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Abstract: The interactivity of internet 2.0 and conversations arising in the virtual environment – social networks – can be considered as representative of the average opinion of citizens and tourists, and analysis thereof, therefore, constitutes a valid tool with a view to exploration. We consider the fact that the constant presence of discourses relating to the heritage of certain destinations, the island of Tenerife and Fuerteventura in this case, can be used as an indicator of the achievement of objectives in the reorientation of heritage-based tourism. The text analyses discourses relating to cultural and natural heritage of Tenerife and Fuerteventura in the social network Facebook. We performed a qualitative analysis of the recorded comments, photographs and videos in an attempt to study themes such as the relevance of heritage in the image shared through this medium in connection with the potential tourists, the type of heritage promoted and the differences among users according to the references to heritage elements in their discourses.
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Theoretical framework and approach to the problem: about the relevance of 2.0 environments for the tourism market

One can identify three clearly differentiated stages in the evolution of the internet.

a a time in which the initial technical foundations are laid, which enable the tool to be developed and which can be seen in the seventies of the last century;

b the appearance of the internet in the day-to-day lives of millions of people in the ‘90s;

c the development, since the beginning of the new millennium, of what is known as the Web 2.0.

This is mainly characterised by its dynamism, resulting from the new possibilities for users to participate, the linking of services, the constant development of renovations on the web, the ubiquity of the information (the development and spread of mobile devices enabling access to the web from anywhere) and the push provided by online marketing systems. Tourism is one of the sectors that has been most affected by the development of the 2.0 stage on the internet. Among many of the implications, we can highlight the following:

a Heretofore unseen levels of dissemination of information relating to destinations, which has facilitated virtual access by internauts to hidden spaces, the new demand for territories that had not been incorporated into the tourism system, which consequently changed the planet into a potential tourist destination.

b Mainly due to the generalisation of forums in which tourists talk of their experiences, pages specialised in criticism of products (such as http://www.holidaywatchdog.com and http://www.tripadvisor.com or http://www.holidaytruths.co.uk) and destinations, and the chance to make comments in an increasing number of environments, together
with the fact that purchasing holiday packages involves a high degree of uncertainty (as tourists do not really know what they are buying), users have become highly relevant with regard to influencing decisions taken by tourists. As highlighted by López Carrillo (2009)

“Bizrate detected that 59% of users consider that comments by other users are more highly valued than comments by the experts. (…). A study by CompUSA-iPerceptions points out that 63% of consumers say that they prefer to buy from a webpage that has comments by other purchasers. (…) According to Marketing Sherpa, 83.8% prefer comments by other users as compared with those of the experts. (…) Jupiter Research states that 77% of online buyers make use of evaluations prior to making their purchase”.

c Rapid growth of direct online sales, with the consequent loss of power by the traditional intermediation agents. By way of an example of this phenomenon, Figure 1 shows that 36.1% of tourists visiting Tenerife in 2009 purchased some of the products making up their holidays on the internet, whereas 10.9% used this medium to make bookings.

d Together with the previous implication, the possibility has been developed of designing made-to-measure packages for the consumer. The tourist can access a bigger offer and more information and can purchase the products he is interested in, creating his own package.

e Communication between the company and the user has changed, and the latter can influence in a more direct fashion the form that products take, enabling the companies to develop new customisation strategies and to access specific niches of tourists, regardless of where they are (so that specific promotions for these groups can be intensified, and campaigns made cheaper, on limiting generalisations).
electronic tour operators is currently imposing a change in this model, in which consumers become partly active, not in consuming the product, but rather in the processes of designing, producing and generating images of products and services.

1.1 The islands of Tenerife and Fuerteventura as stagnated tourist destinations presenting reorientation needs

The tourism area life cycle model (Butler, 1980) has probably been the most widely disseminated explanatory diagram in the scope of tourism. It has been discussed, analysed, and used by a host of authors (Agarwal, 1997, 2006; Agarwal and Brunt, 2006; Benedetto, 1993; Digance, 1997; Getz, 1992; Haywood, 1992; Moore and Whitehall, 2005; Oppermann, 1995; Strapp, 1988; Wall, 1983). However, we can especially highlight the modifications proposed by Agarwal (2006), some of the most interesting ones involving the incorporation of the reorientation phase, which entails drawing attention to the fact that it is not a linear process and that, particularly in the stagnation and post-stagnation phases (different degrees of rejuvenation or decline), the agents who manage and plan destinations can opt for different adaptation and re-adaptation strategies, which present varying degrees of complexity and which can be shared by the stakeholders.

Figure 2 Proposal by Sheela Agarwal based on the tourism area life cycle model put forward by Butler (see online version for colours)

The determining features that define the circumstances of a given destination in the stagnation phase and, therefore, the ones that warn of the need to establish reorientation strategies, are basically the following:

a Saturation. The destination has surpassed its capacity to accommodate, with the consequent negative impacts on the environment, society and culture.

b Scant renovation of attractions. Although the image of the destiny is well defined and recognised by potential tourists, it is not seen as a ‘fashion’ destination. Meanwhile, the destination continues to depend upon the attractions that worked in the past, ignoring possible changes in demand.
Excess of offer. Although the influx of tourists has become stabilised and has started to fall off, the offer continues to be developed, with the consequent problems relating to the global profitability of the destination.

b High levels of dependence on tour operators and recurring tourists. The destination finds it hard to attract new tourists and, given the fact that it needs large numbers of customers to cover the excess of offer, it tends to reproduce models of intermediation that provide a certain degree of security, at the expense of profitability.

c Reduced spending by tourists at the destination. In order to guarantee a minimum number of tourists, there is a tendency to compete in prices; moreover, the tourist is not willing to spend a lot in this type of destination and intermediaries can therefore increase their power (the relationship between spending at the destination and at the point of origin can benefit the latter).

d Obsolescence of infrastructures. The gradual loss of profitability and the little effort invested in renovating infrastructures gives rise to a vicious circle which once again undermines the destination’s possibilities.

Figure 3 Evolution of arrivals of tourists to Tenerife and Fuerteventura (see online version for colours)

As can be seen in Figure 3, the islands of Tenerife and Fuerteventura present a stabilisation of the tourist influx, and even a falling-off, particularly serious in the case of Tenerife, although here the influx is much greater.

In these years, however, the accommodation capacity continued to grow despite the fact that the influx of tourists had stabilised (Figure 4) and spending slowed in the context
of Europe’s economy following the year 2000. In this sense, we can highlight, in absolute terms, a real decrease owing to the effects of inflation together with a slight increase in spending at the point of origin and reduced spending at the destination (Figure 5), particularly in the Mediterranean Europe and Africa, and of necessity, increased internal competition at the destinations.

Changes in these variables (tourists, accommodation and spending) occurred in a context defined by the importance of intermediation by tour operators and the entry into the market of destinations competing for the same segment. All this gave rise to a generalised situation of loss of competitiveness in the industry at the point of origin, which indicates that these islands should fulfil the requirements to be considered as destinations with a pressing need for reorientation.

**Figure 4** Evolution of accommodation capacity in Tenerife and Fuerteventura (see online version for colours)

Source: Design based on Machado Carrillo (1990) and data from the survey on touristic offer (ISTAC, 2009b)

In this framework, the channels of intervention appear to be limited. The option involves either fossilisation and price competition or differentiate the destination. The former will have effects that are known in other areas or at other times in the history of tourism in the Canaries. The latter (Figure 6) requires a differentiation based on real uniqueness, patterns of innovation and ‘quality’, processes and services, marketing networks, communication with customers, training and on organisation of complementary offers.
1.2 Cultural heritage and exposure thereof in social networks as key elements for the strategic reorientation of destinations

It is implicitly accepted that the basic principal of heritage is related to the need to establish identities, to differentiate among groups, to demarcate territories. This provides a conscience of a past, of a more or less mythical and apparently immutable inheritance. The recognition of a past encourages an appraisal thereof, not due to the passing of time.
itself, but rather because this past provides a uniqueness. A boundary is thus established, an imaginary line that distinguishes between the familiar and the unknown. This principle of precaution, regardless of one’s own characteristics, is what forms an identity through opposition to other identities.

Institutionalisation of coincidences in relation to the unknown involves preserving and safeguarding the identifiers, which can be seen in cultural practices and, more specifically, in the standardisation of the static and neutral appearance of heritage. This, once again, comes to constitute something common to the group, a dividing line between the familiar and the unfamiliar. However, the line drawn is not a continuous one, nor is observation of the foreign, of the stranger, by any means standard. Heritage does not await discovery; rather, it becomes such through a series of interventions (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, 1998), of group processes of socio-cultural construction, and it is therefore subject to changes in form and content.

At a time when tourist attractors were flagging, terms such as ‘the intangible’, ‘sustainability’, ‘multiculturalism’ and ‘respect for diversity’ became popular. At the end of the ‘80s (Comisión mundial del medio ambiente y el desarrollo, 1987) and the start of the ‘90s in the last century (Naciones Unidas, 1992), this situation promoted a series of products theretofore quite unknown, such as ecotourism, agro-tourism, cultural tourism, rural tourism, ethno-tourism, geo-tourism, etc. A new segmentation of markets which, based upon more or less specific products, apparently meets individuals’ need for experiences, addressing their socio-environmental concerns and contributing to the sustenance of environments and cultures (Cater and Lowman, 1994; Chambers, 1997; Smith and Eadington, 1994; Smith and Brent, 2001).

This response by the tourism system as a whole, proof of its extreme dynamism and capacity for adaptation, introduces and strengthens tourism in the context of territorial conservation, planning and strategies, using heritage as an amenity and a resource for the emotional experience currently demanded. The basis of much innovation in tourism lies in the possibility to present, in an aesthetically correct and sufficiently accessible manner, ‘traditional’ lifestyles and ‘identities’, which can be seen in day-to-day practices in balanced environments. It is this set of heritage-related features that will make destinations unique and therefore the determining heritage in reorientation processes. In the same way that heritage-based objects lead us to see ourselves as a society (and to become a group), they also serve to make others observe us from outside and to see us as others (Valcuende del Río, 2003). Indeed, according to Mayral Buil (2003), it could also be said that the main function of heritage at present is to ‘conserve to exhibit’.

Given its role as a ‘materialiser’ of the main characteristics of the environments to which it belongs and the need to ‘spectacularise’ reality which accompanies tourism, heritage becomes a part of the systems of marketing and profitability of the global market (Valcuende del Río, 2003). An example of this is the tendency to establish heritage rankings on a worldwide level and to determine the value thereof according to number of visits, that is, of individualised consumption.

Internet ‘popularised’ heritage, revealing it to a multitude of more or less passive spectators who, in time, created an image of their ideal holiday, of emotions combined with services provided by the destinations.

The diversity and high level of segmentation of the market (not only according to nationalities, but also to specificities such as age, travel companions, socioeconomic level and destination preferences) makes it difficult to determine the best channels for reaching
potential tourists, which becomes even more complicated when the destination is subjected to strategies based upon a change of image (crucial in tourism reorientation processes). The penetration of the internet as a means of communication and promotion has partially facilitated this process. In this sense, a new and important advance involves the online social networks or 2.0 communities, which have become generalised and have become a part of the day-to-day lives of millions of people, making the spectator an active element and creating a privileged channel to communicate with him as a potential tourist.

The interactivity of internet 2.0 and the conversations arising in the virtual environment can be considered to be representative of the average opinion of citizens in the western world (grouping highly diverse socio-demographic and socioeconomic characteristics), and analysis thereof, therefore, constitutes a valid tool with a view to exploration.

We consider the fact that the constant presence of discourses relating to the heritage of determined destinations, the island of Tenerife and Fuerteventura in this case, serves as an indicator of the fulfilment of objectives in the reorientation of cultural-natural tourism.

2 Analysis of discourses relating to the heritage of Tenerife and Fuerteventura in Facebook

2.1 Methodology

According to the county of origin, the main tourist markets of the islands of Tenerife and Fuerteventura are England, Germany and the rest of Spain (which together constitute 77.19% and 77.53% of tourists, respectively). Both in England and in Germany, Facebook constitutes the main online social network related to the number of visits (Tenerife Stream, a report drafted by the Tenerife Island Govt.), whereas in Spain, this comes second to the network Tuenti, which has a large number of users under 20 years of age (around 40%, according to this report). This is why we chose Facebook for our study.

We selected the 32 pages with the highest level of repercussion (more admirers) dedicated to the islands of Tenerife (16 pages) and Fuerteventura (16 pages). Eight of these, all referring to Tenerife, are of an official nature, while the rest belong to different types of users, fundamentally tourists, resident population and sports associations or companies.

Using this selection, we developed a qualitative analysis of the comments, photographs and videos in an attempt to determine questions such as the relevance of heritage in the image shared through this channel with potential tourists, the type of heritage promoted through this channel and differences among users in relation to references to elements of heritage in their discourses.

2.2 Results

Taking as a sample the 32 addresses in Facebook presenting the highest number of admirers with the words ‘Fuerteventura’ and ‘Tenerife’, we found that there are three main types of pages: those managed by private individuals, pages pertaining to institutions and those of associations or companies. In the case of Tenerife, we found eight pages of an institutional nature (all created by the Tenerife Tourism Board, the main
organism managing tourism on the island), compared with eight created by different private individuals. For Fuerteventura we found seven pages managed by companies, two by sporting associations and seven private ones.

In accordance with the objectives of this study, several types of contents can be distinguished in the different comments:

a. Those referring to the appearance of the destination in films or TV series:

We detected a total of seven discussions referring to this theme, all of them referring to Tenerife (due to its recently featuring in the film ‘Clash of Titans’ and the sixth season of the series ‘Lost’), mostly (four out of seven) of an institutional nature. The comments generally indicate clearly that the choice of their island for filming was favourably accepted by residents, who were proud of their surroundings. Although these comments are not closely related to heritage, a comment by one user is of particular interest:

“The documentation team has not done its homework, because the house where Ricardo [a character from the series ‘Lost’] lives is more like a Celtic settlement than the island’s typical architecture (…)”. (Risco, 2010)

This can be construed as a demand for correct transformation and symbolic reproduction of determined heritage-based elements.

b. Related to sporting events and clubs:

These comments are mainly associated with the practice of Surf or Windsurf (especially in the case of Fuerteventura), hiking (in Tenerife), sailing, scuba diving, etc. The institutions provide few comments of this kind (within this scope, we only found one reference to a sponsorship of a motorcycling team), and there were more references by sporting associations, users thereof or specialised companies. The contents of these comments are usually related to information on certain events, routes or the characteristics and natural heritage of the islands for practicing these sports.

c. Cultural events and festivities:

In the comments, references to this type of elements tend to be limited to announcing a specific festivity (especially with regard to comments by the institutions, which only provide the dates and programmes for this kind of events). We found no comments explaining the nature of the events, although some people talked of their experiences in specific festivities, highlighting their positive memories. Thus, although there are clear references to heritage-based elements (there are continuous ones dealing with cultural practices with a high identity-related value), they tend to be rather shallow, particularly if the target group is previously unaware of these events.

d. Direct references to natural heritage:

Among the comments we can distinguish direct references by the three types of agents to elements integrated in the natural heritage of both islands (from the habitual mention of unique beaches, volcanoes, malpaisies (lava fields), deserts, lagoons, cliffs, laurel forest and dunes of white sand, or of highly symbolic animals such as the goat, the camel or fish like the vieja (Sparisoma cretense), to the specific
allusion to protected areas – such as the Betancuria Rural Park, the Anaga Rural Park, the Teide National Park, the Teno Rural Park, the Corralejo Dunes Nature Reserve, the Isla de Lobos Nature Reserve, SPAs, SCIs, etc. This kind of comments usually have a good following by other users (measured by the number of related “I like it” comments).

e Direct references to cultural heritage:

Direct allusions to cultural heritage are also frequent, although there are more references to natural aspects. One can clearly distinguish between references to cultural elements associated with the present (such as gastronomic products or certain traditional population settlements, particularly those linked with primary production activities) and those relating to the past (architectural monuments, references to attacks by pirates in the 16th, 17th and 18th centuries, historical volcanic eruptions or the islands’ pre-Hispanic settlers).

We should make separate mention of the comments referring to heritage-based gastronomic products. We detected references to specific products, such as cheeses in the case of Fuerteventura (comment by a company providing accommodation) or the wines of Tenerife (comments by an institution). In both cases, prizes were won in different national and international fairs, the quality of these products thus being highlighted. Moreover, the comments are extended through links with pages describing the products and their relationship with the local culture. Thus, these products constitute a clear reference to cultural heritage. One can highlight the comments by the company Fuerteventura Tours, which refer to the island’s cuisine in the following manner:

“The Canary cuisine of Fuerteventura has to offer a lot of flavours, colours, aromas and textures. Mediterranean nuances give the typical style of the plates a special emphasis. It is characterised by fresh fish, sea food, goat cheese and other agricultural products grown on the island.” (Fuerteventura Tour, 2009)

f Complaints about the state of conservation of different heritage-related elements:

Although we only found four entries of this sort, there are some noteworthy comments by users regarding problems associated with the conservation of heritage (specifically the landscape of Tenerife’s Orotava Valley, Mount Tindaya on Fuerteventura, Santa Cruz de Tenerife’s city centre and the general fauna and flora of the archipelago).

g Promotion of specific tourism products:

Mostly entrepreneurs, but also the institutions and individual users have provided a host of comments referring to tourist products (especially accommodation, thematic parks, flights, rental cars and excursions). Promotion of heritage-based elements in this kind of comments is quite insignificant.

h Tourists commenting on their experience:

Many tourists use this social network to share their ideas about the destinations analysed. It is interesting to note that no negative comments were detected. These references to present or past experience at the destination make this channel an
important means of transmitting the ‘shared image’. This image can be fundamental with regard to generating customer-tourist customisation strategies.

On occasions, it is a desire to share these experiences that promote the creation of private pages by post-tourists:

“Ci sono stato nell’agosto 2008 non riesco a levarmela dalla mente isola fantastica.....è per questo che ho fatto il gruppo dell’isola, vedo che siamo diventati tanti....mi fà piacere ciao ragazzi.” (Isola di Fuerteventura, 2009)

These comments, however, tend to be too general (normally just one clause) and make no explicit reference to heritage-based elements. The following is one example of a typical message in this sense:

“It is sooo lovely on Tenerife!!! I have been there many times, and I LOVE it every time!!” (S.L., 2010)

i Tourists requesting information on destinations:

Another group of comments highlights the demand for information by tourists planning their trip to the island in question. In this case, it is interesting to note that none of the entries of this type that we detected were on institutional pages, but rather ones generated by other users. This could be seen as the materialisation of a higher degree of trust in other users than in the institutions at destinations.

These users mostly request information on the most typical places to visit, where to stay and what to do on the island. To a certain extent, on referring to the emblematic places at the destinations, they are requesting information about the heritage therein.

Likewise, some of the messages seem to indicate that some tourists rely on the island’s local people to provide them with a more ‘authentic’ experience than the organised excursions found in guide books.

It should be pointed out that there has been no answer to these comments, so that demand by these tourists is not met, which can compromise the quality of the general experience of the trip.

Furthermore, in order to fulfil the objectives of this research, we categorised the videos and photographs in the previous pages according to the following types:

j Natural heritage:

The three types of agents considered (tourist companies, an institutional organism and private users) have used to a great extent reproductions of the islands’ natural heritage to illustrate their comments. In the vast majority of the cases, these are representative elements that can easily be identified with the island in question (icons closely related to these destinations in the collective conscience, the clearest example of which is Mount Teide2 – in Tenerife –, which appears in just over 20% of the photographs appearing in the pages on Tenerife that we studied (excluding users’ profile photos), whereas in the case of Fuerteventura, we can highlight reproductions of beaches with yellow sand).

k Cultural heritage:
Cultural heritage is used, although less than natural heritage, to illustrate the comments on these islands. This usually involves images of traditional settlements in a perfect condition, stone walls and festivities (especially carnival and romerías – popular religious festivities). This kind of elements, however, generate little response; perhaps a click on an “I like it” when a photo or the landscape are appreciated.

1 Tourist products:

We can highlight the existence of photographs of specific tourist products, uploaded mainly by entrepreneurs and tourists who talk of their trips. The photos of thematic parks are particularly relevant (mainly in the case of Tenerife) and those uploaded by a company offering excursions in a submarine (in Fuerteventura). There is little presence of heritage-related elements in this type of images.

3 Discussion and conclusions

The development of virtual social networks dealing with tourist destinations is something considered to be of obvious importance by managers, planners, entrepreneurs and tourists. Likewise, cultural heritage and nature are considered to be defining and unique elements that can help to differentiate tourist destinations and even to orientate re-adaptation strategies towards new market demands. An analysis, however, of one of the most widely used social networks (Facebook) for Tenerife and Fuerteventura, provides results that do not tally with these initial assumptions.

The islands’ strategies clearly show an interest in differentiating destinations through the use of natural and cultural heritage. These are projected on the internet, among other media, where one can see that Tenerife has deployed a wide range of web pages aimed at reaching this objective. In comparison, Fuerteventura has not used the web at all to develop this strategy.

Tenerife’s strategy in this sense, however, is far from being completely effective. The island’s institutions make multiple shallow references to cultural heritage, but do not provide any in-depth knowledge or system for exchanging messages. Furthermore, although the institutions offer information in five languages, which implies many different users or potential customers, no interpretation is provided of the contents in order to culturally adapt them to the variety of target groups. All that is given is a literal translation of the texts, along with some photographs. This means that there are generally no comments in the web pages of institutions or companies. The interaction with users increases considerably when this kind of web pages are managed by private individuals, belong to associations or refer to specific activities (surf, sup, etc.) with which participants can relate. Perhaps this is because the comments, the information and the image created seem to be more directed towards a specific audience.

The basic principle and outstanding value of internet 2.0, whose main expression can be seen in social networks, involves intercommunication among users and the capacity to generate online conversations on specific themes, opinions and experiences which, to a certain extent, are individualised. If web pages belonging to institutions do not manage to promote an optimum intercommunication for reviewing products and as a way to provide experiences and satisfaction, then users or companies can be expected to cover these needs. The analysis shows once again that the potential of the network is not exploited,
not due to a lack of tools or possible contents (available on multiple pages on the Web 1.0), but rather to a lack of dynamism or promoters thereof.

Having chosen pages containing the descriptors ‘Tenerife’ and ‘Fuerteventura’ (separately), heritage is seen to be relatively important therein, appearing in almost of the pages, although in some of them as a marginal and/or aesthetic reference. The heritage promoted usually tends to be expressly assumed as a natural or cultural element, or rather simply shown without being named, by way of ornamentation. The analysis, however, highlights the frequent repetition of references to popular festivities, monuments and gastronomy and to intangible heritage (contained in stories and legends, mainly about pirates and pre-Hispanic cultures) and architectural monuments and cultural landscapes.

This makes sense if we consider that the image generated by private pages is based upon the ‘perceived global image’, which results from the set of mental stereotypes prior to the visitor’s stay and from the personal impression formed during his visit (Cromptom, 1978). That is, these kinds of pages are mainly based on a series of assumed ideas, beliefs and impressions relating to the islands and that are to be shared. These are generally expressed through representative elements, which tend to be the attributes that are most patrimonialised. They are usually endorsed by the users of the pages. This representation, in turn, has been oriented to a great extent by the stereotypes of the market itself, on which the institutions and companies in Facebook rely in order to create their projected image. Conversations on the perceived global image of these destinations, particularly their heritage, tend to range from insistence on the projected image to individualised adaptation.

In this sense, the virtual social networks are relevant with regard to generating and reinforcing the ‘image stereotypes’ of a destination (Echtner and Ritchie, 1991; Gallarza et al., 2002) in potential tourists.

In short, it should also be mentioned that, despite the fact that Facebook is used to provide information on the state of determined heritage-related elements, there is an evident lack of conversations on icons of official culture (such as museums). This leads us to consider, with certain reservations, that the effective value of heritage in tourist destinations such as the one studied is merely anecdotal, even at times when there exists a need to revise those elements that can distinguish the destinations from their direct competitors. The awareness of heritage, as a socio-cultural construction in a constant process of renovation, does not fit into marketing plans that require a certain degree of repetition and stability in order for products to be consumed and identified by the markets. Only a few heritage-based elements, such as natural and monumental heritage, meet these requirements, and this is perhaps why they are the most commonly mentioned in tourism and in the promotion thereof by institutions.
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Notes

1 Where Leonard Kleinrock published the first document on the theory of package networks (1961), Lawrence Roberts connected a computer in Massachusetts with another in California (1965) and the first network was setup between the Universities of UCLA and Stanford (1969).

2 Image of Mount Teide (Tenerife) (N.D., 2009).

3 Photograph of the Betancuria settlement (Fuerteventura) (Sheraton Fuerteventura, 2009).