Tourism BSR in the Western Cape communities as a strategy for sustainable development

L.A Tseane-Gumbi
Geography and Tourism
Walter Sisulu University, East London, 5201, South Africa
Tel: 0027 043 7029294, (cell) 0723469651
E-mail: ltseane@wsu.ac.za

Abstract

Sustainable development ensures that development projects and activities are community driven to extend the consumption of resources to future generations. The purpose of this study was to evaluate the extent at which tourism businesses in the Western Cape embrace Business Social Responsibility (BSR) as a strategy to achieve sustainable tourism development in communities. Different types of tourism businesses, 307 in total, were surveyed using stratified sampling. Cluster sampling was also applied to identify geographical regions, while purposive sampling was used to select employees. Government tourism departments and community organisations were identified as the key informants. Research data was analysed using both qualitative and quantitative techniques. The research findings were analysed and interpreted using neo-liberalism and stakeholder frameworks. The findings show that tourism businesses tend to support those communities directly affected by their operations rather than the entire community, irrespective of whether there is greater need for business intervention in other communities. Moreover, tourism businesses are involved in areas and activities that also benefit them. It is recommended that in addition to Broad-Based Black Economic Empowerment (B-BBEE), expanded public work programme (EPWPs) and community development programmes (CDP)s be encouraged in tourism BSR initiatives as they focus more on community empowerment.

Key words: Business, social responsibility, community development, sustainable development, tourism.

Introduction

Sharp (2006) mentions the dominance of international and national agencies in the development of tourism during the late 1990s. These agencies organised funding and elite personnel who were moved from one place to another, bringing a uniform pattern of development across Africa. Today, multinational corporations (MNCs) take control and have the power to influence government development policies (Heath, 2001). Moreover, Hannam (2002) asserts that the political elite use political power to influence tourism development. In many cases, tourism development leads to the abuse of human rights (Scott, 2011). Hence, geographers analyse tourism based on its effect on the environment and society where tourism development occurs (Mazilu, 2011). Geographers are more concerned with tourism infrastructure and the people who shape socio-economic places.

In the case of South Africa the sustainability of the tourism development is questionable. Although major tourism businesses are few in numbers in the country, they control and manage the tourism resources (Tassiopoulos, 2009).These tourism development agents are based locally, whereas others, such as multinational corporations and international funding agencies, operate from abroad. They exercise different powers on tourism development. The government is responsible for laws and regulations, while the tourism businesses have power through wealth, information and technology. Mason (2007) believes that tourism businesses are centred on profitability, with other considerations taking second place. The

argument in this study is supported by Mason (2007) that tourism businesses need to justify their existence to communities while making profit. The citizen groups have power through local participation, but their objectives differ (Inskeep, 1991; Sillignakis, 2003; Mason, 2007; Golja & Nižić 2010; Eja, Otu, Ewa & Ndomah 2011). Eja *et al.* (2011) are of the view that tourism businesses should be involved in the development and promotion of tourism. Yet in developing countries, multinational and big tourism businesses have been criticised for causing serious problems in the communities, which include economic, social, political and environmental issues (Mason, 2007). Two main factors need to be considered in the development of tourism: whether to approve the integrated or enclave model of tourism development. The integrated development model offers more community participation than the enclave model does. In the current study the researcher argues that tourism BSR model could assist developers, policy makers and tourism business to achieve an integrated tourism development.

The location of tourist sites, the existence of tourism infrastructure and patterns in tourism production and consumption also affect tourism development (Tseane-Gumbi, 2015). Cornelissen (2005) argues that the travelling pattern of tourists at a destination, including the interfacing that takes place between residents and locals, determines the type of tourism development in an area and, most importantly, the potential for revenue creation for tourism businesses and locals. In other words, if the spatial concentration of tourism production and consumption occurs in local areas, the effects of tourism development on locals are concentrated. The structural and spatial aspects of tourism are often overlooked in formulating tourism development policy. Hence, the negative effects of tourism exceed the positive effects at the destination. In South Africa, most of tourism businesses are located in urban areas and few lie in peripheral zones, such as townships and rural areas. If they are located in peripheral areas, enclave development occurs, which usually excludes local communities from the economic cycles of businesses. It was within this context that the current study was initiated in order to pursue tourism businesses to consider the needs of both primary and secondary tourism stakeholders, with a specific focus on communities.

Conceptual framework

According to Bruckmayer (2010) and Giampiccoli and Mtapuri (2014), liberalised countries are expected to experience economic growth felt even by the poorest of the poor through the economic trickle-down concept. The argument advanced in this study is that tourism businesses can only justify their existence through BSR activities by broadening their impacts to reach the marginalised and poor communities. Shahzad and Sillanpaa (2013) indicate that there is strong relationship between BSR implementation and stakeholder theory because it is easy for tourism businesses to meet their economic goals if they meet the stakeholders' needs through BSR investment.

Methodology

Research design or type

The study has a qualitative component because it endeavours to establish how stakeholders, particularly communities in the tourism industry benefit from the tourism BSR activities and implementation. The researcher applied an integrated and mixed approach consisting of both qualitative and quantitative components.

Population and sampling aspects of the study

The survey population for the study was drawn from the tourism businesses registered with Western Cape Investment and Trade Promotion Agency (Wesgro), the City of Cape Town

Tourism Department, Cape Town Tourism and the Cape Winelands District Municipality, as indicated in Table 1.

Table 1: Total number of registered tourism businesses in the two surveyed municipalities (Wesgro, 2010)

Total number of registered tourism businesses in the two surveyed municipalities (N =1449)			
City of Cape Town Municipality		**Cape Winelands District Municipality**	
Accommodation	297	*Accommodation*	114
-Backpackers and self-catering	95	-B&Bs	53
-Hotels	77	-Lodges	25
-Guest houses	52	-Hotels	20
-B&Bs	45	-Guest houses	12
-Lodges	28	Attractions, including estate farms	284
Tour operators	82	Travel agencies	43
Travel agencies	75	Tour operators	27
Attractions	42	Car rentals	8
Destination marketing organisations	49		
Car rentals	21		
TOTAL	**863**		**586**

Additionally, the two different types of key informants of the study were surveyed. The first key informant was community organisations, of which ten were targeted. The second key informant was government tourism departments, one at provincial and two at local government level, and two destination-marketing agencies. A total of five questionnaires were targeted from government officials, as indicated in Table 2.

Table 2: Key informants used in the study: Community organisation members and government officials (Based on fieldwork)

Key informants (N= 15)	
Community organisations	10
Government tourism departments	5
Total = 15	

Sampling methods

This study incorporated the stratified sampling method to group the tourism businesses into different categories and further according to regions, such as cities, towns, suburbs and townships. Accommodation was divided into 77 hotels and 28 lodges. The researcher identified 82 tour operators, 75 travel agencies, 42 attractions, 49 destination-marketing organisations and 21 car rental agencies registered within the City of Cape Town Municipality. The Cape Winelands District Municipality included 20 hotels, 204 attractions including estate farms, 43 travel agencies, 27 tour operators and 8 car rental agencies. Bed and Breakfasts, backpackers, self-caterings and guest houses were omitted in this study. The cluster sampling method was used because the tourism businesses under study were geographically diverse. The target tourism businesses were clustered in cities, towns, suburbs and townships. The most popular tourist cities, towns, suburbs and townships were selected. Tourists visit popular cities and towns, including the suburbs and townships, or the areas in which popular natural, socio-cultural and man-made attractions are located, which results in a high density of tourism businesses in these areas. The researcher surveyed the tourism businesses situated at or near these popular tourist destinations.

This also assisted the researcher in analysing the impact of the geographical spatial distribution of tourism business on the implementation of BSR, and the development of tourism in the province was analysed through the application of cluster sampling. Blanche,

Blanche, Durrheim and Painter (2011) explain that purposive sampling is where the researcher selects cases for theoretical reasons. The researcher applied purposive sampling to place greater emphasis on the quality rather than quantity of information. Relevant managers and general employees responsible for BSR in tourism businesses were identified for the current study. The implementation of BSR requires managers to design and endorse the BSR policies for the company, and certain employees are tasked with the implementation of BSR activities. In this study, one manager or owner and two employees for every tourism businesses were targeted.

Data Analysis

The analysis was done using computer software, the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS), to assist the researcher in generating frequencies, such as the total number of accommodation establishments.

Results

Identification of BSR activities in surveyed tourism businesses

According to Taru and Gukurume (2013), local communities can depend on tourism businesses for skills training, jobs and incomes. The respondents were asked to identify their concrete tourism BSR activities. Table 3 contains the findings by setting out the BSR activity choices provided. Table 3 shows that donations (62.3%) and education and training (56.6%) were the main BSR activities mentioned by more than half of the respondents. Of the respondents, 34.1% identified employment opportunities, 30.3% sponsorship, volunteerism work, 16.4% and 13.5% cash benefits. Of the remaining respondents, less than 10% highlighted the development of public facilities, infrastructural development, the provision of facilities and the promotion of information technology, respectively.

Table 3: Tourism BSR activities in which tourism business are engaged

BSR activities in which businesses are engaged (Multiple responses permitted) (N = 452, in %)			
Donations	62.3	Developing public facilities	7.7
Education and training	56.6	Local infrastructure development	6.6
Employment opportunities	34.1	Provision of facilities	6.2
Sponsorship	30.3	Community development programme	5.3
Volunteer work	16.4	Promoting ICT	2.4
Discounting prices	14.2	Do not know	1.5
Cash	13.5		
Total = 257.1			

Distribution of tourism businesses surveyed

Similarly the distribution of the surveyed tourism businesses was established to identify tourism businesses locations. Table 4 indicates the spatial distribution of the surveyed tourism businesses in the City of Cape Town Municipality (COCT) and Cape Winelands District Municipality (CWDM). The findings show that the surveyed tourism businesses were more concentrated in the COCT Municipality (80.7%). The CWD Municipality contained only 19.3% of these tourism businesses. The Cape Town Central Business District (CBD) has the highest percentage of tourism businesses (35.2%), followed by the Victoria and Alfred Waterfront (8.4%). Stellenbosch contained 7.7% of the surveyed tourism businesses, Green Point 6.2% and the remaining areas less than 5%.

Table 4: Distribution of tourism businesses surveyed (Based on fieldwork)

Spatial distribution of tourism businesses surveyed (Multiple responses permitted) (N = 452, in %)								
Area & municipality		**%**	**Area & municipality**		**%**	**Area & municipality**		**%**
City Centre	COCT	35.2	Newlands	COCT	0.9	Gordon's Bay	COCT	0.4
Waterfront	COCT	8.4	Observatory	COCT	0.9	Westlake	COCT	0.4
Stellenbosch	CWDM	7.7	St James	COCT	0.9	Winelands	CWDM	0.4
Green Point	COCT	6.2	Strand	COCT	0.9	Robertson Valley	CWDM	0.4
Paarl	CWDM	4.2	Blouberg	COCT	0.9	Cape wine farm	CWDM	0.4
Simon's Town	COCT	4.0	Bonnievale	CWDM	0.9	Witzenberg	CWDM	0.2
Franschoek	CWDM	3.3	Camps Bay	COCT	0.9	Granger Bay	COCT	0.2
Gardens	COCT	3.1	Khayelitsha	COCT	0.8	Maitland	COCT	0.2
Claremont	COCT	2.7	Bellville	COCT	0.7	Worcester	CWDM	0.2
Seapoint	COCT	2.7	Wellington	COCT	0.7	Somerset West	COCT	0.2
Bantry Bay	COCT	1.8	Century City	COCT	0.7	Parrow	COCT	0.2
Airport	COCT	1.5	Koo Valley	CWDM	0.7	Plumstead	COCT	0.2
Milnerton	COCT	1.5	COCT	COCT	0.6	Rondebosch	COCT	0.2
Table View	COCT	1.5	Chapman's Peak	COCT	0.4	Constantia	COCT	0.2
Montague	CWDM	0.9	Fish Hoek	COCT	0.4	Crawford	COCT	0.2
COCT TOTAL = 80.7%, CWD TOTAL = 19.3%								

Distribution of tourism BSR stakeholders by province

The tourism business investments focus lies mainly where tourist activities are most intense (Cornelissen, 2005). Provinces, towns, suburbs and townships were used to group the locations of the BSR stakeholders against the surveyed tourism businesses to assess this and the results are presented in Table 5. The majority (96%) indicated the Western Cape, 69% did not know, 2.1% stated KwaZulu-Natal, and 1.6% reported all nine provinces and Gauteng respectively. The Eastern Cape, Mpumalanga and Northern Cape were identified by 0.5% respectively.

Table 5: Distribution of tourism BSR stakeholders by province

BSR stakeholders' location: Province (Multiple responses permitted) (N = 190, in %)			
Western Cape	96	Limpopo	1.0
Do not know	69	Eastern Cape	0.5
KwaZulu-Natal	2.1	Mpumalanga	0.5
All provinces	1.6	Northern Cape	0.5
Gauteng	1.6		
Total = 172.8			

Distribution of tourism BSR stakeholders by towns and suburbs

The respondents were asked to indicate the towns and suburbs in which their BSR stakeholders reside. The majority (81%) were unaware, 38% cited Cape Town and 7.6% mentioned Stellenbosch. Respondents further identified Simon's Town (4.7%), Paarl, Bellville and Hout Bay (3.8% respectively) and Heldernburg (2.9%). Following this were five areas: Bo-Kaap, Strand, Fish Hoek, Franschhoek, Groot Drakenstein and Claremont with 1.9% each and 1% identified the remaining areas (Table 6).

Table 6: Distribution of tourism BSR stakeholders by towns and suburbs

BSR stakeholders' location: Towns and suburbs (Multiple responses permitted) (N = 452, in %)					
Area	**%**	**Name**	**%**	**Area**	**%**
Do not know	81	Fish Hoek	1.9	Hermanus	1.0
Cape Town (CBD)	38	Franschhoek	1.9	Montagu and Ashton	1.0

Stellenbosch	7.6	Groot Drakenstein	1.9	Polokwane and Pietermaritzburg	1.0
Simon's Town	4.7	Claremont	1.9	St James	1.0
Paarl	3.8	Bantry Bay	1.0	Table View	1.0
Bellville	3.8	Malmesbury	1.0	Worcester	1.0
Hout Bay	3.8	Drakenstein	1.0	Pietermaritzburg	1.0
Heldernburg	2.9	Green Point	1.0	Aston	1.0
Bo-Kaap	1.9	George	1.0	Belmont	1.0
Strand	1.9	Kalk Bay	1.0		
Total = 172					

Distribution of tourism BSR stakeholders by townships

During the apartheid era, most communities now living in the townships were left incapacitated in skills development, land ownership and housing provision. The business representatives were asked to identify their BSR stakeholder locations in these areas (see Table 7). Most (80%) did not know, while 26% indicated Khayelitsha. Langa was identified by 15.2%, Mitchell's Plain by 10.9%, Phillipi and Gugulethu by 8.7% each, Dunoon by 6.5% and Noordhoek Township by 4.3%. The remaining areas, namely Delft, Soweto and Nyanga, were identified by 2.1% each.

Table: 7: Distribution of tourism BSR stakeholders by townships

BSR stakeholders' location: Townships (Multiple responses permitted) (N = 46, in %)			
Do not know	80	Dunoon	6.5
Khayelitsha	26	Noordhoek Township	4.3
Langa	15.2	Delft	2.1
Mitchell's Plain	10.9	Soweto	2.1
Phillipi	8.7	Nyanga	2.1
Gugulethu	8.7		
Total = 166.6			

Distribution of tourism BSR stakeholders outside South Africa

A follow-up question was constructed to establish whether the tourism businesses in the province have BSR stakeholders outside the country. The majority (98.7%) were unsure. A percentage (16.6%) indicated other countries, such as the United States and Canada, Europe, universities abroad and some international foundations. African countries followed, with Botswana, Namibia, Zimbabwe and Rwanda having the same percentage (16.6%), respectively (Table 8).

Table 8: Distribution of tourism BSR stakeholders outside South Africa

BSR stakeholders' location: Outside South Africa (Multiple responses permitted) (N = 6, in %)			
Not sure	98.7	Namibia	16.6
America	16.6	Zimbabwe	16.6
International foundations	16.6	Rwanda	16.6
Botswana	16.6		
Total = 198.3			

Community perception of tourism BSR in the WC tourism industry

Community organisations were also identified to gather their views and opinions in relation to BSR implementation in the Western Cape. Fig (2005) states that there is a general perception of weak community support from South African tourism businesses. Moreover, there is a significant gap between what South African tourism businesses claim and their practices (King Report I, 2002; Fig, 2005). Three areas (Langa, Gugulethu and Khayelitsha)

were selected for identifying the nature of the tourism industry's BSR activities within communities living in informal settlements.

As indicated in Table 9, community movements had the greatest support. Additionally, 80% of the respondents were familiar with the concept of BSR. Most relationships that exist between community organisations and tourism businesses are partnerships (46.8%), and communities identified the most common BSR activity as volunteerism (66.7%). Financial constraints were the main challenge, while the Department of Social Works and Department of Corrections were mentioned as important role players.

Table 9: Community perception of tourism BSR in the WC tourism industry

Community perception of tourism BSR in the Western Cape tourism industry				
Community organisations by area	• Langa • Gugulethu	86.6 6.7	Khayelitsha	6.7
Type of community organisations	• Community movement • Children's shelter • Development forum • Tourism forum	20.1 13.3 13.3 13.3	• Old age home • Orphanage • Educare centre • Home for disabled	13.3 13.3 6.7 6.7
Type of relationship with the tourism industry (multiple responses permitted)	• Partnership • Donor	46.8 26.7	Public Private Partnership Not sure	20 6.5
BSR activities received from the industry (multiple responses permitted)	• Receiving volunteers • Education and training • Donations • Employment • Provision of facilities	66.7 53.3 26.7 20 13.2	• Local infrastructure development • Cash • Sponsorship	13.3 - -
Impacts of BSR initiatives on the organisation	• Not sure • Counselling services improves the lives of children • Able to get a job through capacity building • Do not know • Government intervention	33.3 13.4 13.4 13.1 6.7	• Improved performance of one employee who was given a house • Job creation • Able to focus on the core business without worrying about food	6.7 6.7 6.7
Tourism government departments involve in BSR	• None • Social Development	80 13.3	• Correctional Services	6.7
Tourism businesses' level of involvement in BSR	• Excellent • Good	73.3 13.3	• Average • Poor	6.7 6.7
Overall perception of community organisations (multiple responses permitted)	• BSR helps in volunteer activities • BSR helps in increasing the tourism business' profits • BSR improves the transfer of knowledge and direct support of education • Donations are important for my community and organisation • Education and training • BSR activities have impacted positively on my community or organisation	60 53.3 53.3 53.3 53.3 46.7	• Many tourism businesses are becoming key providers of aid to civil society • Tourism businesses provide funding for repairs and maintenance of community facilities • Tourism businesses provide entry level employment • Employment opportunities • Provision of facilities • Local infrastructure • Donations • Cash • Sponsorship	46.7 46.7 40 20 13.3 13.3 13.3 - -
Challenges the community organisations face (Multiple responses permitted)	• Financial constraints • Overcrowding • Political instability in the provinces • Community insisting to	40.7 20.1 13.4	• Lack of capacity building • Lack of food • Lack of trust from the adopted children • Lack of ventilation in the	6.7 6.7 6.7 6.7

	use and live in the centre due to lack of houses	13.4	buildings	
Solutions to mentioned challenges (multiple responses permitted)	• Big businesses should be involved	20.1	• Donations for building materials	6.7
	• The management of organisations should not be politicised	20.1	• More funding • Promote private public partnership	6.7 6.7
	• Government should intervene	13.3	• Get support from National Lottery	6.7
	• Not responded	13	• Ventilator installation in the building containers	6.7

Moreover, the highest percentage, 33.3% was not sure of the extent of impact the tourism business have on the community, while 13.4% mention that counselling services offered by these tourism businesses improves the lives of children in the area. In relation to challenges that community organisations faces, respondents, 20.1%, indicated that big businesses should be involved in various BSR initiatives. The findings in Table 10 below shows a lack of government intervention in providing a conducive environment for BSR implementation in the province.

Table 10: Government's involvement in Western Cape tourism BSR

Government's involvement in Western Cape tourism BSR (N = 5)				
Western Cape tourism government departments and agencies	• Province: Economic Development & Tourism • COCT: Tourism Development	20 40	• Cape Winelands District Municipality • Cape Town Tourism	20 20
Ways to support BSR ideas (Multiple responses permitted)	• Implementing business support initiatives • Supporting tourism events (R30 000)	20 20	• Selection of one NGO once a year and supporting it • Hosting awareness workshop • Initiated Responsible Tourism	20 20 20
Dissemination of BSR	• Yes	60	• No	40
Ways of disseminating BSR ideas	• Labelling • Toolkits • Campaign	- 60 20	• Guidelines • Naming poor performance	20 -
Type of tourism businesses that support BSR (Multiple responses permitted)	• Accommodation • Attractions • Car rental agencies	80 66.7 60	• Travel agencies • Tour operators • Airlines	40 20 20
Total number of tourism businesses supported (Multiple responses permitted)	• Accommodation • Car rental agencies • Attractions	75 40 20	• Tour operators • Airlines • Travel agencies	20 - -
Types of incentives provided to identified tourism businesses to ensure sustainable BSR development (Multiple responses permitted)	• Provide funding for research • Building capacity for SMMEs • Training and skills development • Tax exemptions	60 40 40 20	• Award schemes • Inclusion of information and reports on website • Sponsorship guidelines that support BSR	- - 20
Enforcing partnership with the tourism industry	• Do not know	60 -	• Charter to commit to responsible tourism	20

	• Facilitator • Moderator • Initiator	- -	signed by FEDHASA, SATSA, SAACI, CTT, COCT • Through implementation of agreed intervention on SLA/MOU	 20
Ensuring competency in the implementation of the BSR (Multiple responses permitted)	• Aligning BSR within the existing government function • Do not know • Encouraging big businesses to mentor small ones	60 40 20	• Appointment of a lead government agency • Establishing a newly government function	- -
Occurrences of multi-stakeholder dialogues (Multiple responses permitted)	• Every quarter • Annually • Depend on the project	50 50 20	• Every semester • Every five year	- -
Issues that are normally discussed in your various multi-stakeholder dialogues (Multiple responses permitted)	• Environment • Poverty reduction • Infrastructure	80 40 40	• Education • Corruption issues • Safety • Access to health services	40 20 20 -
Mobilise financial resources for BSR	• No	100		
Other resources provided to the industry to promote BSR	• Access to information • None	20 20	• Provision of toolkits and awareness workshop • Marketing platform • N/A	20 20 20
Implementation of soft law (non- regulatory) intervention	• N/A • UN Global Compact • Responsible investment	60 - 20	• OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprise • Responsible tourism policy	- 20
Guidelines for BSR reporting exists	• Yes • No	80 20		
Details on BSR reporting guidelines	• N/A • Local government tool kits provide it	80 20		
Tourism industry BSR reporting procedure	• No current reporting procedures • Do not know	40 20	• Report annually • Through project indicators	20 20
BSR is included in the government department or agency's procurement policy	• Yes • No	60 40		
Sanctions imposed on the tourism businesses that do not comply with BSR policies	• None	100		
BSR activities that the government department or agency supported	• B-BBEE • Community forum • International tourism week	20 20 20	• Tourism Community Trust • None	20 20
Government's expectations of successful BSR implementation	• Comply with the policies and guidelines and full commitment • Mentor emerging and small businesses •	20 20	• Clear BSR expectations • Provide practical implementation workshop, tax breaks, financial incentives • Commit and start small	20 20 20
Evaluating the impact of tourism industry BSR	• No measurement	80	• Monitoring industry growth against set	20

implementation			targets and statistics		
Challenges of implementing BSR	• Financial challenges • Lack of information and commitment • Bureaucracy, red tape	20 20 20	• Government can only encourage businesses to adapt • To continue business investment	20 20	
Solutions to the mentioned BSR challenges	• Clear guidelines and policy from government • Government incentives	20 20	• Communication and dialogue • Working closely with all stakeholders • None	20 20 20	
Relevant department/section responsible for BSR implementation	• None • Industry services • Destination development	60 20 20			

Discussion

The findings in Table 3 reflect Dzansi and Pretorius's (2009) view that most community benefits derived from BSR are in the form of charitable contributions, employee volunteer programmes, education and local employment projects, including product safety, support for community organisations and disaster relief. They argue that donations by tourism businesses tend to dominate the pro-poor element of tourism BSR activities. This is not surprising because the results in Table 10 shows that Western Cape government prioritises environmental issues over social issues. In Africa and other developing countries, philanthropy appears second on the BSR pyramid. There is a need for African governments' intervention to ensure sustainable BSR activities which leads to community empowerment rather than dependency as it is case projected by the findings in Table 3. The selection of tourism BSR stakeholders indicated in Table 5, Table 6, and Table 7 show unbalanced spatial distribution of BSR stakeholders in the Province and the motive behind the selection of BSR stakeholders is questionable. The results in Table 5 indicate that 96 per cent of the BSR stakeholders identified by tourism businesses are located in the Western Cape Province. Although these results indicate a positive effect, 92 per cent of the tourism businesses are within the City of Cape Town due to the abundance of tourism attractions in the area. As indicated in Table 6, a high percentage of the tourism businesses assist the stakeholders residing in the Cape Town and Stellenbosch regions. Benefit decreases as one moves out of these nodes. Zmyslony (2011) commented on the phenomenon of localised tourism business benefits, stating that only the biggest, most attractive and powerful cities usually fully benefit from the globalisation processes associated with tourism. Cape Town, for example, is the designated legislative capital of South Africa (where parliament sits for the meantime as plans are underfoot to move it to Pretoria), and is rated one of the most attractive cities in the world. Nonetheless, although minimal, tourism BSR stakeholders were also found outside South Africa. The findings show that some of the tourism businesses have footprints in other African countries due to globalisation. Table 8 provides the relevant information on this aspect of the study.

Some of the organisations surveyed were based in Langa, as depicted in Table 9. The popularity of this township is due to its proximity to the City of Cape Town. Additionally, some of the organisations surveyed were from Khayelitsha Township, and Mitchell's Plain and Soweto were also identified by surveyed tourism businesses (see Table 7). These are the most popular townships in the country, and they have rich cultural and heritage resources. Tourism businesses tend to support those communities directly affected by their operations rather than the entire community, irrespective of whether there is greater need for

their intervention in other communities. Hence, the motivations behind tourism BSR activities are questioned in this study. Tourism businesses are involved in areas and activities that also benefit them. For example, they prioritise the areas in which tourism resources are abundant such as Cape Town Metro, Stellenbosch towns, Langa Township as shown in Table 6. This causes tension between the hosts and other communities. The aim is to comfort communities rather than encourage sustainable projects. Table 10 indicates lack of government intervention in evaluating tourism BSR activities in the area, while there is no relevant department dealing with tourism BSR activities. The government is also evidently biased towards accommodation establishments. These types of tourism businesses are usually located in urban areas.

In South Africa, townships are characterised by high levels of poverty, and industries like tourism are not bringing about significant change. In the Western Cape, tourism MNCs shows little interest in townships. It is difficult to attract large tourism companies to townships where infrastructure is lacking and security is problematic. Meanwhile, tourism businesses feel that infrastructure development and security is the government's function. Table 10 shows little support from government in relation of infrastructure development in these areas to enhance BSR implementation. If tourism businesses become involved in township activities, they do so due to pressure from international customers.

Conclusion and recommendations

The current lack of a fair spatial distribution of tourism BSR initiatives in the Western Cape Province hinders the sustainable development of tourism in the area. Government should increase its facilitation of meetings and multi-stakeholder dialogues to strengthen partnerships between tourism stakeholders and tourism businesses. Local governments should further take a full responsibility in evaluating the impacts of tourism BSR initiatives to ensure that not only the selected communities benefit from tourism development, but rather the entire community benefit. Tourism BSR initiatives could be used to measure the level of sustainable development in the South African communities as a whole. A list of Non-Government Organisations (NDGs) and their needs should be compiled and made accessible to the industry. Tourism businesses are edged to engage on tourism BSR initiatives that promote empowerment and sustainability. Makalipi (2014) states that after PPP failed to address the socio-economic issues in South Africa, three other programmes came into existence. These are B-BBEE, as well as the EPWPs and CDPs. According to Makalipi (2014), the latter two should be encouraged as they are more aligned to the objectives of BSR implementation, which are in favour of community empowerment. These two programmes address the problem of unemployment, but the proper management and monitoring of these two programmes should be considered. For example, people should be equipped with skills in areas in which they feel comfortable.

References

Blanche, M.J., Blanche, M.T., Durrheim, K. & Painter, D. (2011). *Research in practice: Applied methods for the social sciences, 2nd ed.* Cape Town: UCT Press.

Bruckmayer, M. (2010). *The impact of domestic anti-neoliberal contention on the negotiation outcome of the Free Trade Areas of the Americas (FTAA).* MA. Sacramento: California State University.

Cornelissen, S. (2005). Tourism impact, distribution and development: The spatial structure of tourism in the Western Cape Province of South Africa. *Development Southern Africa,* 22 (2), 163-185.

Dzansi, D. Y. & Pretorius, M. (2009). Addressing and measuring small business social responsibility in the African context: A stakeholder framework. *Social Responsibility Journal,* 5(2),245-256.

Eja, E.I., Otu, E., Ewa, E.E. & Ndomah, B.N. (2011). The role of private sector participation in sustainable tourism development in Cross River State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Business and Social Science,* 2(2), 153-160.

Fig, D. (2005). Manufacturing amnesia: Corporate social responsibility in South Africa. *International Affairs*, 81(3), 599-617.

Giampiccoli, A. & Mtapuri, O. (2014). Dividing the spoils? Mining and tourism in South Africa. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences,* 5(2), 87-96.

Golja, T. & Nižić, M. K. (2010). Corporate social responsibility in tourism: The most populartourism destinations in Croatia: Comparative analysis. *Management*, 15(2), 107-121.

Hannam, K. (2002). Tourism and development 1: Globalisation and power. *Progress in Development Studies,* 2(3), 227-234.

Heath, E. (2001). Globalisation of the tourism industry: Future trends and challenges for South Africa. *SAJEMS NS*, 3(4) [Online]. Available at: http://repository.up.ac.zabitstream/handle/2263/11731/Heath-Globalisation%282001%29.pdf?sequence=1 [Accessed 13 August 2011].

Inskeep, E. (1991). *Tourism planning: An integrated and sustainable development approach.* Danvers: John Wiley and Sons.

King Committee on Corporate Governance. (2002). *King report on corporate governance for South Africa 2002 (King II)*. Johannesburg: Institute of Directors in Southern Africa.

Makalipi, T. (2014). Discussion on South African government pro-poor policies and programmes that are aimed to address unemployment, poverty and inequality in the country. [Conversation] (Personal communication, 4 May 2014).

Mason, B.M. (2007). Advancing health rights in a globalized world: Responding to globalization through a collective human right to public health. *The Journal of   Law, Medicine and Ethics,* 35(4), 545-555.

Mazilu, M. (2011). *Globalisation – tourism a model from green economy.* Recent researcher in economic. Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Business Administration (ICBA '11). Montreux, Switzerland [Pdf]. Available at: http://www.wseas.us/books/2011/mantreux/Icicic.pfd [Accessed 11 September 2012].

Scott, N. (2011). *Tourism policy: A strategic review*. Oxford: Goodfellow Publishers Limited.

Shahzad, K. & Sillanpaa, I. (2013). *The role of fair trade in developing corporate social responsibility: An empirical examination based on multiple cases.* Proceedings of 2013 International Conference on Technology Innovation and Industrial Management, 29-31 May 2013, Phuket, Thailand.

Sharp, J. (2006). Corporate social responsibility and development: An anthropological perspective. *Development Southern Africa,* 23(2). 213-222.

Sillignakis, K.E.S. (2003). *The role of private and public sector in tourism planning and development*. [Pdf]. Available at: http://www.sillignakis.com/PDF/The%20role%20of%20private%20and%20public%20sector%20in%20Tourism%20planning%20and%20development.pdf www.sillignakis.com [Accessed 26 July 2014].

Tassiopoulos, D. (2009). *New tourism ventures.* Cape Town: Juta.

Tseane-Gumbi, L.A. (2015). *Social responsibility of the tourism businesses in the Western Cape Province of South Africa.* PhD. Pretoria: University of South Africa.

Zmyslony, P. (2011). Globalisation, tourism and cities: Pros and cons. *Folia Turistica*, 25(1), 299-312.