

Document downloaded from:

<http://hdl.handle.net/10251/120239>

This paper must be cited as:

De-Miguel-Molina, B.; De-Miguel-Molina, M.; Segarra-Oña, M.; Peiró Signes, A. (2018). Why and how hotel groups in luxury segments give back to their communities. *International Journal of Tourism Research*. 20(1):100-114. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jtr.2166>



The final publication is available at

<http://doi.org/10.1002/jtr.2166>

Copyright John Wiley & Sons

Additional Information

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: deMiguelMolina, B, deMiguel Molina, M, SegarraOña, M, PeiróSignes, A. Why and how hotel groups in luxury segments give back to their communities. *Int J Tourism Res*. 2018; 20: 100 114. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jtr.2166>, which has been published in final form at <http://doi.org/10.1002/jtr.2166>. This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Self-Archiving.

Please, cite this paper as: de-Miguel-Molina B, de-Miguel-Molina M, Segarra-Oña M, Peiró-Signes A (2018) Why and how hotel groups in luxury segments give back to their communities. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 20: 100-114. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jtr.2166>.

Link to the paper: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/jtr.2166>

Why and how hotel groups in luxury segments give back to their communities

Blanca de-Miguel-Molina, María de-Miguel-Molina, Marival Segarra-Oña, Angel Peiró-Signes

Universitat Politècnica de València, Department of Management, Camino de Vera s/n, building 7D, 46022 Valencia, Spain

Abstract

The paper analyses WHY and HOW hotel groups become involved in their communities through philanthropic activities. The analysis focuses on hotel groups with brands in the luxury, upper upscale and upscale segments. The qualitative information disclosed in reports and web sites by 243 hotel brands was studied to answer questions about WHO is involved, HOW they participate, and WHO they target. The study then focused on the 130 hotel groups owning these brands, and a Qualitative Comparative Analysis (fsQCA) was used to explain the combination of causal conditions explaining WHY hotel groups participate in their communities. The causal conditions in the analysis included the participation of different stakeholders, the characteristics of the hotel groups and the culture of the countries. Results indicate that there is a trade-off between customer and employee participation in philanthropy, that customer involvement requires the presence of luxury brands, and that the culture of the countries (religion and altruism) stimulates the philanthropic behaviour of hotel groups.

Keywords: *community involvement, corporate philanthropy, hotel groups, luxury, qualitative comparative analysis*

1. Introduction

Hotels are in the business to make money. This is a fact. So, why should a hotel even think about giving to others? While the community for some hotels is the nice spot where the building is located, for others it is much more than this. While for the majority of hotel chains, philanthropy has nothing to do with their business, others consider that it is possible to make money while giving to others. Why, who and how to promote giving back to the community is the research question addressed in this paper.

The involvement of firms in their communities through philanthropic activities has been analysed by literature using a range of different theories. However, these theories have generally been applied to the corporate social responsibility concept, in which philanthropy appears diluted in terms of its community dimension (Smith, 2013). The scant focus on corporate philanthropy in academic literature has been pointed out by authors like Brammer and Millington (2004) and Liket and Simaens (2015).

Literature analysing the philanthropic activities undertaken by the hotel industry is scarce, as some authors have pointed out (Garay and Font, 2012; Lee et al., 2014). What we have found in previous literature about the hotel industry and its philanthropic behaviour is that the majority of papers involved a small sample and were focused on a small number of countries such as China, Spain and the United States. Moreover, their description of activities was very general (Lee and Park, 2009) or focused only on donations (Chen and Lin, 2015b). However, community involvement is more than just donations. This is why the empirical analysis included in this paper takes on a worldwide profile and covers all the activities undertaken by brands and hotel groups. Moreover, we divide the activities by stakeholder types, indicating the participants involved and whether they assumed the cost of activities.

We did find a few studies covering the analysis of the luxury segment in the hotel sector (Calveras, 2015; Li et al., 2015; Stylos and Vassiliadis, 2015). Therefore, the empirical analysis carried out in this paper includes differences and similarities in philanthropic behaviour in the luxury, upper-upscale and upscale hotel segments. Furthermore, we have divided our results from these three segments by who participates in the community, the activity that defined how they participate and to whom aid was given.

The theories that other authors have applied in the analysis of hotel behaviour provide answers to what hotels are looking for when they undertake philanthropy. They include value for shareholders (Chen and Lin, 2015b), customer satisfaction which results in trust and loyalty (Martínez and Rodríguez del Bosque, 2015), employee identification with the hotel's responsible behaviour, which involves higher motivation and lower turnover (Park and Levy, 2014) and the legitimacy of the hotel as being a responsible organisation from the customer perspective, which also results in trust and loyalty (Sánchez-Fernández et al., 2014). However, we found fewer answers to the causal conditions explaining why hotels become involved in these activities. Therefore, in the empirical analysis in this paper we put forward seven causal conditions that could explain hotel group participation in the community through philanthropic activities.

These causal conditions are: 1) cooperation with NGOs and other non-profit organisations, 2) the hotel group owning its own foundation, 3) having brands in the luxury segment, 4) participation of customers or 5) employees, 6) an altruistic culture and 7) the percentage of Christian religion in the country where the group's headquarters is located. Six hypotheses aimed to analyse whether any combinations of these seven causal conditions influences the participation of hotel groups. A Qualitative Comparative Analysis (fsQCA) was used to test the hypotheses.

The evolution of the hotel industry has led to the existence of hotel corporations which hold different brand portfolios, with each brand (also called hotel chains) focusing on a different customer segment (Ivanova and Rahimi, 2016). Our paper included the analysis of 243 hotel brands (or chains) in the luxury, upper-upscale and upscale segments, and of the 130 hotel groups to whom these brands belong. The paper is structured as follows. After this introduction, Section 2 summarises the theory about corporate philanthropy in the hotel sector and the testing of the defined hypotheses. Then, Sections 3 and 4 present the empirical analysis about the philanthropic behaviour of brands and hotel groups selected for this study. Our conclusions are revealed in Section 5.

2. Literature review

2.1. Literature related to hotel groups in their communities

Community involvement refers to the participation of companies in their communities with a philanthropic connotation. Literature has used other terms, such as corporate philanthropy (Carroll, 2008), corporate citizenship (Melé, 2008), and corporate social responsibility (Wood, 1991) to indicate this type of participation. Although the participation of companies in their communities is not a new activity, companies' awareness of it has increased over the last few centuries, as Carroll (2008) points out with some examples from the late 1800s.

Previous studies have stated the lack of research into community involvement and hotels (Chen and Lin, 2015a). We confirmed this through the results obtained from making queries in the Web of Science and Scopus databases, combined with the keyword "hotel". Results yielded 119 papers, but when these papers were reviewed individually, we found that the majority were focused on the environment. This confirms what Garay and Font (2012) pointed out, in that the focus of responsibility in hotels centres on the environment rather than on social aspects. There were 35 papers that referred to the community in terms of philanthropic activities.

The small number of papers found denotes that literature about philanthropic activities undertaken by hotels is scarce. Moreover, when authors use the variable "community" in their studies, the activities included are very general (Lee and Park, 2009) or refer only to donations (Chen and Lin, 2015b). The majority of works found cover only one country, three of them analyse a worldwide sample and only one includes a large sample with 150 chains (de Grosbois, 2012). Moreover, 14 papers were analysed from an employee/manager's perception, 12 from a firm's perspective, four works from a

customer's viewpoint, one from an owner's viewpoint and four from the outlook of diverse stakeholders. The main results obtained by the authors from these 35 papers indicate that community involvement impacts positively on:

- A firm's value in the analysis of hotels located in the United States, Australia and China (Inoue and Lee, 2011; Hallak et al., 2012; Wang, 2014). Creating value for shareholders is one of the reasons which has been most closely explored by literature to explain why being responsible benefits hotels. Creating value for shareholders implies that when hotels increase their charity activity, the value indicators (ROA, ROE and Tobin's Q) also rise. This might indicate the strategic value for community involvement.
- Customer satisfaction and commitment with hotel behaviour has been improved for hotels located in the United States, Spain and China (Lee and Heo, 2009; Qu, 2014; Martínez and Rodríguez del Bosque, 2015). From this perspective, the participation of hotels in Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) activities (including philanthropy) will impact positively on customer satisfaction, and trust and identification with the company. Consequently, hotels obtain higher purchasing intentions from customers (Lee et al., 2015).
- Employees' identification with the organisation, in hotels located in China, South Korea and the United States (Fu et al., 2014; Lee et al., 2014; Park and Levy, 2014). These studies indicate that hotels use involvement in the community to motivate employees and reduce turnover, although Fu et al. (2014) point out that hotels need more than just activities in the community to motivate employees.
- A firm's legitimacy in hotels situated in Spain and Portugal (Sánchez-Fernández et al., 2014). Authors found that hotels use philanthropy to improve their image and be seen as responsible firms, thus attracting more customers (Hallak et al., 2012) and consequently increasing customer trust and loyalty (Martínez and Rodríguez del Bosque, 2015).

When analysing results from the literature review that focused on hotels, we found activities which reflect the external contributions they made (Kucukusta et al. 2013). These results show that when authors define participation in communities they refer to activities, types of donations, and the destination of their support. Therefore, we can conclude that implementation indicates all the philanthropic activities that companies undertake in support of their communities, in which firms cooperate with employees, customers and non-profit organisations. The activities found in the literature review were as follows:

1. Corporate giving (Holcomb et al., 2007).
2. Charitable donations (Bohdanowicz and Zientara, 2008;), some of which focused on disaster relief and reconstruction (Fu et al., 2014).
3. In-kind donations (Park and Levy, 2014). Donations of this type include blood donations, donations of hotel linen and furniture, serving food to the homeless and parents on youth night patrols (Chen and Peng, 2016), food donations and gift certificates for charitable organisations (Kucukusta et al., 2013).
4. Fundraising (Bohdanowicz and Zientara, 2008).
5. Grants (Holcomb et al., 2007).

6. Sponsorship and support, including sponsoring sporting events, other events and the arts (Stylos and Vassiliadis, 2015), support for educational institutions, local public infrastructures, local community organisations, and training social initiatives (Prud'homme and Raymond, 2013).
7. Organization and launching of activities and projects, including the organisation of voluntary activities (Kucukusta et al., 2013), launching community development activities and investing in the communities (Tsai et al., 2012), participating in local regeneration (Holcomb et al., 2007), getting involved in child assistance programmes (Chen and Peng, 2016) and hiring people with disabilities (Prud'homme and Raymond, 2013).
8. Participating in voluntary activities, like coaching youths with problems and talking to school children about various social problems (Bohdanowicz and Zientara, 2008), visiting homes for the elderly (Chen and Peng, 2016), participation of employees in social events, community projects and activities, local community organisations and volunteerism (Wang, 2014).
9. Cause-related marketing (Boenigk and Schuchardt, 2015).

2.2. Hypotheses

Literature on corporate philanthropy has stated that firms undertake giving activities because they create value for shareholders, increase an organisation's legitimacy and improve its public image (Kim et al., 2011), increase employee engagement (Flencova and Coles, 2011), etc. All these reasons come under the strategic philanthropy perspective, whereas altruistic philanthropy refers to the commitment of making the world a better place (Dennis et al., 2009). When analysing the papers that referred to hotels we saw that some authors state that altruism is the main reason for becoming involved in the community in some countries (Garay and Font, 2012). However, we only found three papers including some sense of purpose that indicate an altruistic perspective; these works talk about improving quality of life, alleviating poverty, and helping the needy (Park and Levy, 2014; Prud'homme and Raymond, 2013).

In this paper, we focus on different causal conditions which might explain the participation of hotels in their communities. These are: 1) cooperation with NGOs and other non-profit organisations, 2) the hotel group has its own foundation, 3) the hotel group has brands in the luxury segment, 4) customer participation, 5) employee participation, 6) the altruistic culture of the country where the hotel group has its headquarters and 7) the percentage of the Christian population in the country where the hotel group has its headquarters. Our hypotheses were defined using combinations of these causal conditions.

In relation to the first causal condition, the question is whether cooperation with **NGOs and other non-profit organisations** implies greater hotel participation in philanthropy. The partnership between firms and non-profits has been analysed in CSR literature, revealing an increase in this type of partnership (Doh and Guay, 2006; Arenas et al., 2009; den Hond et al., 2015).

This type of cooperation has also been studied by the hotel sector, indicating that these organisations are important partners for hotels when they become involved in their communities (Smith and Ong, 2015). However, the activity that best reflects joint efforts with non-profits is cause-related marketing, which occurs when hotels donate a percentage of their sales to a social cause (Ricks and Peters, 2013). This activity has been considered as beneficial for both the hotel and for the non-profit involved; the NGO receives more donations and future donors (Boenigk and Schuchardt, 2015) while the benefits for the hotel are associated with the image and willingness of customers to buy the product (Hagtvedt and Patrick, 2016). These benefits lead to firms being more motivated to give (Ricks and Peters, 2013) and the establishment of a long-term and more strategic partnership between hotels and non-profits, causing a social alliance (Berger et al., 2006).

Therefore, we can put forward the following hypothesis:

H1. Hotel groups which cooperate with NGOs (causal condition 1) involve customers (causal condition 4) more in their philanthropic activities and this will make the group more disposed to undertake corporate philanthropy.

Concerning the second causal condition, Pedrini and Minciullo (2011) list the three main reasons for firms to develop **foundations**, which are an ethical way to give back to the community, improve a firm's reputation and increase employee motivation. Evidence of firms participating in their communities through foundations can be found in literature (van der Voort et al., 2009; Gautier and Pache, 2015). In general, literature correlates the size of firms and them having their own foundations (Fifka, 2013) and finds that both variables have an influence on philanthropic participation, although we found controversy in this statement. For example, Chen et al. (2008) pointed out that firms which have foundations give more to charities. However, Brown et al. (2006) did not find differences in the amount given, though they did find that these firms gave more to the arts, education, religion, social services and science. Therefore, we might infer differences in the case of hotel groups that have their own foundation:

H2. Hotel groups which have their own foundation (causal condition 2) will involve employees (causal condition 5) more in their philanthropic activities and thus this will make the group more disposed to undertake corporate philanthropy.

Regarding the third causal condition, the question centres on whether the hotel group owns brands in the **luxury segment** and whether this implies higher participation in philanthropic activities. Out of the 35 papers found in the literature review, only nine papers included any reference to luxury segments and only three of these papers included results focused on that segment (Calveras, 2015; Li et al., 2015; Stylos and Vassiliadis, 2015). Other papers made some reference to donations by luxury hotels (Kim et al. 2015). In the papers written by authors who analysed higher quality segments, Calveras (2015) and Stylos and Vassiliadis (2015) found that higher the number of stars, the greater the involvement of hotels in CSR practices. One of the

reasons they used to explain why luxury hotels are more involved in their communities is that they use CSR as a differentiation strategy (Calveras, 2015).

Another reason pointed out by different authors to explain why luxury hotels support communities is their legitimacy aim. From this perspective, supporting communities indicates to customers that luxury hotels take responsibility into account (Hallak et al., 2012; Mackenzie and Peters, 2014; Li et al., 2015). If hotels communicate their responsible behaviour this might help them to attract guests who look for more responsible hotels (Prud'homme and Raymond, 2013; Wang, 2014). Other authors found that involvement in the community positively influences customer trust and commitment and, then, loyalty (Martínez and Rodríguez del Bosque, 2015). Therefore, hotels can employ philanthropic activities to strengthen their brand image and reputation (Font et al., 2012; Mackenzie and Peters, 2014). This explains why in some countries, hotels support activities which give them higher visibility and legitimation (Smith and Ong, 2015), such as donations after catastrophic events (Chen and Peng, 2016).

Therefore, we can deduce that:

H3. Hotel groups with brands in the luxury segment (causal condition 3) will involve customers (causal condition 4) more in their philanthropic activities and this will make the group more disposed to undertake corporate philanthropy.

In terms of the fourth and fifth causal conditions, the question would be **who should participate** in philanthropic activities, the hotel directly, the employees (causal condition 5) or the customers (causal condition 4)? In relation to hotel literature, hotels undertake philanthropic activities because it is good for their public image (Hallak et al., 2012; Mackenzie and Peters, 2014; Li et al., 2015) but also because it increases employee engagement (Lee et al. 2014; Chen and Lin, 2015a), and increases customer satisfaction and loyalty (Lee and Heo, 2009; Qu, 2014; Martínez and Rodríguez del Bosque, 2015). In relation to customers, we have found works which state that customers act as motivators for hotels to undertake CSR activities (Smith and Ong, 2015).

Improving employee engagement in hotels has also been considered as a benefit of corporate philanthropy. For example, Chen and Lin (2015a) and Hallak et al. (2012) detected that hotels in Taiwan and Australia use community involvement to motivate employees, whereas Lee et al. (2014) found that philanthropy helps five-star hotels in South Korea to increase employment engagement and reduce staff turnover. Activities that have the community as its aim can create a sense of shared value between employees and communities (Bohdanowicz and Zientara, 2008). On the contrary, Fu et al. (2014) point out that participation in the community is not a large enough source of employee engagement. They think that the activities undertaken by hotels need to be frequent to make sure that employees perceive true involvement by the hotel in its community.

Therefore, we postulate that:

H4. Hotel groups will be more disposed to undertake corporate philanthropy when employees (causal condition 5) or customers (causal condition 4) are also involved in philanthropic activities.

Considering the sixth and seventh causal conditions, the question is whether the **culture of a country** influences the philanthropic behaviour of hotels. An analysis of literature on philanthropy gives evidence about differences among countries and considers that the varieties of capitalism, the altruistic culture of countries and religion are among the causes for these differences. For example, Carnevale and Mazzuca (2014) found that pressures from stakeholders to disclose CSR activities are higher in coordinated market economies (like Germany, Austria, Finland, the Netherlands, and others) than in liberal market economies (UK). This institutional perspective has also been used to explain differences according to whether the country is a welfare state or the religion in countries (Koos, 2012).

In relation to religion, studies state that religious beliefs influence the expectations of people about the role of companies in supporting charity and community projects (Brammer et al., 2007). There are works corroborating the positive correlation between religion and philanthropy (van Elk et al., 2017). Others studies find that religious impacts positively on volunteering, charitable donations and informal helping (Einolf, 2017; Glanville et al., 2016). Along these lines, Ramasamy et al. (2010) obtained higher support from customers for CSR in Hong Kong and Singapore due to religion, whilst Du et al. (2014) obtained a positive correlation for China in the case of corporate philanthropy. Einolf (2017) also verified this correlation for the Catholic, Protestant, Buddhist and Jewish religions. Conversely, Van der Duijn Schouten et al. (2014) found that only extrinsic religiosity (related to social convention and comfort) stimulated corporate philanthropy.

The existence of social conventions could explain the relationship between altruism and culture in countries even when the focus is not religion. From this perspective, people imitate the pro-social behaviour of others (Nook et al., 2016), resulting in similar behaviour in spatial and social proximities (Neymotin, 2016). This shared altruism might influence the behaviour of customers, employees and managers, and as a result, their involvement in communities. For example, Ariza-Montes et al. (2015) pointed out that employees who participate in volunteering activities in their communities can influence the culture of their firms. Smith (2013) stated that the philanthropic culture of employees will make them more predisposed to participating in philanthropic activities organised by the firms where they work.

Taking into account the effect of religion and altruistic culture in countries, we can postulate that:

H5. When a hotel group's headquarters is located in a country with a high altruism rate (causal condition 6), employees (causal condition 5) will be more involved in philanthropy and this will make the group more disposed to undertake corporate philanthropy.

H6. When Christianity is the main religion of the country where the hotel group's headquarters is located (causal condition 7), employees (causal condition 5) will be more involved in philanthropy and this will make the group more disposed to undertake corporate philanthropy.

3. Method

In this section, we present the different steps we followed to obtain data, define variables and test the hypotheses put forward in the previous section.

3.1. Data and variables

The data used in the analysis were both qualitative and quantitative. To obtain qualitative data we undertook a Qualitative Content Analysis of the information disclosed by hotel groups and their brands on their websites. In this paper, we analysed 130 hotel groups and 243 brands (hotel chains) owned by these groups. The hotel groups analysed included Marriott International, Intercontinental Hotels Group (IHG) and Hyatt Hotels Corporation. These three groups own different brands. For example, Marriott International owns the brands The Ritz-Carlton, Westin and Sheraton, among others. Hotel chains are usually classified based on their average daily room rate (Corgel et al., 2011). From this perspective, STR Global (www.strglobal.com), a company specialised in data analysis for the hotel industry, classifies hotel chains in five segments: Luxury, Upper Upscale, Upscale, Upper Midscale, Midscale, and Economy. The brands analysed in this paper were those classified as “Luxury”, “Upper-Upscale” and “Upscale” chains. The list includes other types of accommodation which are not exactly the same as traditional hotels but offer similar services, such as suites and executive accommodation. Table 1 includes the number of brands that STR includes in the three segments, which are located in 42 countries on the five continents. Table 1 indicates that there were 525 hotel chains (brands) included in the STR list for the three segments. Information related to their participation in the community through philanthropic activities was only available for 243 brands (46.3% of the brands) and was found in annual and sustainability reports (for 108 brands) and on their websites (135 brands). Table 2 shows information about the 130 hotel groups and their 243 brands in our analysis indicating the countries where their headquarters are located and differentiating between locations depending on the segment. The predominance of American brands is evident in the luxury and upper upscale segments. The size of North American hotel groups is shown in Table 2; the average of brands by group is around 1 to 1.5 whereas in North America the average is 3.3. The largest groups in our sample are Marriott (27 brands in the three segments), Hilton Worldwide (10 brands), and Hyatt Hotels (10 brands) from the USA, Accor from France (10 brands), Intercontinental Hotels from UK (7 brands), and Meliá Hotels from Spain (6 brands). Some of these groups own brands in different countries from where their headquarters are located.

TABLE 1

TABLE 2

The variables defined for the analyses (Table 3) are shown below and were obtained from different sources:

- The country where the headquarters are located. This information was obtained from the brands' websites.
- Two variables related to the culture in the country where the headquarters are located:
 - o Altruism culture: called *Altruism* and referring to the culture of altruism in the country where the headquarters are located.
 - o Christianity, the religion selected for this study, and called *PChrist* because it indicates the percentage of the population who identified themselves as Christians.
- Brand segment: this indicates whether the brand is in the luxury segment, and was called *Luxurybrands*.
- Community-related information: this includes eight variables (A to H) defined from codes obtained from qualitative information contained in annual and sustainability reports of brands or directly from their websites.

A Computer-Assisted Qualitative Data Analysis (CAQDA), using QDAMiner4 software (Provalis Research, Canada), was used to obtain the variables A to H shown in Table 3. To obtain the codes for these community variables, three databases were created in QDAMiner, one for each segment (luxury, upper upscale and upscale), in which we defined 243 cases corresponding to the brands in the analysis. Then, qualitative information available on the websites of the brands (annual and sustainability reports or directly from the websites) was included for each database. In this paper, we focused on information included in reports and websites centring on supporting the community in terms of corporate philanthropy. We then coded the information for all of the brands. The codes were grouped according to the types of participants in the philanthropic activities: firms, employees or customers/guests. A total of 50 codes were defined and grouped into eight categories (Tables 3 and 4, categories A to H). These codes indicated the activities that brands and groups undertook in relation to the community, and indicated the existence of each activity found in the brand information. Finally, we obtained different matrixes with the results of this coding, including occurrence frequencies and code appearance (values 1 and 0). Table 4 includes the percentage of brands which offer information about a specific code in their reports and on their websites, for each category and code. The information in Table 4 was used to draw up Table 3, i.e. to define the variables A to H. These variables in Table 3 indicated the presence of codes in categories A to H for each brand with the value 1, whereas the absence of codes in each category appeared with value 0.

TABLE 3

3.2. Data analysis

Our data analysis included a descriptive approach and Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA), using fsQCA software (Ragin and Davey, 2016). Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA) is a method which allows variable combinations to incorporate causal complexity in explaining the output for each case (Maggetti, 2014). A QCA can be used to detect which variables, or a combination of them, are necessary and sufficient causal conditions for a specific outcome. Moreover, the method helps to identify groups of cases which share a combination of causal conditions (Legewie, 2013).

The defined model includes the “participation of firms directly in philanthropic activities in their communities” as an outcome, and was named as *Firm* in Table 6. The model analysed the combination of seven causal conditions in relation to the output. Causal conditions 1 to 5 were crisp sets, with values 1 and 0 indicating presence or absence for the set. The other two causal conditions (6 and 7) were fuzzy sets, and the direct method was used to calibrate and define the threshold for full membership, non-membership and the crossover point (Ragin, 2008). Calibration consists of transforming raw data variables to values which indicate a “degree of membership”. In crisp-set calibration, a value of 1 indicates “full membership”, while a value of 0 indicates “non-membership”. In fuzzy-set calibration, however, values between 1 and 0 are also allowed and, when the direct method is used, the researcher can specify the values for the three breakpoints of full membership, full non-membership and the crossover point. Then, these values are used to calibrate original data. Once calibration had been completed, the necessary and sufficient combination of the causal conditions was analysed and the results for intermediate and parsimonious solutions are presented in the Results section.

4. Results

4.1. WHO, HOW and TO WHOM (analysis for brands)

This section analyses similarities and differences between the three segments (luxury, upper upscale and upscale) in relation to the codes defined in Table 4. Results indicate that the terms most frequently used to refer to the participation of firms in communities by the three segments (conceptualisation) are social responsibility, community involvement, giving back and charity. However, we find differences between segments as the upscale segment uses the term social responsibility more often while the term community involvement is more frequently employed by the upper-upscale segment. The luxury segment uses the keywords citizenship and philanthropy more than the two other segments.

Table 4 shows high participation in philanthropic activities for the three segments (percentage), in employee volunteering and direct company participation through cash, in-kind donations and fundraising. Luxury brands are more likely to use activities in which customers participate through cash donations, cause-related marketing and

volunteering. The participation of employees through payroll giving and colleague fundraising is also higher in the luxury segment. Table 5 summarises the participation of the three segments by customers, employees and firms. Data in this table indicate that the participation of customers and employees is higher in the luxury segment, which implies that brands in this segment undertake more activities that come under codes C, D, E and F in Table 4. However, direct participation of brands, through their own foundations, is higher in the upper upscale segment. In terms of where aid is given (Table 4), luxury segment investment in communities is more frequent in arts, heritage and music, education and training, support for educational institutions, libraries, elderly people, people with disabilities, youth support, the homeless and evictions.

TABLE 4

TABLE 5

4.2. WHY hotel groups get involved in their communities

This section analyses seven causal conditions which indicate why hotel groups participate in philanthropic activities. For this purpose, we based the selection of causal conditions on the previous literature review and hypotheses stated in section 2. A Qualitative Comparative Analysis, through the fuzzy set method, was selected to analyse the causal conditions for hotel group participation in their communities. In line with the hypotheses defined in section 2, we analysed whether causal conditions in Table 6 are necessary or sufficient conditions to explain hotel participation.

The steps to follow in the QCA were calibration, an analysis of necessary causal conditions (Table 6), the construction of a truth table and the analysis of sufficient causal conditions. The cases considered were 130 hotel groups, which are the owners of the 243 brands analysed in the luxury, upper-upscale and upscale segments. The fsQCA 3.0 (Ragin and Davey, 2016) software was used for the analysis, as this allowed the use of both crisp and fuzzy sets. Table 6 presents the calibrations we carried out for every variable depending on the transformation of original data using crisp sets or fuzzy sets. For the variables calibrated as crisp sets, a value of 1 indicated “full membership” while a value of 0 indicated “non-membership”. This calibration was used in the categorical variables with the values YES/NO. The “fuzzy sets” calibration mode was chosen to transform the quantitative variables, using direct calibration. In the two variables, the threshold for full membership was defined using values around percentile 50 (median), which were 48.5 for altruism and 64.6 for PChrist. Table 6 also presents descriptive statistics for the variables included in our analysis.

TABLE 6

The model defined for the analysis was as follows, where the outcome represents the direct participation of hotel groups in their communities, whereas the causal conditions were the seven conditions tested in Table 6:

$$\text{Firm} = f(\text{NGOs}, \text{Foundation}, \text{Luxurybrands}, \text{Customer}, \text{Employees}, \text{Altruism}_f, \text{PChrist}_f)$$

The next step was the analysis of whether these seven causal conditions were necessary and sufficient. The necessary nature of these causal conditions was analysed through the option available in the fsQCA software and individually for each causal condition, with the variable *Firm* as the outcome. The results presented in Table 6 indicate that none of the causal conditions were necessary due to consistency values lower than 0.90 in all cases (Maggetti, 2014).

To analyse the possible sufficient causal conditions, we first had to construct the *truth table*. To obtain the truth table, solutions with 1 or 0 cases were deleted. Moreover, the consistency threshold in the output had to be ≥ 0.8 to be marked with the value 1. The fsQCA software presents the results for the complex, intermediate and parsimonious solutions. However, following Ragin and Fiss (2008), we combined the intermediate and parsimonious results (Table 7). The intermediate solution indicated that seven combinations of causal conditions were linked to the philanthropic participation of hotel groups in their communities. Next, we include the seven solutions obtained in the intermediate solution, in which capital letters indicated the presence of a causal condition while lower case letters indicated the absence of a causal condition (Carboni, 2016):

- Solution 1: FOUNDATION \rightarrow FIRM
- Solution 2: NGOS * customer * EMPLOYEES * pchrist_f \rightarrow FIRM
- Solution 3: luxurybrands * customer * EMPLOYEES * ALTRUISM_f \rightarrow FIRM
- Solution 4: NGOS * LUXURYBRANDS * EMPLOYEES * altruism_f * pchrist_f \rightarrow FIRM
- Solution 5: NGOS * luxurybrands * customer * ALTRUISM_f * PCHRIST_f \rightarrow FIRM
- Solution 6: NGOS * LUXURYBRANDS * CUSTOMER * ALTRUISM_f * PCHRIST_f \rightarrow FIRM
- Solution 7: NGOS * luxurybrands * EMPLOYEE * ALTRUISM_f * PCHRIST_f \rightarrow FIRM

The coverage and consistency measures for each solution and the solution as a whole are presented in Table 7. Consistency indicates that each solution and the final solution are subsets of the outcome (Ragin, 2008b). The results denote that the seven solutions have an overall consistency of 0.93 (>0.80) whereas the solution coverage indicates that 64% of the outcome was covered by the entire solution term. Raw coverage measures the percentage of the outcome covered by each of the seven solutions (Ragin, 2008b), while unique coverage includes cases with a membership value higher than 0.5 in only one sufficient path (Schneider and Wagemann, 2012).

TABLE 7

Solution **S1** was “FOUNDATION \rightarrow FIRM”. This solution indicates that owning a foundation (causal condition 2) is a sufficient condition to explain the higher philanthropic participation of hotel groups in their communities, regardless of the other causal conditions. This result supports Chen et al. (2008) but contradicts Brown et al. (2006), who did not find differences when firms had foundations. Therefore, **H2** was proved although only partially, because employee participation (causal condition 5) did not appear as a core or complementary causal condition. However, we confirmed that hotel groups which have their own foundations are more disposed to undertake corporate philanthropy.

Solution **S2** was “NGOS * customer * EMPLOYEES * pchristf \rightarrow FIRM”. This solution shows that in the absence of conditions of customer participation (causal condition 4) and Christian religion in the country (causal condition 7), the participation of employees in philanthropic activities (causal condition 5) combined with cooperation with NGOs (causal condition 1) explained the participation of hotel groups. In this solution, it does not matter whether the group owns brands in the luxury segment (causal condition 3). On the other hand, customer participation (causal condition 4) appears as absent in the two solutions where cooperation with NGOs (causal condition 1) is a core causal condition, **S2** and **S5**. However, in **S6** cooperation with NGOs appears combined with customer participation. Therefore, we can partially confirm hypothesis **H1** and conclude that hotel groups which cooperate with NGOs and other non-profits are more disposed to undertake corporate philanthropy. This result coincides with other works which indicate the importance of this partnership when hotels undertake philanthropy (Smith and Ong, 2015). However, we should rewrite **H1** to say that “hotel groups which cooperate with NGOs and other non-profits (causal condition 1) involve customers and employees (causal conditions 4 and 5) more in their philanthropic activities and this will make the group more disposed to undertake corporate philanthropy”. Moreover, we observe that the participants that are most heavily involved in solutions are employees rather than customers. This stronger relationship with employees might indicate that hotels use employee participation in philanthropic activities as a means to engage them (Hallak et al., 2012; Lee et al. 2014; Chen and Lin, 2015a). It might also confirm the preference of hotel investors for philanthropic schemes in which employees participate because they generate lower costs than the direct contribution of firms (Muller and Kräussl, 2011).

Solution **S3** is “luxurybrands * customer * EMPLOYEES * ALTRUISMf \rightarrow FIRM”. It shows that in the absence of luxury brands (causal condition 3) and customer participation (causal condition 4), the involvement of employees (causal condition 5) combined with an altruistic culture (causal condition 6) explains the participation of hotel groups. This result confirms hypothesis **H5**, which we defined as “when a hotel group’s headquarters is located in a country with a high altruism rate (causal condition 6), employees will be more involved (causal condition 5) in philanthropy and this will make the group more disposed to undertake corporate philanthropy”. This result corroborates what other authors indicated about a pro-social culture in a geographical area and the involvement of employees both directly and through the firms where they work (Smith, 2013; Nook et al., 2016). The effect will also be higher participation for the hotel groups (Ariza-

Montes et al., 2015). When analysing the altruism condition, it is interesting to note that the majority of hotel groups in **S3** (15 out of 20) are located in countries which have been identified as having a Liberal Market Economy (LME) type of capitalism (USA, UK and Canada) or an LME-like type (Australia, Ireland) by authors like Hall and Soskice (2001) and Schneider and Paunescu (2012). Therefore, we can infer the relationship between these varieties of capitalism and altruistic culture in countries, impacting on the behaviour of employees and hotel groups.

Solution **S4** is “NGOS * LUXURYBRANDS * EMPLOYEES * altruism_f * pchrist_f → FIRM”. In this solution, there are no core causal conditions but it does register three complementary causal conditions as being present, namely cooperation with NGOs (causal condition 1), luxurybrands (causal condition 3) and employee involvement (causal condition 5). Moreover, this combination occurs in the absence of the two country culture variables: altruism (causal condition 6) and Christianity (causal condition 7). If we compare solutions **S4** and **S6**, we can observe how the presence or absence of culture causal conditions generates a trade-off between employee and customer participation (causal conditions 4 and 5). This trade-off is observed in the majority of solutions, from **S2** to **S7**, given that there is no solution where both participants appear. This trade-off indicates that hypothesis **H4** is proved, so participation of one of them, not both, will make hotel groups more disposed to undertake philanthropy. However, there is confirmation that groups try to engage employees and customers. The reason for the lower presence of customer participation in the solutions might be that customers demand participation from hotels but they prefer the direct involvement of groups (Kim et al., 2011). As a consequence, hotels participate in philanthropic activities in an attempt to increase customer satisfaction and loyalty (Qu, 2014), although customers are not involved in such participation.

Solution **S5** is “NGOS * luxurybrands * customer * ALTRUISM_f * PCHRIST_f → FIRM”. This indicates that although hotel groups do not have luxury brands (causal condition 3), and so there is no customer participation (causal condition 4), they will be more disposed to undertake philanthropy if a combination of three causal conditions occurs. This combination is cooperation with NGOs (causal condition 1), an altruistic culture in the country (causal condition 6) and a high percentage of Christian religion (causal condition 7). This solution shows that even when customers and employees do not participate in philanthropy (causal conditions 4 and 5), the culture in the country where the headquarters is located encourages hotel groups to cooperate with NGOs (causal condition 1) and undertake philanthropy directly. Hotel groups continue to invest in their communities because it is good for their public image (Hallak et al., 2012) or because of an ethical belief of giving back to their communities (Pedrini and Minciullo, 2011). Solution **S5** concludes that, contrary to hypothesis **H5**, an altruistic culture in the country (causal condition 6) is a sufficient condition to assure group participation, even when employee involvement (causal condition 5) does not appear as a causal condition. From this solution we can also infer that hotel groups imitate the pro-social behaviour of other groups in their area (Neymotin, 2016) even when there is no demand to do so from customers and employees. Moreover, this solution shows that 100% of cases come under the two types of capitalism found in **S3** (6 groups in USA, 7 in UK, 5 in Canada, 1 in Australia and 1 in Ireland).

Solution **S6** is “NGOS * LUXURYBRANDS * CUSTOMER * ALTRUISM_f * PCHRIST_f → FIRM”. This shows a combination of causal conditions for which customer participation (causal condition 4) needs the presence of luxury brands (causal condition 3). This solution confirms hypothesis **H3**, which we defined as “hotel groups with brands in the luxury segment will involve customers more in their philanthropic activities and this will make the group more disposed to undertake corporate philanthropy”. The different solutions obtained in this analysis do not enable us to infer what other authors conclude about luxury hotels being more involved in their communities (Calveras, 2015; Stylos and Vassiliadis, 2015). On the contrary, our solutions revealed participation for both below-luxury and luxury hotels. However, what we found is that the philanthropic behaviour of luxury brands seems to be focused on improving their public image with their customers. Moreover, we found that this situation of engaging customers only occurs in the case of luxury brands. Therefore, customers act as motivators for hotels to undertake philanthropic activities (Smith and Ong, 2015). This would contradict the opinions of other authors, like Kucukusta et al. (2013) who believe that customers do not select a hotel because of their external contributions. On the other hand, the combination of causal conditions in solution **S6** also includes the two variables related to culture of countries (causal conditions 6 and 7) and cooperation with NGOs (causal condition 1), although these three conditions are complementary. **S6** is similar to **S5** except for the presence of luxury brands and customer participation; in both cases, culture and cooperation with NGOs explain hotel group participation in their communities, in **S6** for luxury brands and in **S5** for the rest of brands.

Finally, solution **S7** is “NGOS * luxurybrands * EMPLOYEE * ALTRUISM_f * PCHRIST_f → FIRM”. This indicates that, in the absence of luxury brands (causal condition 3), the combination of Christian religion (causal condition 7) and employee participation (causal condition 5) explains the involvement of hotel groups in their communities. This solution confirms hypothesis **H6**, which we stated as “the main religion of the country where the hotel group’s headquarters is located will influence employees involved in philanthropy and this will make the group more disposed to undertake corporate philanthropy”. This result agrees with authors who conclude that religion impacts positively on philanthropic behaviour (Einolf, 2017; Glanville et al., 2016). On the other hand, in the three solutions where Christian religion appears as a causal condition (solutions **S5**, **S6** and **S7**) we found that an altruistic culture also appears (causal condition 6). However, the opposite situation does not occur and altruism appears even when Christian religion does not. Therefore, we can confirm that religion stimulates altruism and corporate philanthropy.

Table 8 includes a summary of hypotheses and results. Hypotheses **H4**, **H3** and **H6** were confirmed, whereas the other hypotheses were partially confirmed.

TABLE 8

5. Conclusions

The aim of this paper was to analyse how and why hotel groups participate in their communities through philanthropic activities, and if there were differences when the focus of analysis was the luxury brands of those hotel groups. Philanthropy undertaken by the hotel sector has scarcely been analysed by literature and we have attempted to fill this gap. For this purpose, we obtained a list of the brands in the segments under study STR Global (www.strglobal.com). This gave a total of 243 brands, located in 42 countries, and 130 groups owning these brands. We found similarities and differences for the three luxury, upper-upscale and upscale segments analysed. For example, the main activities used for the three segments are employee volunteering and direct donations from firms (both cash and in-kind). However, luxury brands use more activities in which customers are involved (customer cash donations, cause-related marketing and volunteering). There are also differences in the destination of aid, in which luxury brands invest more in the arts, education, educational institutions, libraries and youth support.

Qualitative Comparative Analysis (fsQCA) was used to study whether seven causal conditions could be considered as necessary or sufficient to explain why hotel groups undertake philanthropy. The conditions analysed included: 1) cooperation with NGOs and other non-profit organisations, 2) the hotel group has its own foundation, 3) the hotel group has brands in the luxury segment, 4) customer participation, 5) employee participation, 6) the altruistic culture of the country where the hotel group has its headquarters and 7) the percentage of the Christian population in the country where the hotel group has its headquarters. The results yielded seven combinations of these causal conditions, all of which were sufficient conditions, as explainers of the involvement of hotel groups in their communities. Some results confirmed previous studies; for example, the important role of own foundations (Chen et al., 2008) and the presence of NGOs as key partners (Smith and Ong, 2015).

However, we obtained five new important results from the analysis. The first result is that there is a trade-off in the majority of solutions between customer and employee participation. Moreover, this trade-off is related to the presence or absence of culture conditions in the country (altruism and Christian religion). The second result is that we found a coincidence between higher participation of employees in more altruistic countries, thus generating the philanthropic participation of hotels. The cases covered came from mainly LME and LME-like countries (Hall and Soskice, 2001). The third result is that although customers and employees do not participate in the activities, hotel groups continue to invest in their communities through cooperation with NGOs when an altruistic culture exists. The fourth result is that only groups with luxury brands involve customers in philanthropy, although this does not imply a higher participation of luxury brands in their communities, as some authors indicate (Calveras, 2015; Stylos and Vassiliadis, 2015). Finally, the fifth result indicates that Christian religion stimulates an altruistic culture and corporate philanthropy, although this does not imply that other religions would not have a similar result.

These results help to better understand how and why hotel groups get involved in their communities and the importance that philanthropy has today for hotels, their employees

and customers. They also show that culture in countries influences hotel behaviour and reveal the importance of partnerships with different stakeholders in developing their communities. The limitations of this study are that it only covers the three higher segments of hotels, Christian religion and the rest of the selected variables. Although the QCA method does not advise using more than eight conditions (Ragin, 2008), future analyses could include different combinations of causal conditions as well as the other three segments (upper-midscale, midscale, and economy).

References

Arenas D, Lozano JM, Albareda L (2009) The Role of NGOs in CSR: Mutual Perceptions Among Stakeholders. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 88 (1), 175-97.

Ariza-Montes A, Roldán-Salgueiro JL, Leal-Rodríguez A (2015) Employee and Volunteer. An unlikely cocktail? *Nonprofit Management & Leadership*, 25 (3), 255-268.

Berger IE, Cunningham PH, Drumwright ME (2006) Identity, Identification, and Relationship Through Social Alliances. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 34 (2), 128-137.

Boenigk S and Schuchardt V (2015). Nonprofit Collaboration With Luxury Brands: Positive and Negative Effects for Cause-Related Marketing. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 44 (4), 708-733.

Bohdanowicz P and Zientara P (2008). Corporate Social Responsibility in Hospitality: Issues and Implications. A Case Study of Scandic. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 8 (4), 271–293.

Brammer S and Millington A (2004) The Development of Corporate Charitable Contributions in the UK: A Stakeholder Analysis. *Journal of Management Studies*, 41 (8), 1411-1434.

Brammer S, Williams G, Zinkin J (2007) Religion and Attitudes to Corporate Social Responsibility in a Large Cross-Country Sample. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 71 (3), 229–243.

Brown WO, Helland E, Smith JK (2006). Corporate philanthropic practices. *Journal of Corporate Finance*, 12 (5), 855–877.

Calveras A (2015) Corporate Social Responsibility Strategy in the Hotel Industry: Evidence from the Balearic Islands. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 17 (4), 399–408.

Carboni JL (2016) Combined Effects: The Influence of Organizational Form and Structural Characteristics on Contract Performance in Mixed Sector Markets. *Voluntas*, 27 (4), 1781–1808.

Carnevale C and Mazzuca M (2014) Sustainability Reporting and Varieties of Capitalism. *Sustainable Development*, 22 (6), 361–376.

Carroll AB (2008) A History of Corporate Social Responsibility. Concepts and practices. In Crane A, McWilliams A, Matten A, Mood J, and Siegel DS (ed.) *The Oxford Handbook of Corporate Social Responsibility*. Chapter 2, p. 19-46. Oxford University Press, UK.

- Chen MH and Lin CP (2015a) Understanding corporate philanthropy in the hospitality industry. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 48, 150-160.
- Chen MH, Lin CP (2015b). The impact of corporate charitable giving on hospitality firm performance: Doing well by doing good? *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 47, 25-34.
- Chen X and Peng Q (2016) A content analysis of corporate social responsibility: Perspectives from China's top 30 hotel management companies. *Hospitality & Society*, 6 (2), 153–181.
- Chen JC, Patten DM, Roberts RW (2008) Corporate Charitable Contributions: A Corporate Social Performance or Legitimacy Strategy? *Journal of Business Ethics*, 82 (1), 131–144.
- Corgel JB, Mandelbaum R, Woodworth RM (2011) Hospitality property ownership. Where you fit in. In Sturman MC, Corgel JB, Verma R (ed.) *The Cornell School of Hotel Administration on Hospitality. Cutting Edge Thinking and Practice*. Chapter 17, p. 247 - 269. John Wiley & Sons, USA and Canada.
- De Grosbois D (2012) Corporate social responsibility reporting by the global hotel industry: Commitment, initiatives and performance. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 31 (3), 896-905.
- Den Hond F, De Bakker FGA, Doh J (2015) What Prompts Companies to Collaboration With NGOs? Recent Evidence From the Netherlands. *Business & Society*, 54 (2), 187–228.
- Dennis BS, Buchholtz AK, Butts MM (2009). The Nature of Giving. A Theory of Planned Behavior Examination of Corporate Philanthropy. *Business & Society*, 48 (3), 360-384.
- Doh JP and Guay TR (2006). Corporate Social Responsibility, Public Policy, and NGO Activism in Europe and the United States: An Institutional-Stakeholder Perspective. *Journal of Management Studies*, 43 (1), 47-73.
- Du X, Jian W, Du Y, Feng W, Zeng Q (2014) Religion, the Nature of Ultimate Owner, and Corporate Philanthropic Giving: Evidence from China. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 123 (2), 235–256.
- Einolf CJ (2017) Cross-National Differences in Charitable Giving in the West and the World. *Voluntas*, 28 (2), 472-491.
- Fifka MS (2013) Corporate citizenship in Germany and the United States – differing perceptions and practices in transatlantic comparison. *Business Ethics: A European Review*, 22 (4), 341-356.
- Fenclova E and Coles T (2011) Charitable Partnership among travel and tourism businesses: perspectives from low-fares airlines. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 13 (4), 337-354.
- Font X, Walmsley A, Cogotti S, McCombes L, Häusler N (2012). Corporate social responsibility: The disclosure-performance gap. *Tourism Management*, 33 (6), 1544-1553.
- Fu H, Ye BH, Law R (2014) You do well and I do well? The behavioral consequences of corporate social responsibility. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 40, 62-70.

- Garay L, Font X (2012). Doing good to do well? Corporate social responsibility reasons, practices and impacts in small and medium accommodation enterprises. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 31 (2), 329-337.
- Gautier A and Pache AC (2015) Research on Corporate Philanthropy: A Review and Assessment. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 126 (3), 343–369.
- Glanville JL, Paxton P, Wang Y (2016) Social Capital and Generosity: A Multilevel Analysis. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 45 (3), 526–547.
- Hagtvedt H, Patrick VM (2016). Gilt and Guilt: Should Luxury and Charity Partner at the Point of Sale? *Journal of Retailing*, 92 (1), 56-64.
- Hall PA and Soskice D (2001) Varieties of Capitalism. The institutional foundations of comparative advantage. Oxford University Press, UK.
- Hallak R, Brown G, Lindsay NJ (2012). The Place Identity e Performance relationship among tourism entrepreneurs: A structural equation modelling analysis. *Tourism Management*, 33 (1), 143-154.
- Holcomb JL, Upchurch RS, Okumus F (2007) Corporate social responsibility: what are top hotel companies reporting? *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 19 (6), 461 – 475.
- Inoue Y and Lee S (2011) Effects of different dimensions of corporate social responsibility on corporate financial performance in tourism-related industries. *Tourism Management*, 32 (4), 790-804.
- Ivanova M and Rahimi R (2016) Nature and definition of hotel chain. In Ivanova M, Ivanov S, and Magnini VP (ed.) *The Routledge Handbook of Hotel Chain Management*. Chapter 1, p. 9-18. Routledge, Taylor & Francis, London and New York.
- Kim N, Cho E, Kim Y, Lee M (2011) Developing an effective strategic mix of corporate philanthropy. *The Service Industries Journal*, 31(7), 1049–1062.
- Kim CA, Kim SH, and Lee KH (2015) A Comparison Study of Multinational Chain Hotel Employees' Perceptions of Corporate Social Responsibility in China and Korea. *Emerging Markets Finance & Trade*, 51 (2), 364–376.
- Koos S (2012) The institutional embeddedness of social responsibility: a multilevel analysis of smaller firms' civic engagement in Western Europe. *Socio-Economic Review*, 10 (1), 135–162.
- Kucukusta D, Mak A, Chan X (2013) Corporate social responsibility practices in four and five-star hotels: Perspectives from Hong Kong visitors. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 34, 19-30.
- Lee S and Heo CY (2009) Corporate social responsibility and customer satisfaction among US publicly traded hotels and restaurants. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 28 (4), 635–637.
- Lee S and Park SY (2009). Do socially responsible activities help hotels and casinos achieve their financial goals? *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 28 (1), 105-112.

Lee YK, Choi J, Moon BY, Babin BJ (2014). Codes of ethics, corporate philanthropy, and employee responses. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 39, 97-106.

Legewie N (2013) An Introduction to Applied Data Analysis with Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA). *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 14 (3), Art. 15.

Li Y, Fu H, Huang S (2015) Does conspicuous decoration style influence customer's intention to purchase? The moderating effect of CSR practices. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 51, 19-29.

Liket K and Simaens A (2015) Battling the Devolution in the Research on Corporate Philanthropy. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 126 (2), 285-308.

Mackenzie M and Peters M (2014) Hospitality Managers' Perception of Corporate Social Responsibility: An Explorative Study. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 19 (3), 257–272.

Maggetti M (2014) Promoting Corporate Responsibility in Private Banking: Necessary and Sufficient Conditions for Joining the Wolfsberg Initiative Against Money Laundering. *Business & Society*, 53 (6), 787–819.

Martínez García de Leaniz P and Rodríguez Del Bosque Rodríguez I (2015) Exploring the Antecedents of Hotel Customer Loyalty: A Social Identity Perspective. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, 24 (1), 1-23.

Melé D (2008) Corporate Social Responsibility Theories. In Crane A, McWilliams A, Matten A, Mood J, and Siegel DS (ed.) *The Oxford Handbook of Corporate Social Responsibility*. Chapter 3, p. 47-82. Oxford University Press, UK.

Muller A and Kraüssl R (2011) The Value of Corporate Philanthropy During Times of Crisis: The Sensegiving Effect of Employee Involvement. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 103 (2), 203–220.

Neymotin F (2016) Individuals and Communities: the Importance of Neighbors Volunteering. *Journal of Labor Research*, 37 (2), 149–178.

Nook EC, Ong DC, Morelli SA, Mitchell JP, Zaki J (2016) Prosocial Conformity: Prosocial Norms Generalize Across Behavior and Empathy. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 42 (8), 1045–1062.

Park SY and Levy SE (2014) Corporate social responsibility: perspectives of hotel frontline employees. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 26 (3), 332 – 348.

Pedrini M and Minciullo M (2011) Italian Corporate Foundations and the Challenge of Multiple Stakeholder Interests. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership*, 22 (2), 173-197.

Prud'homme B and Raymond L (2013) Sustainable development practices in the hospitality industry: An empirical study of their impact on customer satisfaction and intentions. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 34, 116-126.

Qu R (2014) Market Orientation and Organizational Performance Linkage in Chinese Hotels: The Mediating Roles of Corporate Social Responsibility and Customer Satisfaction. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 19 (12), 1399-1416.

Ragin CC and Davey S (2016) Fuzzy-Set/Qualitative Comparative Analysis 3.0. Irvine, California: Department of Sociology, University of California.

Ragin CC and Fiss PC (2008) Net effects versus configurations: an empirical demonstration. In Ragin CC (2008) Redesigning Social Inquiry. Fuzzy Sets and Beyond. Chapter 11. The University of Chicago Press, USA.

Ragin CC (2008) Redesigning Social Inquiry. Fuzzy Sets and Beyond. The University of Chicago Press, USA.

Ragin C (2008b) User's guide to Fuzzy-set/Qualitative Comparative Analysis. Available at www.u.arizona.edu/~cragin/fsQCA/download/fsQCAManual.pdf

Ramasamy B, Yeung MCH, Au AKM (2010) Consumer Support for Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR): The Role of Religion and Values. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 91 (sup. 1), 61–72.

Ricks JM, Richard JR, Peters C (2013) Motives, Timing, and Targets of Corporate Philanthropy: A Tripartite Classification Scheme of Charitable Giving. *Business and Society Review*, 118 (3), 413–436.

Sánchez-Fernández MD, Vargas-Sánchez A, Remoaldo P (2014) Institutional context and hotel social responsibility. *Kybernetes*, 43 (3/4), 413 – 426.

Schneider MR and Paunescu M (2012) Changing varieties of capitalism and revealed comparative advantages from 1990 to 2005: a test of the Hall and Soskice claims. *Socio-Economic Review*, 10 (4), 731–753.

Schneider CQ and Wagemann C (2012) Set-Theoretic Methods for the Social Sciences. A guide to Qualitative Comparative Analysis. Cambridge University Press, USA.

Smith JM (2013) Philanthropic Identity at Work: Employer Influences on the Charitable Giving Attitudes and Behaviors of Employees. *Journal of Business Communication*, 50 (2), 128–151.

Smith RA and Ong JLT (2015) Corporate Social Responsibility and the Operationalization Challenge for Global Tourism Organizations. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 20 (5), 487-499.

Smith JM (2013) Philanthropic Identity at Work: Employer Influences on the Charitable Giving Attitudes and Behaviors of Employees. *Journal of Business Communication*, 50 (2), 128–151.

Stylos N and Vassiliadis C (2015) Differences in Sustainable Management Between Four- and Five-Star Hotels Regarding the Perceptions of Three-Pillar Sustainability. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, 24 (8), 791-825.

Tsai H, Tsang NKF, Cheng SKY (2012) Hotel employees' perceptions on corporate social responsibility: The case of Hong Kong. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 31 (4), 1143-1154.

Van der Duijn Schouten M, Graafland J, Kaptein M (2014) Religiosity, CSR Attitudes, and CSR Behavior: An Empirical Study of Executives' Religiosity and CSR. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 123 (3), 437–459.

Van der Voort JM, Glac K, Meijs L (2009) Managing Corporate Community Involvement. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 90 (3), 311–329.

Van Elk M, Rutjens BT, van Harreveld F (2017) Why Are Protestants More Prosocial Than Catholics? A Comparative Study Among Orthodox Dutch Believers. *The International Journal for the Psychology of Religion*, 27 (1), 65-81.

Wang C (2014) Do ethical and sustainable practices matter? *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 26 (6), 930 – 947.

Wood DJ (1991) Corporate Social Performance revisited. *Academy of Management Review*, 16 (4), 691-718.

TABLES

Table 1. Number of brands in the analysis

| Hotel segment | Number of chains in STR list | Information about community involvement | | Information from reports | | Information from websites | |
|----------------------|------------------------------|---|-------------|---------------------------|-------------|---------------------------|-------------|
| | | Number of chains (brands) | % | Number of chains (brands) | % | Number of chains (brands) | % |
| Luxury chains | 103 | 60 | 58.3 | 31 | 51.7 | 29 | 48.3 |
| Upper Upscale chains | 150 | 70 | 46.7 | 32 | 45.7 | 38 | 54.3 |
| Upscale chains | 272 | 113 | 41.5 | 45 | 39.8 | 68 | 60.2 |
| Total | 525 | 243 | 46.3 | 108 | 44.4 | 135 | 55.6 |

Source: Own source

Table 2. Hotel groups and brands by country

| Number of brands/ groups | Europe | USA & Canada | Region | | | |
|--|--------|--------------|-----------------|------|---------|--------|
| | | | Rest of America | Asia | Oceania | Africa |
| Luxury chains/brands (60) | 13 | 29 | 1 | 17 | 0 | 0 |
| Upper Upscale chains/brands (70) | 16 | 32 | 3 | 11 | 2 | 4 |
| Upscale chains/brands (113) | 49 | 35 | 4 | 18 | 4 | 4 |
| Hotel chains/brands in the three segments (243) | 78 | 96 | 8 | 46 | 6 | 8 |
| Hotel groups to whom the 243 brands belong (130) | 51 | 29 | 6 | 30 | 6 | 8 |
| Brands by group (average) | 1.5 | 3.3 | 1.3 | 1.5 | 1 | 1 |

Source: Own source

Table 3. Variables used in the analyses

| Name of the variable | Source | Value |
|---|---|--|
| Country of headquarters | Brand websites | Name of the country |
| Altruism culture (Altruism) ⁽¹⁾ | The World Giving Index (www.cafonline.org/about-us/publications/2016-publications/caf-world-giving-index-2016) | CAF World Giving Index score (%), which takes into account: – Helping a stranger average (%) – Donating money average (%) – Volunteering time average (%) |
| Christianity (PChrist) ⁽²⁾ | www.globalreligiousfutures.org http://www.pewforum.org/files/2012/12/globalReligion-tables.pdf | % Christian religion |
| Brand segment (Luxurybrands) ⁽³⁾ | STR Global (www.strglobal.com) | Luxury (1) Upper Upscale (0) Upscale (0) |
| <i>Community-related information variables (from codification):</i> | | |
| A. Conceptualisation | Qualitative analysis | Yes (1)/No (0) |
| B. Partnerships with NGOs & non-profits (NGOs) ⁽⁴⁾ | Qualitative analysis | Yes (1)/No (0) |
| – Customer participation (Customer)⁽⁵⁾: C+D | Qualitative analysis | Yes (1)/No (0) |
| C. Customer participation through the firm | Qualitative analysis | Yes (1)/No (0) |
| D. Firm participation through customers | Qualitative analysis | Yes (1)/No (0) |
| – Employee participation (Employee)⁽⁶⁾: E+F | Qualitative analysis | Yes (1)/No (0) |
| E. Employee participation through the firm | Qualitative analysis | Yes (1)/No (0) |
| F. Firm participation through employees | Qualitative analysis | Yes (1)/No (0) |
| – Firm participates directly (Firm): G | Qualitative analysis | Yes (1)/No (0) |
| G. Firm participates directly or through its own foundation | Qualitative analysis | Yes (1)/No (0) |
| G5. Own foundation ⁽⁷⁾ | Qualitative analysis | Yes (1)/No (0) |
| – Destination of aid | | |
| H. Destination of aid | Qualitative analysis | Yes (1)/No (0) |

(1) Causal condition 6 in Table 6; (2) causal condition 7 in Table 6; (3) causal condition 3 in Table 6; (4) causal condition 1 in Table 6; (5) causal condition 4 in Table 6; (6) causal condition 5 in Table 6; (7) causal condition 2 in Table 6.

Table 4. Results for the three segments* (%)

| | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------|---|--|---|
| A. Conceptualisation | | <i>A.1. Charity</i> (23.3%)(27.1%)(21.2%) <i>A.5. Creating Shared Value</i> (1.7%)(4.3%)(7.1%) <i>A.2. Citizenship</i> (16.7%)(10%)(10.6%) <i>A.6. Philanthropy</i> (16.7%)(14.3%)(8.8%) <i>A.3. Giving back</i> (25%)(30%)(21.2%) <i>A.7. Social Responsibility</i> (36.7%)(47.1%)(66.4%) <i>A.4. Community involvement</i> (65%)(78.6%)(58.4%) <i>A.8. Solidarity</i> (0%)(0%)(1.8%) | | |
| B. Partnership with NGOs & non-profit | | <i>B1.NGOs and non-profit</i> (58.3%)(57.1%)(63.7%) | | |
| Activities through the firm | | Who assumes the cost of the activity? | | |
| | | Customer | Employee | Firm (or its Foundation) |
| Who participates in the activity? | Customer | C. Customers through the firm: <i>C1.Customer cash donations</i> (20%)(14.3%)(17.7%) <i>C2.Customer in-kind donations</i> (3.3%)(4.3%)(0%) <i>C3.Points in loyalty program for solidarity</i> (10%)(12.9%)(14.2%) | X | D. Firm through customers: <i>D1.Cause-related marketing</i> (5%)(4.3%)(2.7%) <i>D2.Customers decide the charity</i> (1.7%)(0%)(0%) <i>D3.Customer volunteering</i> (6.7%)(2.9%)(3.5%) <i>D4.Dollar-for-dollar guest donations</i> (1.7%)(0%)(1.8%) |
| | Employee | X | E. Employees through the firm: <i>E1.Employee fundraising</i> (21.7%)(21.4%)(9.7%) <i>E2.Employee in-kind donations</i> (1.7%)(2.9%)(3.5%) <i>E3.Employees' other cash donations</i> (11.7%)(12.9%)(14.2%) <i>E.4.Payroll giving</i> (6.7%)(4.3%)(2.7%) | F. Firm through employees: <i>F1.Colleague fundraising</i> (11.7%)(4.3%)(8%) <i>F2.Community grants</i> (13.3%)(14.3%)(7.1%) <i>F3.Employee volunteering</i> (58.3%)(61.4%)(48.7%) <i>F4.Matching gifts/grant programme</i> (1.7%)(4.3%)(5.3%) |
| | Firm (or its Foundation) | X | X | G. Firm directly: <i>G1.Buying goods from NGOs</i> (1.7%)(4.3%)(0.9%) <i>G2.Cash donations</i> (43.3%)(57.1%)(45.1%) <i>G3.Fundraising</i> (33.3%)(35.7%)(46%) <i>G4.In-kind donations</i> (48.3%)(58.6%)(48.7%) <i>G5.Own Foundation</i> (21.7%)(22.9%)(23.9%) <i>G6.Sponsorship</i> (21.7%)(24.3%)(28.3%) |
| H. Destination of aid | | <i>H1.Arts, Heritage, Music</i> (30%)(21.4%)(15.9%); <i>H2.Children support</i> (61.7%)(62.9%)(61.9%); <i>H3.Disaster relief</i> (33.3%)(42.9%)(28.3%); <i>H4.Education and training</i> (66.7%)(57.1%)(59.3%); <i>H5.Educational institutions</i> (51.7%)(31.4%)(31,9%); <i>H6.Elderly people</i> (10%)(4.3%)(8%); <i>H7.Food and Water</i> (26.7%)(28.6%)(21.2%); <i>H8.Housing</i> (16.7%)(27.1%)(17.7%); <i>H9.Indigenous communities</i> (0%)(0%)(1.8%); <i>H10.Libraries</i> (16.7%)(5.7%)(4.4%); <i>H11.Medical and Health initiatives</i> (35%)(31.4%)(36.3%); <i>H12.People with disabilities</i> (23.3%)(15.7%)(15%); <i>H13.Sports and entertainment</i> (6.7%)(5.7%)(8%); <i>H14.Women and girls</i> (25%)(34.3%)(24.8%); <i>H15.Youth support</i> (55%)(48.6%)(49.6%); <i>H16.Families</i> (6.7%)(1.4%)(30.1%); <i>H17.Veteran aids</i> (0%)(1.4%)(6.2%); <i>H18.Community infrastructures</i> (6.7%)(1.4%)(8.8%); <i>H19.Refugees</i> (1.7%)(0%)(2.7%); <i>H20.Homeless and evictions</i> (11.7%)(4.3%)(7.1%) | | |

*the order of results in brackets are (luxury)(upper-upscale)(upscale)

Source: Own source through qualitative analysis of information from hotel brands

Table 5. Participation of customers, employees and company depending on the segment

| Segment | % of brands with customer participation (codes C or D are present) | % of brands with employee participation (codes E or F are present) | % of brands with direct firm participation (code G is present) | % of brands with participation (codes C, D, E, F or G are present) |
|---------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| Luxury (60 brands) | 33.33% | 65% | 78.3% | 88.33% |
| Upper upscale (70 brands) | 30% | 64.3% | 90% | 94.3% |
| Upscale (113 brands) | 25.7% | 60.2% | 80.5% | 88.5% |
| Total (243 brands) | 28.8% | 62.6% | 82.7% | 90.1% |

Source: Own source through qualitative analysis of information from hotel brands

Table 6. Calibration for outcome and conditions in the analysis

| Name for variable | Description | Mean | Std. Dev. | Calibration | Necessary condition | |
|--------------------------|---|-------|-----------|---|---------------------|----------|
| | | | | | Consistency | Coverage |
| Outcome | | | | | | |
| Firm | This variable indicates that the hotel group participates in philanthropic activities directly or through its own foundation. | 0.81 | 0.39 | Crisp sets: Participation YES: 1 NO: 0 | | |
| Causal Conditions | | | | | | |
| 1.NGOs | The hotel group cooperates with NGOs and non-profits. | 0.61 | 0.49 | Crisp sets: Hotels cooperate with NGOs YES: 1 NO: 0 | 0.65 | 0.86 |
| 2.Foundation | The hotel group has its own foundation. | 0.15 | 0.35 | Crisp sets: Foundation YES: 1 NO: 0 | 0.18 | 1.00 |
| 3.Luxurybrands | The hotel group has brands in the luxury segment. | 0.28 | 0.45 | Crisp sets: Luxury YES: 1 NO: 0 | 0.28 | 0.81 |
| 4.Customer | This variable indicates that the hotel group involves customers in philanthropic activities. | 0.24 | 0.43 | Crisp sets: Participation YES: 1 NO: 0 | 0.24 | 0.81 |
| 5.Employees | This variable indicates that employees participate in philanthropic activities. | 0.48 | 0.50 | Crisp sets: Participation YES: 1 NO: 0 | 0.55 | 0.92 |
| 6.Altruismf | The culture in the country indicates altruism. Data | 45.08 | 15.64 | Fuzzy sets: (Full membership; | 0.78 | 0.80 |

| | | | | | | | |
|------------|---|-------|-------|--|--|------|------|
| | represent the Giving index score (%) | | | | crossover point; non-membership) = (50; 30; 0) | | |
| 7.PChristf | Percentage of population who are Christian. | 53.49 | 30.96 | | Fuzzy sets: (Full membership; crossover point; non-membership) = (60; 30; 0) | 0.75 | 0.83 |

Source: Table drawn up using fsQCA software

Table 7. Configuration for the participation of hotel groups in communities

| Causal conditions | Solutions | | | | | | |
|-------------------|---|---|---|--|---|--|--|
| | S1 | S2 | S3 | S4 | S5 | S6 | S7 |
| 1. NGOs | | ● | | ● | ● | ● | ● |
| 2. Foundation | ● | | | | | | |
| 3. Luxurybrands | | | ⊗ | ● | ⊗ | ● | ⊗ |
| 4. Customer | | ⊗ | ⊗ | | ⊗ | ● | |
| 5. Employees | | ● | ● | ● | | | ● |
| 6. Altruismf | | | ● | ⊗ | ● | ● | ● |
| 7. PChristf | | ⊗ | | ⊗ | ● | ● | ● |
| Cases | Barceló, Bharat, CanadInns, Carlson, Choice, ClubMed, Disney, Divan, GHL, Gposadas, Greal, Hyatt, Iberostar, InterC, Lotte, Palace, Sandals, Voyages, Wyndham | Aldemar, Electra, Mitsui, Oberoi, TAJ, Jkeells, Jumeirah, Meritus | CanadInns, Choice, Coast, Dalata, Disney, GrandAm, Mantra, Wyndham, Arora, Dorchester, GLH, Grange, Jkeells, Millennium, Ocallagham, PPHE, TPS, Sandals, Arcotel, Scandic | Langham, Mandarin, ShangriLa, Aldemar, Oberoi, TAJ | Affinia, Choice, Sonesta, Dalata, GrandAm, Wyndham, Oakwood, CanadInns, Coast, Germain, MonteCarlo, Sawridge, Arora, Dorchester, GLH, Grange, HandPck, Meriton, Macdonald, PPHE | FourSeasons, InterC, Icelandair, Baglioni, Accor | BestWestern, Choice, Dalata, GrandAm, HardRock, Wyndham, CanadInns, Coast, Apex, Arora, Dorchester, GLH, Grange, IHI, Mantra, PPHE, RedCarn, Voyages, Arcotel, Scandic |
| Consistency | 1 | 0.88 | 0.96 | 0.99 | 0.89 | 1 | 0.96 |
| Raw coverage | 0.18 | 0.06 | 0.24 | 0.05 | 0.29 | 0.04 | 0.21 |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|------|------|------|--|------|------|------|
| Unique coverage | 0.10 | 0.02 | 0.05 | 0.02 | 0.13 | 0.03 | 0.05 |
| Consistency cut-off | 0.84 | | | | | | |
| Solution consistency | 0.93 | | | | | | |
| Solution coverage | 0.64 | | | | | | |
| ● = Core causal condition present ⁽¹⁾ | | | | ⊗ = Core causal condition absent ⁽²⁾ | | | |
| ● = Complementary causal condition present ⁽³⁾ | | | | ⊗ = Complementary causal condition absent ⁽⁴⁾ | | | |

⁽¹⁾ The causal condition is present in both parsimonious and intermediate solutions; ⁽²⁾ the causal condition is absent in both parsimonious and intermediate solutions; ⁽³⁾ the causal condition is present only in the intermediate solution; ⁽⁴⁾ the causal condition is only absent in the intermediate solution; blank spaces indicates a “do not care” situation: the causal condition might be either present or absent.

Source: Table drawn up using fsQCA software; Ragin and Fiss (2008)

Table 8. Results from the analyses of the hypotheses and solutions

| | Causal conditions in the hypotheses | Causal conditions present in the solutions | Tested |
|----|---|---|---|
| H1 | NGOs (causal condition 1) and Customers (causal condition 4) | NGOs, Customers or Employees (causal conditions 5) | Customers (S6) Employees (S2, S4, S7) |
| H2 | Foundation (causal condition 2) and Employees (causal condition 5) | Foundations | Partially (S1) |
| H3 | Luxury brands (causal condition 3) and Customers (causal condition 4) | Luxurybrands, Customers | Yes (S6) |
| H4 | Employees (causal condition 5) or Customers (causal condition 4) | Customer or Employees | Customer (S6) Employees (S2, S3, S4, S7) |
| H5 | Altruism (causal condition 6) and Employees (causal condition 5) | Employees, Altruism | Yes (S3, S7) No (S4, S5) |
| H6 | Christian religion (causal condition 7) and Employees (causal condition 5) | Employees, PChrist | Yes (S7) |