007). An exploratory investigation of tourist accommodation price setting in Australian strata titled properties. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 26, 277-292.

Cassidy, K., & C. Guilding. (forthcoming). Defining an emerging tourism industry sub-sector: Who are the strata titled tourism accommodation stakeholders? *International Journal of Hospitality Management*.

Cooper, C., Fletcher, J., Gilbert, D., Shepherd, R., & Wanhill, S. (1998). *Tourism: Principles and Practice* (2nd Edition), Longman, Harlow.

Everton-Moore, K., Ardill, A., Guilding, C. & J. Warnken, (2006) The Law of Strata Title in Australia: A Jurisdictional Stocktake. *Australian Property Law Journal*, 13, 1-35.

Fontana, A and Frey, J.H. (1994) Interviewing: The art of science. In *Handbook of qualitative research*, edited by N. Denzin and Y. Lincoln, pp. 361-376. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Goss-Turner, S. (1996). The accommodation sector. In: P. Jones (Ed.), *Introduction to Hospitality Operations*, pp. 21–35. London: Cassell.

Guilding, C., Warnken, J., Ardill, A., & Fredline, L. (2005). An agency theory perspective on the owner/manager relationship in tourism-based condominiums. *Tourism Management*, 26 (3), 409-420.

Hunt, S. (2002). Foundations of Marketing Theory Toward a General Theory of Marketing. London: M.E. Sharpe

Jones Lang LaSalle Hotels (2005). *Hotels and Serviced Apartments: Obstacles to Convergence*. Sydney.

Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. (1999). *Designing Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Merriam, S. (1988). *Case study research in education: a qualitative approach*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

National Tourism Investment Strategy Consultative Group. (2006) *National Tourism Investment Strategy: Investing for our future*, report to the Minister for Small Business and Tourism. Canberra, Australia: Department of Industry, Tourism and Resources.

Pizam, A. (2006) Condominium hotels: A scorching hot lodging product. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 25(2), 167-169.

Sharpley, R. (2000). The influence of the accommodation sector on tourism development: lessons from Cyprus, *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 19 (3), 275-293.

Warnken, J., Guilding C & K. Cassidy, (2008) "A Review of the Nature and Growth of Multi-titled Tourism Accommodation Complexes", *International Journal of Hospitality Management* 27, 574-583.

Warnken, J., Russell, R., & Faulkner, B. (2003). Condominium developments in maturing destinations: potentials and problems of long-term sustainability. *Tourism Management*, 24, 155-168.

Weaver, A., (2005). Spaces of containment and revenue capture: 'super-sized' cruise ships as mobile tourism enclaves. *Tourism Geographies* 7, 165–184.

Woods, R.H., (2001). Important issues for a growing timeshare industry. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly* 42, 71–81.

Yin, R. (2003). *Case Study Research, Design and Methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Table 1
Overview of interviewees providing interviews that were transcribed

Overview of interviewees providing interviews that were transcribed					
Interviewee	Stakeholder group	Position held	State focus		
			of the		
			stakeholder		
A	Developer	CEO	Qld & Vic		
В	Hotel group with strata title	Chairman	All		
	interest		Australia		
C	State Tourism Office	General Manager	Vic		
D	Publicly listed STTA provider	Executive	Qld, NSW		
		Director	& Vic		
E	Body corporate service provider	CFO	NSW		
	Hotel group with strata title				
	interest				
F	Developer	Project	NSW &		
		Development	Australia		
		Manager			
G	Developer, Property investment	Executive Vice	NSW &		
	fund, Financier & Commercial	President	Australia		
	property manager				
Н	Management rights broker	State Manager	NSW & Qld		
I	Body corporate service provider	President	NSW		
	and senior representative of NSW				
	Institute of Strata Title Managers				
J	Focus group of eight resident	Resident	NSW		
	managers	managers			
K	Management rights broker &	Lawyer	Vic		
	Lawyer				
L	Financier	Chief Operating	NSW		
		Officer			
M	Institutional investment fund	Fund Manager	Australia		
N	Hospitality management	Director	WA		
О	Ministerial taskforce	DPI-	WA		
	representatives	Co-ordinator			
	GTO Regional manager	Strategic			
	Local MP as chairperson	Planning			
	Department of planning and				
	infrastructure (DPI)				
P	Body corporate service provider,	Director of body	WA		
	lawyer and senior representative	corporate service			
	of Western Australia Institute of	provider			
	Strata Title Managers	0 111			
Q	Body Corporate service provider	General Manager	WA		
	and Real Estate Institute	of body			
	representative	corporate service			
		provider			
R	Developer	Managing	WA		
Legend		Director			

Legend

NSW: New South Wales, Qld: Queensland, Vic: Victoria, WA: Western Australia

		Table 2	
Summary of differences between three primary STTA types			
	Organizational Forms		
Characteristic	Type A (Mum	Type B (Strata	Type C (MASO)
	and Dad)	Titled Hotels)	
Location	Predominantly	Have Australia	Predominantly found
	found in	wide	in Queensland
	Queensland and	representation.	however experienced
	increasingly in		Queensland operators
	regional areas of		are expanding into
	NSW.		other parts of Australia
			and the Pacific.
Size	Generally	Affected by	Targeting the larger
	ranging from 12	location. Regional	complexes in the
	to 80 units.	areas average 50 –	'Mum and Dad' sector,
		80 units while	i.e., 80-140 unit
		CBD locations	complexes.
		range from 80 to	
		150 units.	
Type of location	Predominantly	Mainly located in	Mostly located in
	located in	CBD areas,	regional areas although
	regional areas.	however some	some operators are
		brands are	diversifying their
		diversifying into	market by buying

		the regional areas.	management rights in
			Brisbane
Market	Mainly family /	Mainly corporate	Mainly family / leisure
	leisure		
Level of	High due to	Medium due to	Medium due to
personalised	owner operators	employee	employee managers.
service		managers,	
		although quality	
		of service is	
		generally good	
		due to most hotels	
		being branded.	
Level of return	High	High within the	Medium
visitation		branded sector.	
Level of	Minimal	High	Low
additional			
services offered.			
E.g. food and			
beverage, room			
service, valet,			
etc.			
Manager	Owner operators	Employees	Employees
Manager prior	Frequently no	Prior experience	Limited prior
experience and	prior experience	in hospitality	experience and variety
occupation	and many ex	industry and	of previous

	government	mainly ex-hotel	backgrounds
	employees.	(traditional)	
		managers.	
Centralised	No	Yes	Yes
administration			
Centralised	No – direct	Yes	No – direct
reservations			
Distribution of	Direct return	Usually	Combination of
income to unit		guaranteed return	pooled, direct and
owners		(i.e., lease	guaranteed return.
		arrangement).	
Standard	3 star	4-5 star	4-5 star
Sale of unit	Real estate agent	Investment	Real estate agent
		advisor/planner	
		registered with	
		Australian	
		Security	
		Investment	
		Commission	
		(ASIC)	
Sold as	Predominantly	Investment only	Lifestyle/investment,
	lifestyle and		some more
	afterthought of		sophisticated operators
	investment.		do focus on return on
			investment.

Can unit owner	Yes	No	Yes
live in unit?			
Is there	No, usually not	Yes	No, usually not
provision for			
unit Furniture			
Fittings and			
Equipment			
replacement.			
Is	No	Yes	No
refurbishment			
regular and			
consistent			
across the			
complex?			
Do all units look	No	Yes	No
the same			
internally?			
Age of building	Majority are old	Newer properties,	Majority are old
		if not, frequent	
		refurbishments	
		maintain a quality	
		appearance.	
Ample	Contributions are	There are	Contributions are
contribution or	frequently non-	contributions but	frequently non-
levels in existing	existent, although	they are not	existent, although

sinking funds?	complexes in	ample.	complexes in
	Queensland must		Queensland must now
	now have a		have a quantity
	quantity surveyor		surveyor determined
	determined		sinking fund levy. New
	sinking fund		complexes in New
	levy. New		South Wales must also
	complexes in		raise a sinking fund.
	New South		
	Wales must also		
	raise a sinking		
	fund.		