Critical considerations on gender and tourism: an introduction

Donna Chambers and Tijana Rakić

University of Sunderland, UK and University of Brighton, UK

I imagine phallocentric reality to be the space and figures and motion which constitute the foreground, and the repetitive uneventful activities of women to constitute and maintain the background against which this foreground plays. It is essential to the maintenance of the foreground reality that nothing within it refer in any way to anything in the background and yet it depends absolutely upon the existence of this background (Marilyn Frye cited in Rose, 1993, p. 5)

The Global Gender Gap Report, produced by the World Economic Forum (WEF) seeks to quantify the extent of disparities based on gender in four key areas – health, education, economy and politics – in over 100 countries across the globe. In its 11th edition published in 2016, the report concluded that no country in the world has fully closed its gender gap (WEF, 2016). This report is useful in so far as it provides quantitative indicators of the attainment gap between men and women in the four identified areas but it does not seek to unpack the very meaning of gender, nor does it seek to problematize the concept of 'gender equality' as a necessary or desired state. Our inspiration for editing this special issue of Tourism Culture and Communication on gender and tourism stems from a recognition of what we would argue is the lack of sufficient coverage and theoretical depth to current discussions of gender within tourism research. It is of course commonly recognized that gender is a complex concept which cannot be understood based simply on deterministic biological differences between men and women. The World Health Organization (WHO) defines gender as socially constructed characteristics of both women and men (WHO, 2015). Gender is also culturally and politically contingent and is therefore 'performed' differently across space and time. Indeed, the performative nature of gender has long been articulated by noted feminist theorists such as Judith Butler (1988) and by academics like West and Zimmerman in their seminal article titled 'Doing Gender' (1987). That gender is a social, cultural and political construct, rather than an innate

quality of a person's biological sex, results in several critical interrogations of the nature of gender performances and their effects on both women and men.

While not occluding the role of biology and its link to culture, gender can be said to be constituted through social interactions and as such serves as a 'powerful ideological device, which produces, reproduces and legitimates choices' (West and Zimmerman, 1987:147). Although the broad area of 'gender studies' incorporates a variety of different research streams, due to the historic and continued oppression of women within largely patriarchal societies, much of the academic discourse on gender has been developed and articulated through the lens of feminist scholarship (Hall, Swain and Kinnaird, 2003; Aitchison, 2005). Feminist scholarship is itself heterogenous and over time has become underpinned by varying philosophical conceptualizations of the nature of [masculinist] human (and non-human) existence, realities, interactions and interconnections within the context of a complex social world. Many feminism*s* have therefore emerged but are generally clustered into what are termed in an historical sense as three 'waves' – feminist empiricism, standpoint feminism and post-structural feminism respectively (see for example Code, 2000; Figueroa-Domecq et al, 2015 for further discussion of each of these waves). There have of course been many criticisms of this rather linear conceptualization of feminist thought as it seeks to suggest that there are no intersections or continuities between and among the various waves, that each wave represents an advancement on the previous one and importantly this historicity is quite specific to Western contexts (Browne, 2014).

Today it is recognized that there is no universal definition of feminism and the question that seems more pertinent is for what purpose is feminist knowledge and scholarship? The aim of feminist theorizing is to achieve political and social change, not just in the conscious and material circumstances of women but also in the relationship between men and women in society, recognizing that they are inextricably linked as intimated in the quote from Marilyn Frye at the beginning of this introduction. That is, there is a fundamental political emancipatory project which underpins much of feminist scholarship. Yet, gender studies are often said to be about women's **problems**, thus failing to acknowledge the complex intersections between 'men's and women's spaces and the dynamics of gender relations' (Kolawole, 2005, p. 251). Further, relations between men have been observed to be also gendered (Rotman and Savulis,2003). It

is surprising therefore that Issues of masculinity are often elided in tourism studies on gender (Pritchard, Morgan, Ateljevic and Harris, 2007) although a recent book length publication by Thurnell-Read & Casey (2014) has sought to partially address this lacuna.

The leisure studies literature, which bears a strong family resemblance to tourism studies, has been exploring women's participation and constraints in leisure through significant empirical projects since the latter half of the 1970s (Aitchison, 2005). In 2013, Karla Henderson and Heather Gibson published an integrative review of research and publications on women and leisure (which synthesised four separate reviews they had undertaken from 1980 to 2010) and concluded that most of the studies used qualitative methods and could be divided into seven broad themes, including resistance and empowerment through leisure, feminist frameworks, family, psychical and mental health and social inclusion. However, in tourism studies, it is generally agreed that serious academic interrogations of gender emerged only in the early-1990s, much later than they did in other fields of study (Aitchison, 2005). Noted publications in the decade of the 1990s include the text by Kinnaird & Hall (1994) titled 'Tourism: a gender analysis'; the article by Veijola and Jokinen (1994) on the 'Body in tourism' and the special issue of Annals of Tourism Research on 'gender in tourism' edited by Swain (1995). In 2003 another special issue on tourism and gender appeared in the journal Tourism, Recreation Research (Hall, Swain and Kinnaird, 2003) which offered reflections on the 'gender agenda' (p. 7) and concluded that 'there is still much to debate and contest at the interface of gender and tourism to further our understanding of tourism processes' (p. 7).

More recently, Munar et al (2015) published a report on the gender gap in tourism studies (which focused on key leadership indicators in the tourism academy including journal editorship) and concluded that women are under-represented in leadership and gatekeeping positions. Figueroa-Domecq et al. (2015) undertook an exegesis of the 'state of the art' of scholarship on tourism and gender and determined that while research in this area has increased in the last three decades, it remains marginal within the wider context of enquiry of and about tourism. In their review, they found that most of the research in this area adopted quantitative methodologies with the key topics grouped into four broad categories – gendered tourists, gendered hosts, gendered

labour and theory, research and education. Importantly, they argue that gender research in tourism is 'disarticulated from wider feminist and gender aware initiatives and lacks the critical mass of research leaders, publications, citations and multi-institutional networks which characterise other tourism sub-fields' (2015, p.87).

The continued failure of gender research in and about tourism to engage sufficiently with wider theoretical discussions taking place in other disciplines and fields of study is exemplified by the polemics surrounding women's rights and human rights. Gender research generally regards the struggle for women's rights as inseparable from the struggle for human rights. This notion is often articulated as 'Women's rights as human rights' but we have found no in-depth theorization of this link within the tourism literature. In an interesting and insightful discussion Nayak (2013) problematized the conceptualization of women's rights as human rights as either leading to an acceptance of a homogenizing universalism or cultural relativism. Nayak wrote that:

> It is alleged that feminists calling for universal human rights base their claim to rights on a Western, white middle class women's perspective…cultural relativists charge that the essentialist position taken by many feminists is merely another instance of Western values and norms being imposed on non-Western countries in an imperialistic and neo-colonial manner (2013, p. 85-86).

Studies which focus on the 'liberation' and 'empowerment' of women in the 'Third World' through for example community based tourism projects, and written from the perspective of Western women researchers often fail to consider cultural and historical specificities and moreover do not often seek to unpack the colonial nature of developmental models. In this regard, Arnfred (2004) argues that one of the areas in which 'colonial continuities are still alive and kicking is in gender and development discourse' (p.11). She contends that in an African context, referring to 'female subordination' is far too simplistic and generally misleading. However, these representations of African women as downtrodden and overworked 'beasts of burden', as victims, provides legitimacy to 'concerted Western efforts to come to their rescue' (p. 12). While Arnfred admits that in gender and development discourse, the 'victimization' of African women is increasingly being questioned and criticized, this nevertheless fails to disrupt the continued persistence of the 'othering' of African women.

According to Chandra Mohanty 'universal images of the 'Third World woman' (the veiled woman, chaste virgin, etc) – images constructed from adding 'the Third World difference to 'sexual difference' – are predicated upon (and hence bringing into sharper focus) assumptions about Western women as secular, liberated, and having control over their own lives' (1988, p.74). This dichotomous construction of 'Third World' and Western women results in a process of 'othering' of the former, and fails to consider the possibility that the self can only be created by means of the other (Mohanty, 1988). Further, in this simplistic binary characterization, the 'Third World' woman lacks agency. Returning to Figueroa-Domecq et al's (2015), review of the current state of gender research in tourism, it is argued here that in keeping with much of the existing scholarship in tourism, tourism gender research is 'heavily Anglo-centric', eliding the voices of those who do not write, research or who do not have lived experiences in English. Indeed, in the tourism literature, little has been written on the experiences of women in Africa, the Caribbean, Latin America, Asia and all the previously colonized territories *from the perspective of the women themselves*.

We go further to argue that tourism gender research has also failed to take sufficient account of the complex intersectionalities between gender and a host of identifications including race, class, sexuality and age (as argued by post-structural feminists). Gender is but one value through which Western, white, bourgeois, heterosexual Man (what Haraway, 2013 deems as 'the master subject') mediates power, but race, class and sexual preference are also equally important (Rose, 1993). McGirr (2003, p. 65) contends that 'Man's hegemony is dependent upon ceaselessly excluding and marginalizing women, people of color and homosexuals.' The term 'intersectionality' was originally popularized by Kimberley Crenshaw (1989), a noted black feminist, and referred to the way in which racial and sexual subordination were inextricably linked. An inability to understand the mutually reinforcing relationship between racism and sexism, Crenshaw argued, had led to the significant elision of black women's experiences from both the discourses of feminism and the discourses of anti-racism.

However, the notion of intersectionality has since been extended to include the intersections between and among gender and a host of multiple identifications which go beyond race. Henderson and Gibson (2013) writing in the context of leisure studies, identified intersectionality as a 'promising paradigm' (p. 115) for the future study of

gender, women and leisure. What underpins the notion of intersectionality is the idea that women are a heterogenous group and do not therefore have the same experiences of oppression. Intersectionality rejects essentialised views of women's experiences and the inherent power implications of such absolutism and instead embraces the pluralism and fluidity of identity categories. Haraway, in advocating what she terms 'cyborg feminism' stated this cogently thus:

> None of 'us' have any longer the symbolic or material capability of dictating the shape of reality to any of 'them.' Or at least 'we' cannot claim innocence from practising such dominations. White woman, including socialist feminists, discovered (that is, were forced kicking and screaming to notice) the non-innocence of the category 'woman.' Cyborg feminists have to argue that 'we' do not want any more natural matrix of unity and that no construction is whole. (2013, p. 157)

Still, while intersectionality is a useful paradigm it does have its detractors who argue that recognizing such multiple identifications is counter-productive to women's struggle for equality as it focuses on difference between and amongst women rather than their commonalities (chiefly common experiences of oppression in a male dominated world) (see Nayak, 2013). Intersectionality, it is argued, serves to fracture the feminist project and weakens its political power to enable change for *all* women. Okin (1994) argues that while women from different cultural and social contexts might experience sexism differently, they still experience sexism (cited in Nayak, 2013). Further, Haraway (2013) cautions against 'lapsing into boundless difference' (p.160) and surrendering the job of making real, though partial connections between and amongst women. For her part, Siegel (1997) argues that while it is difficult for third wave feminists to say 'we' it is still vital to the success of the feminist political project. We argue in this introduction that recognizing the differences between and amongst women based on varied historical, cultural, social and political contexts is crucial. There is no 'one size fits all' in women's lived experiences nor in the development and implementation of strategies to enable women's empowerment. Adopting such a reductionist approach is, we believe, doomed to failure. And we do not see this perspective as inconsistent with a recognition of the common struggles that women still face. Women worldwide can work together without negating difference under an essentialist project that portends to speak for **all** women. Indeed, we agree with Friedman who contended that 'to define identity solely in terms of gender re-inscribes other forms of oppression by rendering them invisible' (1998, p. 20). It is in this light that we argue for more gender and

tourism research to reflect the diverse voices of women from and within Africa, Asia, Latin America, and the Caribbean thus breaking the Euro/Anglocentric stranglehold of existing research in this, as in many other areas, of tourism scholarship.

In this special issue, Maliva et al seek to do just that. Their research illustrates the extent to which Zanzibari women have agency over their own lives disrupting traditional views of African women as victims. They draw on enactment theory to demonstrate how Zanzibari women in tourism can challenge, negotiate and resist religious and cultural norms through entrepreneurial activities. In this account, Maliva et al enable the voices of Zanzibari women to be heard as they narrate how they make sense of, and influence their own environments to create employment opportunities for themselves in the tourism industry. It is in this process of sense-making that new meanings and identities emerge for the women.

Further, the contribution by Foley et al focus on women in villages on the Kokoda Track in Papua New Guinea and illustrate the way these women negotiate the power dynamics as they go about their day to day social interactions in the development of sustainable tourism micro businesses. Foley et al agree with our own previously articulated view about the need to understand differences in the lived experiences of women and claim in their article that 'it is essential, to undertake research at the micro level that examines feminist issues in the context of specific groups of women to provide insight into practice and theoretical development not dominated by western-centric research'. They draw on insights from three theoretical perspectives to explore the issue of women's empowerment in the Kokoda villages – Michel Foucault's approach to governmentality, Chandra Mohanty's post-colonial feminist perspective and Anthony Giddens' structuration theory. Using a participatory approach in which a series of workshops were held with women in the villages along the Kokoda track, the authors suggest that through the involvement by Kokoda women in a community based ecotourism development project they have managed to resist not only the patriarchal structures of their communities, but also the dominant neo-liberal capitalist construction of the tourism industry.

The gendered nature of employment is a key issue which has preoccupied gender and feminist studies for decades. Haraway (2013) borrowed from Richard Gordon's 1983

notion of the 'homework economy' to explain how work was redefined as being 'both literally female and feminized whether performed by men or women' (p. 166). This feminization of labour has serious implications as it exposes the vulnerability of jobs so ascribed, making them easily 'dissassembled and reassembled' (Haraway 2013, p.166). Further the remuneration and benefits assigned to jobs seen as 'feminine' has traditionally been lower than those defined as 'masculine.' This is important for tourism as it has often been argued that the dependence of the tourism industry on human resources results in the creation of jobs that are low-skilled, low-paid and part time. These jobs are unsurprisingly often carried out by women and within the tourism industry there has developed a culture of gendered employment which attributes certain job roles as being more appropriate to women (Jordan, 1997).

Sinclair argued that 'work in tourism…is structured along gender lines and generally conforms to dominant gender norms' (1997, p. 6). In their bibliometric analysis of full research papers published in indexed tourism journals between 1985-2012, Figueroa-Domecq et al (2015) indicated that of the 466 papers analysed, 59 of these dealt with gendered labour and of this total the majority (34) dealt with gender discrimination and occupational segregation. It is not clear how many of these papers focused on the non-English speaking world but given the overall dearth of published research in and of tourism which examines these cultural and geographical contexts, it would not be unreasonable to discern that the non-English speaking world would be under-represented in these analyses of gendered labour. Admittedly, we have seen a few recent publications which seek to explore gendered labour in non-English speaking contexts in the developing world. For example, Guimarães & Silva (2016) explored the gender wage gap in the Brazilian tourism sector and concluded that there is still discrimination as women are less valued than men even when they perform the same job roles.

The contribution in this special issue by Costa et al draw on feminist economics to examine the gender wage gap in Portugal, considered a peripheral region of Western Europe. In this paper, they argue that there are several theories which seek to explain the gender wage gap but their paper is different in so far as it adopts an interpretative approach, drawing on the narratives of research participants to explore the ways in which the gender wage gap is created and maintained. The results of their study reveal

several factors which contributed to the gender pay gap in the Portuguese tourism industry including horizontal segregation, the continued prominence of men in higher hierarchical positions and women's apparent lack of both temporal and geographical flexibility. They conclude with several policy recommendations aimed at eliminating the gender pay gap.

Cultural geographers like Rose (1993), have argued that spaces are gendered. Public and private spaces (such as the home) are masculinized and feminized respectively and thus mirror the gendered power relationships which infuse our social world. Dowler, Carubia & Szcygiel (2005) suggested that feminist scholars have argued that landscape is a medium through which socially constructed 'gender stereotyping is perpetuated' (2005, p.1).   Interestingly Dowler et al (2005) deepened the discussion of gendered landscapes to include the moral dimension. They contended that:

> Historically landscapes have been exempted from moral responsibility due to their imagined nature…it is evident in the early studies of landscape that there was literally a 'love' for the landscape. As the cultural turn has proven, this was certainly a blinded love, which was 'unseeing' of the landscape as an active system of oppression (Dowler et al, 2005, p.3)

Dowler et al emphasized this point by arguing that 'landscapes are not innocent; rather they are the palette of a specific moral agenda' (2005, p.7) and suggested further that while much of the literature has focused on the moral landscape, insufficient explorations have been conducted on 'the gendering of that morality' (p.7). In tourism, this concept of the gendered identity of landscape was adapted by Pritchard & Morgan (2000) who argued that representations of tourist destinations (for example in promotional materials) manifest the gendered nature of landscapes. In a very general sense they suggested that those landscapes in the south and east of the world were represented as feminine and sexualized. However hostile environments in the north were portrayed as masculine, bleak and rugged. Pritchard & Morgan surmised that:

> In contrast to the passive, seductive, feminine landscapes of the south and east, northern male landscapes are active, wild, untamed and often harsh and even penetrative. Moreover, these wild landscapes are exclusively oriented towards the male tourist gaze (2000, p. 897).

Two of the articles in this special issue draw insights from this notion of gendered landscapes. Yudina et al in their paper focus on the way in which the representation of a nature based arctic tourism destination (Churchill, Manitoba in British Columbia) reproduces dominant gender stereotypes not only of the landscape itself (as an imagined object) but also of the polar bears (non-human subjects) that inhabit this landscape. Using critical discourse analysis of promotional texts, they reveal 'how various representations of polar bear tourism impose hegemonic gender roles onto polar bear bodies, which are emplaced within a conventionally gendered landscape.' Importantly they expose the power relationships inherent in these gendered representations of the arctic landscape, the polar bears and the polar bear/human relationships which result in certain tourism practices. They argue for a questioning of these taken for granted gendered representations so that spaces can be created in tourism for more equitable practices.

In their contribution, Cassel and Pashkevich also explore arctic landscapes but this time the geographical context shifts to Russia. Focusing on the Nenets Autonomous District, they use a mix of qualitative methods (semi-structured interviews, observation and analysis of online tourism promotional materials) to explore hegemonic masculinist representations of the north and how these both 'inform and are challenged by tourism and its representations and practices'. They indicate that amongst these representations is that of the artic as being a demanding and risky playground, largely the domain of the 'macho' male. Unsurprisingly risk-taking is associated with masculinity, and women are normally represented as involved in more sedate activities traditionally associated with the private space of the home (such as cooking). Recently, Yang, Khoo-Lattimore and Arcodia (2016) undertook a systematic literature review of risk and gender research in tourism and defined risk itself as being gendered. For example, women's risk taking behaviour is likely to be evaluated in a more negative way than men's as the latter is 'associated with the construction of masculinity, whereas risk aversion is a desirable value of femininity' (p. 89). This gendered representation of risk is certainly evident in the practices and performances of men and women in their tourism activities in the Russian arctic, as illustrated in Cassel and Pashkevich's contribution in this special issue. However, their research has identified a nascent challenge to these gendered portrayals of these arctic landscapes and tourism performances, through the involvement of men in domesticated activities such

as cooking and caring for customers. They caution though that while this is a 'sign of potential transformation' it is only partial and has not to date served to disrupt the hegemony of masculinist portrayals of, and performances within, the Russian arctic tourism landscape.

In summary, the five papers in this special issue have contributed to the critical conversations that we urgently need to engage with in order to understand the nature of gender relationships in tourism. They have inspired us to think about gender from different theoretical perspectives and from diverse geographical contexts including the often neglected Third World. In our deliberations on the relationship between gender and tourism we need to remind ourselves that research is not value-neutral. Indeed, the term 'passionate scholarship' according to Morley (1996, p.128) 'breaches the academic rule of disembodiment' and as such we firmly locate ourselves in the context of critical tourism scholarship which has long ago gone beyond any notion of value neutral research. Our focus on gender and tourism mirrors our own positionality as women in tourism and the papers in this special edition reflect the sort of theorising that we feel is central to critical tourism scholarship.

References

Aitchison, C. (2005). Feminist and gender perspectives in tourism studies: the social-cultural nexus of critical and cultural theories. *Tourist Studies* 5(3), 207-224

Arnfred, S. (2004).   Introduction: re-thinking sexualities in Africa. In S. Arnfred (ed). *Re-thinking sexualities in Africa*. (pp 7-29). Sweden: Almqvist Wiksell Tryckeri AB

Browne, V. (2014). Introduction: feminism and historical time, In V. Browne (ed). *Feminism, time and non-linear history* (pp 1-23). US: Palgrave MacMillan

Butler, J. (1988). Performative acts and gender constitution: an essay in phenomenology and feminist theory. *Theatre Journal* 40(4), 519-531

Code, L. (ed). (2000). *Encyclopaedia of feminist theories*. New York: Routledge

Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: a black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum*, 1(8): 139-167

Dowler, L., Carubia, J. and Szcygiel, B. (2005). *Gender and landscape: renegotiating the moral landscape.* London: Routledge.

Figueroa-Domecq, C., Pritchard, A., Segovia-Pérez, M., Morgan, N., and Villacé-Molinero, T. (2015). Tourism gender research: a critical accounting. *Annals of Tourism Research* 52, 87-103.

Friedman, S. (1998). *Mappings: feminism and the cultural geographies of encounter.* Princeton: Princeton University Press

Guimarães, C., and Silva, J.R. (2016). Pay gap by gender in the tourism industry of Brazil. *Tourism Management* 52, 440-450.

Hall, D., Swain, M., and Kinnaird, V. (2003). Tourism and gender: an evolving agenda. *Tourism Recreation Research* 28(2), 7-11.

Haraway, D. ([1991],2013). Simians, cyborgs, and women: the reinvention of nature. London: Routledge

Henderson, K. and Gibson, H. (2013). An integrative review of women, gender and leisure: increasing complexities. *Journal of Leisure Research* 45(2), 115-135

Jordan, F. (1997). An occupational hazard? sex segregation in tourism employment. *Tourism Management* 18(8), 525-534

Kinnaird, V., and Hall, D. (1994). *Tourism: a gender analysis.* Chichester: John Wiley

Kolawole, M. (2005). Re-conceptualizing African gender theory: feminism, womanism and the *Arere* metaphor. In S. Arnfred, (ed) Re-thinking sexualities in Africa. Pp 251-268. Uppsala: Nordic Africa Institute.

McGirr, P. (2003). The Vietnam veterans' memorial: landscape and gender in the twentieth century. In D.L. Rotman, D.L., and E-R. Savulis, E-R. (eds). *Shared spaces and divided places: material dimensions of gender relations and the American historical landscape.* (pp 62-85) Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press

Mohanty, C. (1988). Under Western eyes: feminist scholarship and colonial discourses. *Feminist Review*, 80, 61-88.

Morley, L. (1996). Interrogating patriarchy: the challenges of feminist research. In L. Morley and V. Walsh (eds). *Breaking boundaries: women in higher education* (pps 128-143). Bristol: Taylor and Francis

Munar, A.M, et al (2015). *The gender gap in the tourism academy: statistics and indicators of gender equality*. Copenhagen: While waiting for the dawn

Nayak, B.S. (2013). Challenges of cultural relativism and the future of feminist universalism. *Journal of Politics and Law* 6(2), 83-89

Pritchard, A., Morgan, N., Ateljevic, I. and Harris, C. (2007). *Tourism and gender: embodiment, sensuality and experience*. Wallingford: CABI

Pritchard, A., and Morgan, N. (2000). Privileging the male gaze: gendered tourism landscapes. *Annals of Tourism Research* 27(4), 884-905

Rose, G. (1993). *Feminism and geography*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Rotman, D.L., and Savulis, E-R. (eds) (2003). *Shared spaces and divided places: material dimensions of gender relations and the American historical landscape.* Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press

Siegel, D. (1997). Reading between the waves: feminist historiography in a 'postfeminist' moment. In L. Heywood and J. Drake (eds). *Third wave agenda: being feminist: doing feminism.* (pp 55-82). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press

Sinclair. M.T. (ed) (1997). *Gender, work and tourism.* London: Routledge

Swain, M.B. (1995). Introduction: Gender in Tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research* 22(2), 247-266

Thurnell Reid, T., and Casey, M. (eds) (2014). *Men, masculinities, travel and tourism.* US: Palgrave MacMillan

Veijola, S. and Jokinen, E. (1994). The body in tourism. Theory, Culture and Society 11, 125-151

West, C. and Zimmerman, D-H. (1987). Doing Gender. *Gender and Society* 1(2), 125-151

World Economic Forum (WEF) (2016). *The global gender gap report.* WEF, Geneva: Switzerland

WHO Fact Sheet No 403 (August 2015). Gender. Available from http://www.who.int/mediacentre/factsheets/fs403/en accessed 01/10/16

Yang, E.C.L., Khoo-Lattimore, C. and Arcodia, C. (2016). A systematic literature review of risk and gender research in tourism. *Tourism Management* 58, 89-100.