

CSR as a strategy for public-private relationships in protected island territories: Fuerteventura, Canary Islands

Olga González-Morales

Area of Applied Economics, Instituto Universitario de Investigación Social y Turismo (ISTUR), Universidad de La Laguna, Spain

olgonzal@ull.edu.es

Agustín Santana Talavera

Area of Social Anthropology, Instituto Universitario de Investigación Social y Turismo (ISTUR), Universidad de La Laguna, Spain

asantana@ull.edu.es

Abstract: This article reflects on governance and Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) as a competitive strategy. It shows that synergies for achieving sustainable tourism destinations require innovation, inter-business cooperation, and public-private cooperation. The empirical analysis focuses on the island of Fuerteventura, Canary Islands. The island is an outermost territory of the European Union, where the high number of tourists has an important socio-environmental impact. Fuerteventura has also been designated a Biosphere Reserve due to respect for its cultural, natural and scenic values and the manner in which commitment to renewable energy, responsible water management and responsible fishing have contributed to its sustainable development. This recognition has led to a coordinated decision-making process, which has resulted in the implementation of different plans to modernize this tourist destination. In fact, the island has been divided into three basic zones that differ in the conservation levels pursued and the activities allowed in each of them. In this context, this article aims to analyze the influence of innovation, private-public collaboration and private-private collaboration on tourist accommodation companies regarding their level of integration of CSR in an island designated as a Biosphere Reserve.

Keywords: Canary Islands, Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR), Biosphere Reserve, innovation, public-private cooperation, Fuerteventura

<https://doi.org/10.24043/isj.83>

© 2019—Institute of Island Studies, University of Prince Edward Island, Canada.

Introduction

Processes of diversification and market segmentation (Bushell & Eagles, 2007), with a tendency toward personalization of the products offered, have accompanied the development of tourist destinations in recent decades. This is especially noticeable in consolidated sun, sea,

and sand destinations, many of which have renewal needs and must search for new attractions that are environmentally and population friendly. Along these lines, the needs of destinations converge with those of organizations such as UNESCO, which, since the end of the century, has faced the challenge of conserving cultures (cultural territories) without opposing tourism development. The combination of both interests can inspire the growth and/or renewal of sustainable environmental and socio-cultural resources, taking as a possible tool the designation of a Biosphere Reserve. The entire island of Fuerteventura in the archipelago of the Canary Islands, Spain, was incorporated into the Biosphere network in 2009 (Díaz Rodríguez et al., 2010).

An important feature of Biosphere Reserve destinations is their growth and/or renewal proposals based on the criterion of responsibility (Manente et al., 2014). In other words, stakeholders must be made aware of the implications for the territory and societies of actions developed there and adapt to demands for protection, conservation, authenticity, nature and culture (Buckley, 2010; Bushell & Eagles, 2007; Kuper, 2009; Richards, 2018; Vidon & Rickly, 2018).

Adaptation to these demands becomes a challenge when the availability of resources is limited. Such is the case for highly peripheral islands (Azores, Madeira, Canary Islands, Bermuda, New Caledonia, Malvinas, French Polynesia, etc.), marked by their distance from the markets of origin, their shortage of resources (developable land, energy, water, food), their capacity of reception (suitability of the territory and its populations for the development as a destination, integrating the tourist activity or other economic activities in question in a viable/responsible way in their future strategies) and social and environmental fragility. The objective of sustainable tourism renewal in such contexts requires a strategic evaluation analysis (Fernandes & Pinho, 2017; Seetanah, 2010; Sufrauj, 2011) and the collaboration of companies in the tourism sector, especially tourism accommodation companies, with all groups of interest and stakeholders (Lee, 2011; Tiago et al., 2016; Zach, 2013). In this sense, the management of sustainability requires a business model for creating shared value (Porter & Kramer, 2011), and CSR is a business strategy that can contribute to greater competitiveness of companies that apply it (Porter & Kramer, 2006). In addition, CSR acquires added importance when it refers to and applies to the internal dimensions of a company. It focuses on the management of human resources, health and safety at work, adaptation to change and the environmental impact of a company's productive practices. Its external dimensions involve the company in the development and quality of life of local communities, adopting codes of conduct that help to solve general problems and to collaborate with commercial partners, suppliers and customers (European Commission, 2001).

Governance mechanisms involved in CSR are often based on innovation, public-private collaboration, and private-private collaboration (Brinkerhoff & Brinkerhoff, 2011; Brammer et al., 2012; Garriga & Melé, 2004; London, 2012; Scott & Scott, 2015; Wagner & Llerena, 2011). There is a wide body of literature on CSR, innovation and public-private cooperation (Andrighi & Hoffmann, 2010; Brogaard & Petersen, 2018; Curtis & Hoffman, 2009; Kim et al., 2014; Melo Sacramento & Teixeira, 2012; Rexhepi et al., 2013; Teixeira, 2012; Teixeira et al., 2006). However, there has been little research into the three terms integrated into the same approach or into an island destination characterized by being declared a Biosphere Reserve or incorporating other forms of environmental protection.

Because this study focuses on Biosphere Reserve tourist destinations, the natural environment represents the main component of the tourism attractiveness of these destinations. CSR is an important environmental strategy that has the potential to foster vital innovation in the tourism sector as well as collaboration between private sector companies and between the public and private sectors.

Innovation and collaboration with public and private agents as key aspects of CSR in protected island territories

Serious difficulties are involved in establishing a relationship between CSR, innovation, public-private collaboration, and private-private collaboration.

CSR is an innovative strategy for companies that adopt it and, in turn, its adoption implies the implementation of new innovations (Rexhepi et al., 2013). In addition, CSR is a voluntary strategy for a company that allows it to differentiate itself from other companies that do not use it. As Gowri (2004) points out, CSR starts where the law ends, because compliance with legal regulations is mandatory for all companies and, therefore, mandatory actions do not allow differentiation. Grydehøj and Kelman (2017) agree with this, but with some limitations. These authors understand that the adoption of environmentally oriented CSR actions increases the competitiveness of companies with respect to other companies that do not adopt this strategy, but they also consider that, as the adoption of CSR actions grows, the value from the CSR to the company (and the destination) decreases due to the generalization of the strategy. The key in the present study is to understand CSR as contributing to both company competitiveness and the sustainable development of the local society.

This research focuses on the island of Fuerteventura, a tourist destination that is a Biosphere Reserve. Companies located in such a destination are advised to comply with social sustainability criteria (regarding employment and human resources policies, for example) (Solnet et al., 2014) and environmental requirements (regarding solid waste, water use, water treatment, *etc.*) with specific obligations to which they must comply (Higgins-Desbiolles, 2018). Although such obligations would not be part of a CSR strategy, any CSR actions that a company voluntarily starts up would grant it added value. In short, it can be considered that CSR establishes the minimum conditions to achieve, in collaboration with other public and private agents, sustainable development in its environment, covering economic, social and environmental dimensions (triple bottom line) (Jackson et al., 2011; Lin-Hi & Müller, 2013).

Generally speaking, islands of a markedly tourist nature are increasingly resorting to sustainability strategies (Hong, 2019; Petridis et al., 2017; Weaver, 2017), but, sometimes, the search for the status of an ecological island can increase costs without increasing income, and its development is not adapted to the reality of the island (Baldacchino & Kelman, 2014; Grydehøj & Kelman, 2017; Xie et al., 2019). According to Grydehøj and Kelman (2017), island communities should pursue locally contextualized development, potentially focused on adapting to climate change, instead of focusing on being an ecological island oriented towards brand positioning and ecotourism. When the economy of the islands mainly depends on the tourism sector, the debate focuses on how to maintain the income from the activity to maintain the livelihoods of the island's citizens and its sustainability (mass tourism or high-level tourism), which requires reflection on what the island can or cannot offer (Dodds et al., 2010).

Different research works have focused on the problems generated by the size of territories for the development of their small economies, especially in island territories that are far from their primary markets. Baldacchino and Bertram (2009) criticize this position and propose outlining the development trajectories of these small economies from the perspective of the strategic flexibility that small states use to take advantage of opportunities. According to Leseure (2010), it is important to start from the competences and the autochthonous capacities so that the islands can find their place in a constantly evolving global economy.

Grayson et al. (2008) consider that, in the long term, CSR is not viable without innovation. Innovation is associated with new knowledge that is introduced into the tourism sector in the form of new or improved products and services, improvements in procedures, new production processes, management systems, marketing systems or new forms of work organization. This knowledge usually consists of two types: tacit and codified. Moreover, a distinction is made between strategic innovation models according to the type of knowledge used (Álvarez González & González-Morales, 2006; Bocquet et al., 2013; González-Morales & Álvarez González, 2010; Kim et al., 2014; London, 2012). In addition, the environmental aspects contained in CSR dimensions generate incentives for the introduction of eco-innovations (Hellström, 2007; Rexhepi et al., 2013).

Kelman et al. (2015) argue that island communities are experiencing changes accompanied by innovative actions, but without adequate support to face these changes. These authors propose a research agenda for island territories, with actions to develop innovation and lay the groundwork for policymakers and professionals. They suggest five key objectives: 1) to involve knowledge users and potential change agents from the beginning, on and outside the islands, especially in projects and research programs; 2) to integrate and combine different types of knowledge from within and outside science (taking advantage of local knowledge in all its forms); 3) to explore alternative approaches and articulation; 4) to expand the dissemination of actions; 5) to develop wisdom, evaluating the situation internally and externally and then initiating an innovative change based on these evaluations, without this being a static process.

However, the literature emphasizes that the success of innovation, whatever the type, is linked to the entrepreneurial and destination's capacity to establish collaborative networks or, at least, coordination (Divisekera & Nguyen, 2018; Zach & Hill, 2017). Decisions affecting a tourist destination are made or must be made among all its active members. Networks of collaboration and cooperation between public and private agents in the area of destination promotion, supported by a strong institutional framework, can generate positive externalities for the sector. This concept of collaboration networks is intimately associated with CSR, in the sense that stakeholders (public and private agents, especially the tourism accommodation companies, with involvement, affection or interests in the area of tourist use) interact in pursuit of common goals for sustainable development in the territory.

For Muñoz Mazón and Fuentes Moraleda (2013), the process of cooperation between the agents involved in a tourist destination is situated at two extremes: 1) cooperation is carried out to manage specific financial assistance or financial allocation that may lead to continued relationships, or 2) cooperation is used as a development mechanism within a long-term local strategy that modifies behavior and achieves responsible commitments. In the second case, public institutions have the maximum responsibility to help establish formal and informal cooperation mechanisms.

According to Ibáñez (1999), the process of globalization has led to public institutions being unable to control markets and global economic activities, leading to the implementation of private self-regulation. In this context, public institutions can endorse the rules being established or play a more active role, including being mediators of conflicts. In this sense, Fox et al. (2002) understand that the functions that the public sector can adopt to exert this influence through less coercive actions consist of basically four actions: order, facilitate, collaborate, and approve (or endorse).

In the case of the island of Fuerteventura, the management of the destination as a Biosphere Reserve established a model of public-private governance with actions by the public administration that try to respond to the demands of a private sector eager to adopt new strategies. González Morales et al. (2016), when surveying the people in charge of tourist accommodation in Fuerteventura, concluded that CSR, as a strategy, is relatively extended in these companies. Within this strategy, the importance given to socio-environmental actions is highlighted, since they are considered sources of fundamental value that influence the companies' images and reputations. The most important reasons that companies allude to when integrating CSR among their objectives are the voluntary commitment of the management and/or the ownership of the company, improvement in the company's image, and reduction in costs. However, although companies consider that the Biosphere Reserve has benefited their establishments' relations with the public administration that manage the Reserve, these benefits are minimal, whereas relations with other public administrations are much closer, such as with city/town councils. This seems to demand an evaluation of the governance of the Biosphere Reserve and its relations with stakeholders (Schliep & Stoll-Kleemann, 2010).

Objective, hypothesis and methodology

Based on the above premises, the objective of this study is to analyze the importance of innovation, private-public collaboration, and private-private collaboration of tourist accommodation companies in the level of integration of CSR in islands declared Biosphere Reserves, with special interest in the self-imposed goals and strategies of such companies.

This aim is based on the hypothesis that tourist accommodation providers located in environments declared Biosphere Reserves are sensitive and carry out more CSR actions when they are more innovative and collaborate more with the public sector and other private agents.

Information was collected from those responsible for the accommodation of 130 hotels and non-hotel accommodation companies (51.5% are hotels) located in Fuerteventura. The sample obtained was 94 questionnaires (49 hoteliers and 45 non-hoteliers), with a confidence level of 95% and an error of $\pm 5.34\%$.

A questionnaire was developed with 67 items that were assessed on a Likert scale (1932) of five options (see questionnaire and percentages obtained in Appendix 1). The 67 items encompass a series of questions centered on:

1. The CSR actions carried out by tourist accommodation companies, taking into account all aspects that the European Commission recommends in its definition of CSR.
2. The evaluation of the Biosphere Reserve and its effect on tourist accommodation establishments.
3. The types of innovations carried out.

4. The degree of collaboration with public agents.

5. The degree of collaboration with private agents.

Based on the stated objective and taking into account the previous theoretical approaches, various descriptive and multivariate statistical techniques were applied, which are explained below. The program used was SPSS 21.

Multiple linear regression (MLR) analysis was chosen, because it analyzes the relationship of a single dependent variable (Y), quantitative (criterion), with several independent quantitative variables and/or dummy (predictor variables) (Martínez Arias, 1999). A linear combination of all or some of the predictor/explanatory variables (X_i) was attempted that correlates maximally with the dependent variable (Y). The model is summarized in the following equation:

$$Y = b_0 + b_1 X_1 + b_2 X_2 + \dots + b_p X_p + \varepsilon$$

Y = scores of dependent variables; X_i = scores of independent explanatory variables ($i = 1, \dots, p$); b_0 = constant; b_i = regression coefficients estimated using the least squares method with n observations that measure the influence of independent variables on the dependent variable ($i = 1, \dots, p$); and ε = error.

To achieve an MLR model whose variables have a strong relationship and are significant, a backward stepwise regression method or backward elimination was used, which introduces all the predictor variables at the beginning of the analysis and eliminates the variable whose Fisher F is not significant at each step, testing for the null hypothesis. The process ends when all the p -values are significant, that is, less than 0.05 (Díaz et al., 2013).

The nature of the questionnaire items, constructed on a Likert scale, requires a transformation of the responses, so that they can be used in the MLR in the form of factors. Therefore, the dependent variable and the independent variables became factors that measure a global result of each group of responses. This transformation was carried out by means of a factorial analysis for each group of items (Pérez López, 2005), as shown in Table 1, verifying its validity by means of the Bartlett sphericity test and the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin test (KMO). With the first test, the null hypothesis of no correlation of the variables in the population under study was tested. If a high value is obtained, it means there is a correlation between the factors, and the null hypothesis is rejected. In this case it is possible to continue with the analysis because the values are ideal. With the second test, it is confirmed that the KMO index takes values between 0.5 and 1 in all cases.

Before starting the MLR analysis, it was verified whether these factors, disaggregated by the variable *accommodation type*, were significant, which would indicate that there are differences between the responses of the established groups. For this, the non-parametric Mann-Whitney-Wilcoxon test was applied, with two independent samples (hotel offer and non-hotel offer) (Hernández et al., 2006). If the null hypothesis H_0 was fulfilled, it would indicate that there were no differences in the responses of the two groups ($Md_1 = Md_2$). If $p \leq 0.05$, the null hypothesis (H_0) was rejected, and there were significant differences between the two groups analyzed. The results were not significant, so the introduction of the variable *accommodation type* was ruled out in the analysis.

In summary, the variables for the analysis of MLR were established as shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Variables used in the multiple linear regression (MLR).

Variable type	Variables measured in the study and constitutive factors	
Dependent variable	Y = Integration of CSR actions in their actions	Item P.2, P.3, P.6
Independent variables	Factor 1. The Biosphere Reserve favors CSR Item	Item P.1
	Factor 2. Innovation	Item P.8, P.9, P.10
	Factor 3 Collaboration with the public sector	Item P.4 (4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.6, 4.9), P.5
	Factor 4. Collaboration with private agents	Item P.4 (4.4, 4.5, 4.7, 4.8), P.7

Results

The percentages of the descriptive results of the 67 items can be consulted in Appendix 1. In terms of the results of the MLR analysis, two models are obtained (see Table 2), the first with all the variables introduced and the second with those that were significant. It is observed that the second model eliminates Factor 4 related to the collaboration of tourist accommodation companies with private agents in the field of CSR. This second model is the one that will be used to obtain the most relevant conclusions of this study.

To evaluate the significance of the regression model, an analysis of ANOVA variance was performed, which resulted in $p = 0.000$. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected that the variability observed in the dependent variable is explanatory by chance, and its association with the independent variables is accepted. The model can be expressed by the following equation:

$$Y = 0.288 \cdot \text{Factor1} + 0.361 \cdot \text{Factor2} + 0.484 \cdot \text{Factor3}$$

Table 2: Coefficients (a) of the models.

	Non-standardized coefficients		Standard. coeff.	T	sig.	Confidence interval for B at 95%		Correlations			Collinearity statistics	
	B	typ. error				lower limit	upper limit	zero order	partial	semi-partial	tolerance	FIV
Model 1												
Constant	-3.62E-017	.062		.000	1.000	-.123	.123					
Factor 1	.279	.067	.279	4.151	.000	.146	.413	.522	.403	.259	.858	1.165
Factor 2	.287	.086	.287	3.343	.001	.117	.458	.538	.334	.208	.526	1.901
Factor 3	.419	.081	.419	5.152	.000	.257	.581	.626	.479	.321	.588	1.702
Factor 4	.138	.104	.138	1.325	.189	-.069	.344	.665	.139	.083	.360	2.776
Model 2												
Constant	-2.43E-017	.062		.000	1.000	-.124	.124					
Factor 1	.288	.067	.288	4.289	.000	.155	.422	.522	.412	.268	.867	1.153
Factor 2	.361	.066	.361	5.452	.000	.229	.492	.538	.498	.341	.896	1.116
Factor 3	.484	.065	.484	7.412	.000	.354	.613	.626	.616	.464	.920	1.087

a Dependent variable: Integration of CSR actions in companies

The constant in the equation has been eliminated because it has an infinitesimal value and is not significant. Y represents a measure of the set of CSR actions carried out by tourist

accommodation. The rest of the equation reflects that one more point in the assessment of the effect of being a Biosphere Reserve (Factor 1) favors an increase of 0.288 points in the implementation of CSR actions. Regarding innovation (Factor 2) and collaboration with the public sector (Factor 3), CSR actions are increased by 0.361 and 0.484, respectively, for each extra point.

The three coefficients are positive which indicate that the integration of CSR actions in tourism accommodation objectives increases when these three factors increase. Collaboration with the public sector is the independent variable that most influences or explains that tourist accommodation providers implement CSR actions. The second most influential variable is innovation: the more socially responsible a company is, the more it innovates.

The factors indicated, which are left in the final model, thus coincide with those that really influence the tourist accommodation companies to perform CSR actions.

Discussion and conclusions

Other studies have analyzed similar variables and many of their results coincide with those obtained in this analysis (González-Morales et al., 2016; Massukado & Teixeira, 2007; Matías Cruz & Pulido-Fernández, 2012; Merinero Rodríguez & Pulido-Fernández, 2009; Parra López, 2007). However, for this case study, it is important to note the low importance given to the creation of business networks in the destination among private agents. This low importance negatively affects the quality of inter-business relations and does not lead to the emergence of recognized leadership (Tiago et al., 2016; Zach, 2013). This apparent lack (and weakness) in a consolidated destination like Fuerteventura is compensated for by important relationships with the closest public agents (city/town councils and the Island Council, i.e. the government of the island). This fluid connection (independent variable with greatest weight) yields the assumed importance of the declaration of Biosphere Reserve status, which strengthens an asymmetric network of relationships between actors of similar 'weight', with nodes of greater importance within the public sector. That is, public agents seem to fulfill the objective of communicating (and, to a lesser extent, demanding) the desirable values of the Biosphere designation, to which companies are responding with the application of innovative actions in their internal CSR strategy—even though these actions are partially a result of compliance with legal regulations.

When considering true CSR, without mandatory compliance (Gowri, 2004), we can observe, for example, actions in response to the demand for employment (favoring nearby local populations), support for local social activities and the importance given to the ethical aspects of activities (Solnet et al., 2014), the adoption of innovative management measures, energy saving and responsibility in the use of other limited resources (Arbulú et al., 2017; Hellström, 2007).

However, the Biosphere Reserve designation seems to have little impact on the income of the tourism accommodation companies. That is, it does not provide an essential value when it comes to attracting customers. In spite of this, the analysis ratifies the proposed hypothesis, confirming the importance given to such a designation in relation to CSR strategies, with these strategies being even more favored when the company is more innovative.

The hypothesis does not hold in terms of private-private collaboration, which does not seem to play a relevant role in daily business. Its influence on CSR is negligible. This situation

contrasts with the recommendation for reducing risks associated with innovation (Zach & Hill, 2017), such as redundancy in diagnostic and implementation tasks or effectiveness in combining innovative ideas and actions (Cowan & Jonard, 2009; Nooteboom et al., 1997). In addition, the scarce clustering of businesses entails problems of governance and low capacity to respond to problems inherent in the uncertainty of tourist destinations as well as a decline in collective bargaining capacity with the higher levels of administration (Government of the Canary Islands and Government of Spain), especially applicable in cases of necessary destination renewal. It should be mentioned that the public sector has limitations in how it can influence the behavior of companies beyond regulatory aspects, especially when they are hotel chains. This power is based on recommendations that companies can choose to follow or to ignore, depending on their commitment to the tourist destination. The networks between private companies that share good CSR practices can help foster socially responsible corporate behavior, so that strengthening relations between private agents becomes an objective of the public action aimed at supporting the sustainable tourism destination.

In summary, this paper has contributed evidence to establishing a triple relationship between CSR, innovation, and public-private cooperation. Its most important contribution is the evaluation of the effects that these factors have on CSR actions that affect the environment, rather than on the internal returns that they can provide to the company itself. In future research, it would be worthwhile to analyze whether there are differences between the large hotel chains and other types of accommodation. Font et al. (2012), for example, have found that large hotel chains have comprehensive CSR policies yet that there is a significant gap with the results of their implementation, while small hotel groups or individually owned accommodation are more committed to environmental management in compliance with the initial set objectives.

Acknowledgements

This article has been carried out within the framework of the project 'Tourism Intelligence for Responsible Marine Tourism' (ProdID2017010128), co-financed by the Canarian Agency for Research, Innovation and the Information Society through the call for grants for the realization of I-projects. + D in the priority areas of the Smart Specialization Strategy of the Canary Islands, and the Operational Program FEDER Canarias 2014-2020.

References

- Álvarez Gonzalez, J.A., & González-Morales, O. (2006). L'apprentissage, l'innovation et la compétitivité dans les clusters touristiques: une étude comparée entre l'Espagne et l'Italie. *Revue d'Économie Régionale & Urbaine*, 4, 551-574.
<https://doi.org/10.3917/reru.064.0551>
- Andrighi, F.F., & Hoffmann V.E. (2010). Redes e cooperação na Destinação Turística de Urubici/SC. *Revista Turismo em Análise*, 21(1), 149-164.
<https://doi.org/10.11606/issn.1984-4867.v21i1p149-164>
- Arbulú, I., Lozano, J., & Rey-Maqueira, J. (2017). The challenges of tourism to waste-to-energy public-private partnerships. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 72, 916-921.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2017.01.036>

- Baldacchino, G., & Bertram, G. (2009). The beak of the finch: insights into the economic development of small economies. *The Round Table*, 98(401), 141–160. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00358530902757867>
- Baldacchino, G., & Kelman, I. (2014). Critiquing the pursuit of island sustainability: blue and green, with hardly a colour in between. *Shima*, 8(2), 1–21.
- Bocquet, R., Le Bas, C., Mothe, C., & Poussing, N. (2013). Are firms with different CSR profiles equally innovative? Empirical analysis with survey data. *European Management Journal*, 31(6), 642–654. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2012.07.001>
- Brammer, S., Jackson, G., & Matten, D. (2012). Corporate social responsibility and institutional theory: new perspectives on private governance. *Socio-economic Review*, 10(1), 3–28. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ser/mwr030>
- Brinkerhoff, D.W., & Brinkerhoff, J.M. (2011). Public–private partnerships: perspectives on purposes, publicness, and good governance. *Public Administration and Development*, 31(1), 2–14. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pad.584>
- Brogaard, L., & Petersen, O.H. (2018). Public–private partnerships (PPPs) in development policy: exploring the concept and practice. *Development Policy Review*, 36(52), O729–O747. <https://doi.org/10.1111/dpr.12277>
- Buckley, R. (2010). *Conservation tourism*. Wallingford: CABI.
- Bushell, R. & Eagles, P.E.J. (2007). *Tourism and protected areas: benefits beyond boundaries*. UK: IUCN. <https://doi.org/10.1079/9780851990224.0000>
- Cowan, R., & Jonard, N. (2009). Knowledge portfolios and the organization of innovation networks. *Academy of Management Review*, 34(2), 320–342. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2008.0052>
- Curtis, L.F., & Hoffmann, V.E. (2009). Características determinantes de redes: Um estudo nos relacionamentos do setor hoteleiro das destinações turísticas de Gramado e Canela (RS). *Revista de Negócios*, 14(1), 48–62. <https://doi.org/10.7867/1980-4431.2009v14n1p46-62>
- Díaz, M., González, A., Henao, A., & Díaz M. (2013). *Introducción al análisis estadístico multivariado*. Barranquilla: Editorial Universidad del Norte.
- Díaz Rodríguez, P., Ruiz-Labourdette, D., Rodríguez Darias, A.J., Santana, A., Schmitz, M., & Pineda, F.D. (2010). Landscape perception of local population: relationship between ecological characteristics, local society and visitor preferences. In C.A. Brebbia & F.D. Pineda (Eds.) *Sustainable tourism IV* (pp. 309–317). Southampton: WIT Press. <https://doi.org/10.2495/st100271>
- Divisekera, S., & Nguyen, V.K. (2018). Determinants of innovation in tourism evidence from Australia. *Tourism Management*, 67, 157–167. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2018.01.010>
- Dodds, R., Graci, S.R., & Holmes, M. (2010). Does the tourist care? A comparison of tourists in Koh Phi Phi, Thailand and Gili Trawangan, Indonesia. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 18(2), 207–222. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669580903215162>
- European Commission (2001). *Promoting a European framework for Corporate Social Responsibility*. Brussels: European Commission.
- Fernandes, R., & Pinho, P. (2017). The distinctive nature of spatial development on small islands. *Progress in Planning*, 112, 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.progress.2015.08.001>

- Font, X., Walmsley, A., Cogotti, S., McCombes, L., & Häusler, N. (2012). Corporate social responsibility: the disclosure–performance gap. *Tourism Management*, 33(6), 1544–1553. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2012.02.012>
- Fox, T., Ward, H., & Howard, B. (2002). *Public sector roles in strengthening corporate social responsibility: a baseline study*. Washington DC: The World Bank.
- Garriga, E., & Melé, D. (2004). Corporate social responsibility theories: mapping the territory. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 53(1–2), 51–71. <https://doi.org/10.1023/b:busi.0000039399.90587.34>
- González-Morales, O., Álvarez-González, J.A., Sanfiel-Fumero, M.Á., & Armas-Cruz, Y. (2016). Governance, Corporate Social Responsibility and cooperation in sustainable tourist destinations: the case of the island of Fuerteventura. *Island Studies Journal*, 11(2), 561–584.
- González-Morales, O., & Álvarez González, J.A. (2010). Human capital, innovation and productivity in the hotel and restaurant sector in Mediterranean tourist countries. In F.M. Díaz Pérez (Ed.) *Competitive strategies and policies for tourism destinations: quality, innovation and promotion* (pp. 75–97). New York: Nova.
- Gowri, A. (2004). When responsibility can't do it. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 54(1), 33–50. <https://doi.org/10.1023/b:busi.0000043497.23400.00>
- Grayson, D., Rodríguez, M.A., Leman, M., Jin, Z., Slaughter, S., & Tay, S. (2008). *A new mindset for corporate sustainability*. British Telecommunications and Cisco Systems.
- Grydehøj, A., & Kelman, I. (2017). The eco-island trap: climate change mitigation and conspicuous sustainability. *Area*, 49(1), 106–113. <https://doi.org/10.1111/area.12300>
- Hellström, T. (2007). Dimensions of environmentally sustainable innovation: The structure of eco-innovation concepts. *Sustainable Development*, 15(3), 148–159. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sd.309>
- Hernández C., Fernández R., & Baptista P. (2006). *Metodología de la investigación*. D.F., México: Editorial McGraw-Hill.
- Higgins-Desbiolles, F. (2018). Sustainable tourism: sustaining tourism or something more? *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 25, 157–160. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2017.11.017>
- Hong, G. (2019). Islands of enclavisation: eco-cultural island tourism and the relational geographies of near-shore islands. *Area*, published ahead of print. <https://doi.org/10.1111/area.12521>
- Ibáñez, J. (1999). La realidad de la globalización: Procesos, factores y actores de un incipiente sistema global. *Revista de Investigaciones Políticas y Sociológicas*, 1(1), 41–61.
- Jackson, A., Boswell, K., & Davis, D. (2011). Sustainability and Triple Bottom Line Reporting – What is it all about? *International Journal of Business, Humanities and Technology*, 1(3), 55–59.
- Kelman, I., Burns, T.R., & des Johansson, N.M. (2015). Islander innovation: A research and action agenda on local responses to global issues. *Journal of Marine and Island Cultures*, 4(1), 34–41. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.imic.2015.04.001>
- Kim, Y., Brodhag, C., & Mebratu, D. (2014). Corporate social responsibility driven innovation. *Innovation: The European Journal of Social Science Research*, 27(2), 175–196. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13511610.2014.915191>
- Kuper, D. (2009). Turismo y preservación ambiental: El desarrollo turístico de península Valdés, provincia del Chubut. *Pasos. Revista de Turismo y Patrimonio Cultural*, 7(1), 85–97. <https://doi.org/10.25145/j.pasos.2009.07.007>

- Lee, M.D.P. (2011). Configuration of external influences: The combined effects of institutions and stakeholders on corporate social responsibility strategies. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 102(2), 281-298. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-011-0814-0>
- Leseure, M. (2010). Exploitation versus exploration in island economies: a brand diagnostic perspective. *The International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, 9(4), 463-479. <https://doi.org/10.1504/ijesb.2010.032405>
- Likert, R. (1932). Techniques for the measurement of attitudes. *Archives of Psychology*, 22, 5-55.
- Lin-Hi, N., & Müller, K. (2013). The CSR bottom line: Preventing corporate social irresponsibility, *Journal of Business Research*, 66(10), 1928-1936. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2013.02.015>
- London, M. (2012). CSR partnership initiatives: Opportunities for innovation and generative learning. *Organizational Dynamics*, 41(3), 220-229. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2012.03.005>
- Manente, M., Minghetti, V., & Mingotto, E. (2014). *Responsible Tourism and CSR: Assessment Systems for Sustainable Development of SMEs in Tourism*. Switzerland: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-06308-9_2
- Massukado, M.S., & Teixeira, R.M. (2007). Como cooperar em turismo? Configuração em redes para empresas turísticas. Paper presented to IV Seminário da Associação Brasileira de Pesquisa e Pós-Graduação em Turismo UAM. São Paulo, Brasil: Anais do Seminário de ANPTUR, 27 a 28 de agosto de 2007. <https://doi.org/10.7784/rbtur.v2i1.97>
- Martínez Arias, R. (1999). *El Análisis Multivariante en la Investigación Científica*. Madrid, España: La Muralla/Hespérides.
- Matías Cruz, G., & Pulido-Fernández, J.I. (2012). Dinámica relacional interorganizacional para el desarrollo turístico. Los casos de Villa Gesell y Pinamar (Argentina). *Revista de Estudios Regionales*, (94), 167-194.
- Melo Sacramento, P., & Teixeira, R.M. (2012). Redes de cooperación y relacionamiento en el sector turístico. *Estudios y Perspectivas en Turismo*, 21(6), 1481-1501.
- Merinero Rodríguez, R., & Pulido-Fernández, J.I. (2009). Desarrollo turístico y dinámica relacional. Metodología de análisis para la gestión activa de destinos turísticos. *Cuadernos de Turismo*, (23), 173-193. <https://doi.org/10.25145/j.pasos.2009.07.015>
- Muñoz Mazón, A., & Fuentes Moraleda, L. (2013). La cooperación público privada en el ámbito de la promoción de los destinos. El análisis de redes sociales como propuesta metodológica. *Cuadernos de Turismo*, (31), 199-223. <https://doi.org/10.6018/turismo.37.256221>
- Nooteboom, B., Berger, H., & Noorderhaven, N.G. (1997). Effects of trust and governance on relational risk. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 40(2), 308-338. <https://doi.org/10.2307/256885>
- Parra López, E. (2007). Determinantes estratégicos en las redes de relaciones de las empresas turísticas en Canarias. En Yanes Estévez, V., & de Saa Pérez, P. (Dir.). *Innovación en la gestión directiva ante el nuevo contexto empresarial canario* (pp.55-75). Santa Cruz de Tenerife, España: Fundación FYDE-CajaCanarias. <https://doi.org/10.4995/thesis/10251/7202>
- Pérez López, C. (2004). *Técnicas de Análisis Multivariante de Datos Aplicaciones con SPSS®*. Madrid: Pearson Educación.
- Pérez López, C. (2005). *Métodos estadísticos avanzados con SPSS*. Madrid: Thompson.

- Petridis, P., Fischer-Kowalski, M., Singh, S. J., & Noll, D. (2017). The role of science in sustainability transitions: citizen science, transformative research, and experiences from Samothraki island, Greece. *Island Studies Journal*, 12(1), 115-134. <https://doi.org/10.24043/isj.8>
- Porter, M.E., & Kramer, M.R. (2011). The big idea: Creating shared value. *Harvard Business Review*, 89(1/2), 62-77.
- Porter, M.E., & Kramer, M.R. (2006). Strategy and society: The link between Competitive Advantage and Corporate Social Responsibility. *Harvard Business Review*, 84(12), 78-92.
- Rexhepi, G., Kurtishi, S., & Bexheti, G. (2013). Corporate social responsibility (CSR) and innovation—the drivers of business growth? *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 75, 532-541. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.04.058>
- Richards, G. (2018). Cultural Tourism: A review of recent research and trends. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 36, 12-21. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2018.03.005>
- Schliep, R., & Stoll-Kleemann, S. (2010). Assessing Governance of Biosphere Reserves in Central Europe. *Land Use Policy*, 27(3), 917-927. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2009.12.005>
- Scott, T.J., & Scott, J.T. (2015). Standards and innovation: US public/private partnerships to support technology-based economic growth. *Economics of Innovation and New Technology*, 24(5), 457-489. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10438599.2014.988516>
- Seetanah, B. (2010). Assessing the Dynamic Economic Impact of Tourism for Island Economies. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 38(1), 291-308. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2010.08.009>
- Solnet, D.J., Ford, R.C., Robinson, R.N.S., Ritchie, B.W., & Olsen, M. (2014). Modeling locational factors for tourism employment. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 45, 30-45. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2013.11.005>
- Sufrauj, S. (2011). Islandness and Remoteness as Resources: Evidence from the tourism performance of Small Remote Island Economies (SRIES). *European Journal of Tourism, Hospitality and Recreation*, 2(1), 19-41.
- Teixeira, R.M. (2012). Redes de cooperação em Turismo: Um estudo nas pequenas empresas hoteleiras em Curitiba, Paraná. *PASOS*, 10(3), 407-416.
- Teixeira, R.M., Cunha, A.R.S., & Silva, M.R. (2006). Redes de relacionamento e cooperação interorganizacional em hotéis de pequeno porte em Curitiba. Curitiba, Brasil: Anais do Seminário Internacional de Turismo. <https://doi.org/10.1590/s1415-65552004000100006>
- Tiago, T., Faria, S.D., Cogumbreiro, J.L., Couto, J.P., & Tiago, F. (2016). Different shades of green on small islands. *Island Studies Journal*, 11(2), 601-618.
- Vidon, E.S., & Rickly, J.M. (2018). Alienation and anxiety in tourism motivation. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 69, 65-75. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2018.02.001>
- Wagner, M., & Llerena, P. (2011). Eco-innovation through integration, regulation and cooperation: comparative insights from case studies in three manufacturing sectors. *Industry and Innovation*, 18(8), 747-764. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13662716.2011.621744>
- Weaver, D.B. (2017). Core-periphery relationships and the sustainability paradox of small island tourism. *Tourism Recreation Research*, 42(1), 11-21. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02508281.2016.1228559>

- Xie, L., Flynn, A., Tan-Mullins, M., & Cheshmehzangi, A. (2019). The making and remaking of ecological space in China: The political ecology of Chongming Eco-Island. *Political Geography*, 69, 89-102. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2018.12.012>
- Zach, F. (2013). Collaboration for innovation in tourism organizations: Leadership support, innovation formality and communication. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 40(3), 271-290. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1096348013495694>
- Zach, F., & Hill, T. (2017) Network, knowledge and relationship impacts on innovation in tourism destinations. *Tourism Management*, 62, 196-207. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2017.04.001>

Appendix 1: Questionnaire on CSR in tourism accommodation in Fuerteventura and response percentages.

1	2	3	4	5	Value from 1 to 5 the following questions (value 1 not at all important, value 5 very important)
P.1. Social Responsibility implies the commitment of a company to the socio-economic and environmental development of its surrounding					
9.6	17.0	20.2	34.0	19.1	P.1.1) Fuerteventura being a Biosphere Reserve has made your establishment give more importance to Social Responsibility
10.6	12.8	26.6	14.9	35.1	P.1.2) Belonging to the Biosphere Reserve has benefited your establishment
P.2. To what degree do the following socially responsible actions apply in your establishment?					
31.9	7.4	23.4	26.6	10.6	P.2.1) training activities open to people living in the immediate environment
25.5	10.6	24.5	21.3	18.1	P.2.2) initiatives aimed at protected species
4.3	7.4	34.0	22.3	31.9	P.2.3) support for social, cultural and sports activities in your community
13.8	5.3	28.7	23.4	28.7	P.2.4) help to preserve the cultural heritage of your locality
0.0	0.0	2.1	23.4	74.5	P.2.5) attention to customer satisfaction
0.0	0.0	2.1	29.8	68.1	P.2.6) prevention of occupational risks
19.1	17.0	37.2	14.9	11.7	P.2.7) services to employees (day-care centers, cafeteria, gym, etc.)
1.1	4.3	28.7	16.0	50.0	P.2.8) initiatives aimed at equal opportunities (due to sex, disability, etc.)
2.1	0.0	8.5	21.3	68.1	P.2.9) security in the products and services offered
3.2	3.2	20.2	22.3	51.1	P.2.10) importance of the ethical and social aspects of your products and/or services
5.3	4.3	10.6	39.4	40.4	P.2.11) buy products and / or services in the local market
2.1	6.4	29.8	25.5	36.2	P.2.12) your establishment integrates social responsibility in its activities
P.3. Indicate to what extent the following environmental protection actions are applied in your establishment					
8.5	10.6	23.4	28.7	28.7	P.3.1) there is a formalized environmental policy (definition of objectives and action plans, assignment of functions and responsibilities, control of results, etc.)
24.5	8.5	13.8	27.7	25.5	P.3.2) there is a management system according to some standard (ISO 14000, EMAS,.)
5.3	9.6	11.7	37.2	36.2	P.3.3) environmental criteria are taken into account when selecting suppliers and / or collaborators (policy of environmentally friendly supplies)
1.1	4.3	9.6	31.9	53.2	P.3.4) reduce the consumption of natural resources (water, energy, etc.)
1.1	4.3	1.1	31.9	61.7	P.3.5) reduce the use of polluting and / or hazardous substances
1.1	3.2	7.4	31.9	56.4	P.3.6) reduce emissions, discharges and generation of waste
0.0	4.3	20.2	19.1	56.4	P.3.7) separation, recycling and / or reuse of waste
0.0	1.1	7.4	26.6	64.9	P.3.8) compliance with environmental legislation
6.4	9.6	7.4	36.2	40.4	P.3.9) training and motivation of personnel in environmental matters
17.0	14.9	10.6	20.2	37.2	P.3.10) communication to customers, suppliers, distributors, shareholders, administration and other influencers of the environmental protection actions of the establishment
22.3	13.8	23.4	22.3	18.1	P.3.11)) other environmental marketing actions
P.4. Indicate the degree of collaboration that you have with your closest interlocutors					
29.8	21.3	16.0	23.4	9.6	P.4.1) Autonomous Regions
31.9	11.7	22.3	24.5	9.6	P.4.2) Island Council
29.8	7.4	20.2	30.9	11.7	P.4.3) Town Hall
31.9	18.1	14.9	25.5	9.6	P.4.4) Business Associations
39.4	22.3	17.0	14.9	6.4	P.4.5) Citizens Associations, NGOs, Red Cross, etc.
43.6	25.5	12.8	16.0	2.1	P.4.6) Biosphere Reserve Councils
17.0	16.0	9.6	25.5	31.9	P.4.7) Business customers (tour-operators, agencies, ...)
16.0	19.1	10.6	31.9	22.3	P.4.8) Suppliers
40.4	27.7	17.0	9.6	5.3	P.4.9) Universities
P.5. What actions does your establishment carry out in collaboration with the public sector?					
27.7	16.0	28.7	14.9	12.8	P.5.1) Participate in the tourist planning of Fuerteventura
26.6	13.8	25.5	22.3	11.7	P.5.2) Attend regular meetings with the public sector

33.0	5.3	27.7	14.9	19.1	P.5.3) Disseminate tourist products and / or services
28.7	6.4	12.8	21.3	30.9	P.5.4) Invest in the tourism sector
30.9	12.8	16.0	25.5	14.9	P.5.5) Carry out training activities in the tourism sector
55.3	12.8	17.0	10.6	4.3	P.5.6) Advise from a scientific-technological point of view
41.5	13.8	6.4	14.9	23.4	P.5.7) Carry out socio-environmental sustainability actions
43.6	8.5	10.6	24.5	12.8	P.5.8) Share infrastructure for events
P.6. Assess your degree of agreement with the following statements					
10.6	6.4	33.0	27.7	22.3	P.6.1) It is difficult for our establishment to protect the environment and meet economic-financial objectives at the same time.
16.0	8.5	27.7	43.6	4.3	P.6.2) For the time being, the socio-environmental commitment of our establishment is limited to compliance with the legislation
10.6	3.2	19.1	21.3	45.7	P.6.3) Social-environmental protection constitutes a fundamental source of value for our establishment (image, reputation, etc.)
13.8	3.2	41.5	22.3	19.1	P.6.4) Our establishment has a social and environmental commitment superior to the average of its sector
10.6	6.4	33.0	27.7	22.3	P.6.5) The environmental protection allows to increase the economic results of the establishment
P.7. Rate your degree of agreement with the following statements regarding your main suppliers and customers					
14.9	4.3	35.1	31.9	12.8	P.7.1) My establishment has a positive attitude towards carrying out joint social-environmental responsible activities with our main supplier/s
18.1	4.3	34.0	26.6	17.0	P.7.2) My establishment has established minimum standards of social-environmental responsibility obligatory to my main supplier/s if they want to work with us
19.1	13.8	29.8	27.7	9.6	P.7.3) My establishment cooperates with our main supplier/s to comply with social-environmental responsibility objectives
22.3	5.3	8.5	34.0	29.8	P.7.4) My establishment has a positive attitude towards carrying out joint activities of environmental social responsibility with our main customer – companies (tour operators, agencies, ...)
24.5	9.6	18.1	29.8	18.1	P.7.5) Our main customer –companies (tour operators, agencies, ...) have imposed minimum standards of social-environmental responsibility that we are required to meet in order to work with them
22.3	5.3	20.2	30.9	21.3	P.7.6) My establishment cooperates with its main companies/customers(tour operators, agencies, ...) to comply with social-environmental responsibility objectives
P.8. In the last 3 years, to what extent has your establishment carried out any of the following innovation activities					
13.8	2.1	9.6	33.0	41.5	P.8.1) Introduced new products or services
11.7	0.0	8.5	31.9	47.9	P.8.2) Improved existing ones
11.7	0.0	18.1	27.7	42.6	P.8.3) Improved procedures in provision of services
19.1	3.2	16.0	27.7	34.0	P.8.4) New production processes
28.7	2.1	12.8	25.5	30.9	P.8.5) New management systems
16.0	3.2	9.6	29.8	41.5	P.8.6) New business or marketing systems
21.3	2.1	13.8	34.0	28.7	P.8.7) New ways of organizing work
P.9. In the last 3 years, to what extent has your establishment carried out any of the following innovation activities:					
18.1	3.2	7.4	14.9	56.4	P.9.1) The continuous training of the personnel
24.5	6.4	21.3	25.5	22.3	P.9.2) Carrying out innovation projects
26.6	4.3	30.9	11.7	26.6	P.9.3) Marketing consultancy contracts
26.6	8.5	25.5	14.9	24.5	P.9.4) Other consultancy contracts
P.10. To what extent does your establishment use technologies to:					
18.1	10.6	22.3	29.8	19.1	P.10.1) Diversify energy resources
12.8	7.4	28.7	23.4	27.7	P.10.2) Make a more efficient use of energy
29.8	3.2	18.1	23.4	25.5	P.10.3) Use water treatment and reuse mechanisms