sure@sunderland.ac.uk.

Gender-Based Harassment in Tourism Academia: Organisational Collusion, Coercion and Compliance

Jocelyn Finniear, Swansea University, UK

Nigel Morgan, University of Surrey, UK

Donna Chambers, University of Sunderland, UK

Ana Maria Munar, Copenhagen Business School, Denmark

INTRODUCTION

Gender-based harassment (GBH) and violence has been discussed in the tourism and hospitality industry, a sector often associated with a bullying culture (Ram, 2019). Further, gender-based harassment on university campuses, particularly sexual violence, has an extensive literature (e.g. Dziech & Hawkins, 2012) and has recently gained heightened attention amongst the media, politicians and higher education (HE) institutions worldwide (Universities UK (UUK, 2016). Much of this attention has focused on gender-based violence experienced by female students; in the UK the National Union of Students (NUS, 2010) found that 14% had experienced a serious sexual assault and 68% verbal or non-verbal harassment in and around their institutions. A similar picture emerges elsewhere, including the USA (Fisher, Daigle, & Cullen, 2010) and Spain (Valls, Puigvert, Melgar & Garcia-Yeste, 2016). In Denmark 82% of all students reported unwanted sexual behaviour, harassment or violation during their studies (Analyse & Tal F.M.B.A, 2018), whilst 25% of Norwegian students reported having been sexually harassed at some point (Sivertsen, et al., 2019). There is growing acknowledgement that universities have a responsibility for student safeguarding and wellbeing and have a role to play in challenging attitudes underpinning GBH and violence (McCullough, McCarry, & Donaldson, 2017). However, focusing on students as victims and perpetrators of harassment and identifying 'laddish culture' (Phipps, 2017) as if that was the only problem has allowed institutions worldwide to avoid their responsibility to address their patriarchal and misogynistic cultures, which have become more toxic in today's metric-driven neoliberal academic climate in many countries (Standing & Atkinson, 2018).

In the wake of the #MeToo and the #Time'sUp movements, which highlighted workplace sexual harassment and the silencing of women's experiences, there has been some discussion of the GBH and violence experienced by academics. For example, Fernando and Prasad (2019) focus on early and mid-career women in business schools and illustrate how, through reluctant compliance, women conform in maintaining the status quo and acquiesce in organisational silencing. Our chapter similarly debates organisational collusion and discusses how women who attempt to voice their experiences of GBH, bullying, discrimination, marginalisation and abuses of power can be silenced in tourism academic workplaces. This silencing becomes a double violence, as the muzzling of the harassment itself becomes a violent act (Rhodes et al., 2010). Such silence is not merely attributable to the actions or inactions of individual bystanders, but

to the collusion of third-party organisational actors (e.g., line managers, human resource (HR) management professionals, and colleagues), who distance themselves from the situation or mobilise discourses to dissuade women from formalising their complaints, so that GBH becomes unseen (Fernando & Prasad, 2019).

Our discursive chapter presents a critical synthesis of a range of literature from tourism studies, organisation studies and the wider social sciences and has two interrelated aims. Firstly, to locate GBH as an issue in the tourism academy and thereby de-isolate, empower and reassure victims/survivors that they are not alone in experiencing such ordeals. Secondly, by discussing the issue, to create a lexicon for resistance and recovery for those subjected to GBH, which may help them to name and share their experiences. We deliberately do not proffer HR management-based solutions and recommendations focused on individuals or departments, which can be superficial and even counter-productive. Instead, we argue that HE institutions must recognise that they inherently organise in ways, which support orderings and behaviours that go unchecked and nurture harassment. We then discuss how, in our neoliberal age, women and other underrepresented groups tend to be isolated and marginalised in HE hierarchies, before examining how GBH occurs in the tourism academy and concluding with an agenda for future enquiry.

GENDER-BASED HARASSMENT

The scale of GBH in academia is ill-understood as studies of workplace bullying only began in the 1990s (e.g. Leymann & Gustafsson, 1996) and only truly emerged as a new field of study focused on bullying, emotional abuse and harassment in the 2000s (Einarsen, Hoel, Zapf & Cooper, 2011). Researchers have yet to truly examine academia (Agarwala, 2018), the culture of which has been characterized as intimidating and "rife" with bullying (Keashly, 2019). The focus of our discussion here is wider GBH against female academics, since studies have shown that it is women who are predominantly subjected to these behaviours (Berdahl, 2007; Fitzgerald & Cortina, 2017). GBH also includes acts perpetrated by women, in which they subject other women to psychological bullying behaviours such as 'mobbing' and 'gaslighting' (Popp, 2017). Further, it should also be noted that where men are harassed, it is generally because they are 'seen' to exhibit feminine qualities, which do not conform to traditional masculine tropes (Berdahl, 2007).

We employ the term gender-based harassment (GBH) to encapsulate all types of behaviour that demeans or humiliates an individual based on that individual's sex, sexual orientation or gender identity, including hostilities towards lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer or questioning, intersex, asexual or allied (LGBTQIA) and other non-conforming gender identities (Berdahl, 2007; Fernando & Prasad, 2019). GBH includes elements of sexual harassment (Collinson & Collinson, 1996; Wilson & Thompson, 2001), such as unwelcome sexual attention and sexual coercion (Lim & Cortina, 2005), but also encompasses wider hostility and bullying behaviours unrelated to sexual interest (Leskinen et al. 2011). Bullying is repeated and malicious mistreatment of someone that results in harm. It could be insulting or intimidating victims or more subtle actions, such as spreading malicious rumours about another, undermining their work and opinions, or withholding information necessary for them to do their jobs. Managers can become bullies if they are domineering, continually changing a person's responsibilities or assigning them unachievable workloads or deadlines (Lipinski & Crothers, 2014). In the following sections we expand on these behaviours and the conditions, which foster them, focusing first on HE in general, before discussing the tourism academy more specifically.

Gender-Based Harassment in Higher Education

GBH is an expression of control, and academia is permeated with power. Moreover, academia, so often perceived to be a meritocracy and an engine of social change, remains a highly gendered sector characterised by a glacial pace of change towards equality (Pritchard & Morgan, 2017). Indeed, the 're-masculinisation' of the university, with its skewed male professoriate (Thornton, 2013) is upholding those structures that enable gender micro-aggressions (Sue, 2010), which undermine and devalue women staff and their achievements, but also create a culture where discussion of harassment and violence becomes censored (Standing & Atkinson, 2018). Previous research has identified four causes of violence against women, which are particularly relevant in academia: "the existence of power structures placing men over women, the presence of hostility toward victims, the naturalization and tolerance of violence, and the presence of sexist stereotypes" (Valls et al., 2016:1521). The profession enables academics in positions of power to prey upon its vulnerable members and the same power dynamics leave victims and witnesses with little recourse to justice. Victims are either blamed for their own victimisation, labelled as troublemakers or disbelieved. Predators go

unpunished and their behaviours unimpeded, frequently because of their seniority, often enhanced by the privileges conferred by whiteness, masculinity, heterosexuality, wealth, and older age (Badruddoja, 2016). Professional hierarchies are laid upon social hierarchies so that gender, race and class intersect. Thus, a focus on white able-bodied, heterosexual women as the main victims of GBH ignores nuances of violence in queer and transgender spaces, amongst disabled persons and in communities of colour, to name a few (Badruddoja, 2016).

GBH affects women differently based on diverse identifications, including race, class, ethnicity and sexuality. The concept of intersectionality, popularised by Crenshaw (1989, 1992), is used to understand the ways in which black women especially are silenced by the effects of racism and sexism. In Western, capitalist societies, "race cannot be separated from gender in black women's lives" so that black women's experiences of racism are shaped by gender and their experiences of sexism are often shaped by race (Crenshaw, 1992: 1468). Thus, they are more susceptible to harassment from male or white subordinates because of their lower ascribed status as part of a marginalised group within the organisation (Buchanan & Omerod, 2002). Yet most investigations of GBH in the workplace focus on the impact on women and elide the effects of race, whilst those of racial harassment ignore the consequences of gender (Buchanan & Fitzgerald, 2008). It is important in considering GBH in HE, to acknowledge and address the fact that "harassment can reflect gender and race bias concurrently" (Buchanan & Fitzgerald, 2008:138). Indeed, a recent qualitative study of the experiences of 20 out of the UK's only 25 black (African/Caribbean) female professors, identified passive bullying and racial micro-aggressions from both white men and women in universities (Rollock, 2019; see also Sian, 2019).

GBH occurs both in quotidian encounters of academic life and in singular events, such as a physical assault. The everyday events of micro-aggression (i.e. subtle forms of indirect discrimination), which rarely involve public displays of antagonism and bullying nonetheless coalesce to create toxic working environments, which have profound impacts (Sue, 2010). This includes: invisibility (e.g. lack of female keynotes and editorial board members), gendered social closure and ghosting (e.g. exclusion from networks, emails and conversations), gaslighting (a form of bullying based on manipulative emotional and psychological abuse in which the harasser engenders doubt and

uncertainty in the target) and mobbing (this is where a bully enlists co-workers to collude in a relentless campaign of psychological terror against the target).

Reports of these behaviours are increasing within HE (O'Brien & Guiney, 2019), linked to the rise of neo-liberal managerialism, marketisation, amplified financial pressures and the rising numbers of academics "at the bottom of the power ladder: the casuals, the probationers, the post-doctoral and the contract academics" (Ryan, 2012:5). Estimates suggest that half of all teaching in HE is undertaken by casual or sessional staff (Percy & Beaumont, 2008), who are more likely to be female (May, Peetz, & Strachan, 2013). As HE is subject to increasing external and internal measurement, surveillance and control through the mechanisms of bureaucratisation, monetarisation and managerialism (Habermas, 1984), so its workforce has become increasingly subject to the authoritarianism of institutional managers (Ryan, 2012). Whilst the impact on its precarious professionals persists, such harassment is not restricted to those at the bottom of the ladder. Harassment of those mid-career is often more pernicious as vicarious and abetting behaviours to maintain power create a toxic and abusive social structure in which others target women on behalf of a primary perpetrator.

GBH in academia is framed by the structures, cultures and practices of the neoliberal university, which create conditions that fuel violence, collusion and silence. The neoliberal marketisation of HE constructs student as consumer and lecturer as commodity and reflects the enterprising status of universities and pressures of doing more with less (Sennett, 1998). Excessive pressures on performance (Vickers, 2001; Rhodes et al., 2010) and HE's minimal tolerance for diversity (Harvey et al., 2009), together with the persistence of misogyny and patriarchy, creates an environment where GBH is normalised, and feminist voices are marginalised and silenced (Standing & Atkinson, 2018). In such an environment moral obligation becomes subordinated to economic interest to preserve corporate reputations, and this can silence discussion of wider gendered inequalities (Flood et al, 2013). Universities are rife with institutional sexism, which in turn intersects with structural issues and the dominant discourses of masculinity and neoliberalism.

In other words, whilst overt gender discrimination may have weakened in Western jurisdictions due to legislation, neoliberalism encourages a stereotypical masculinist culture (Standing & Atkinson, 2018). This ethos rewards individualism, extreme competitiveness and acute self-interest, encourages clientelism and under-

values collegiality and academic emotional labour (Leathwood & Hey, 2009; Thornton, 2013). Above all, today's university incubates the dark side of organizational behaviour: 'situations in which people hurt other people, injustices are perpetuated and magnified, and the pursuits of wealth, power or revenge lead people to behaviours that others can only see as unethical, illegal, despicable, or reprehensible' (Griffin & O'Leary-Kelly, 2004, p.xv; see also Griffin & Lopez, 2005). Such behaviours include workplace violence, stress, aggression, discrimination, sexual harassment, politics, side-deals, cronyism; careerism and impression management, retaliation and incivility (Griffin & O'Leary-Kelly, 2004).

Gender-Based Harassment in Tourism

Whilst sexism within the wider university sector needs addressing (Standing & Atkinson, 2018), tourism academia remains arguably more gendered than its cognate fields (Chambers & Rakić, 2018; Morgan & Pritchard, 2018). There is a global under-representation of women amongst those who dominate its sponsorship, mentoring and career prospects so that men hold 80% of tourism professorships (Pritchard, 2014; Pritchard & Morgan, 2017). In addition, women remain underrepresented amongst its wider leaders and gatekeepers (Munar et al, 2015) who define the field's structures and agenda (Brink, Brouns & Waslander, 2006), the so-called 'alpha scholars' (Law, Leung & Buhalis, 2010; Ek & Larson, 2017), a situation that has significant implications for the creation of tourism knowledge (Chambers, Munar, Khoo-Lattimore & Biran, 2017). Whilst some organisations and editorial boards are now addressing their gender imbalances, gender remains of marginal interest to the tourism academy and a minor topic in top-ranking tourism journals, themselves marginalised within business school metrics (Small, Harris, and Wilson, 2017).

This situation coalesces to create a chilly climate (Biggs, Hawley & Biernat, 2018) for female tourism academics, especially early career scholars. Whilst dedicated studies of GBH are absent, the totality of women's narratives from within the academy reveals an emergent but consistent discourse of the "hidden injuries of… women in tourism academia" (Christou & Janta, 2019). These include abusive and sexually predatory behaviours (Munar et al., 2015), harassment and gendered social closure at conferences (Mair & Frew, 2018), unequal access to academic jobs and career progression opportunities, workplace discrimination and gender stereotyping (Basurto-Barcia & Ricaurte-Quijano, 2017) and invisibility (Pritchard, 2014, 2018). Finally, and perhaps

most tellingly, female academics report being on the receiving side of subtle but highly destructive patriarchal attitudes of condescension, marginalisation and disdain when discussing issues of concern to them including, but not restricted to their research (Small, Harris, Wilson, & Ateljevic, 2011).

Individual Impacts of GBH

Much of this chilly climate in tourism academia can be ascribed to social closure, the Weberian concept by which individuals and collectives defend and maximise their privileged positions of status and power "through institutional exclusion and dominant group positioning" (Roscigno et al, 2007:316). This occurs through formal processes and in everyday interaction, for example through language or access to events and meetings and gives rise to incivility in the workplace. In tourism academia status-power can be derived from race and gender and positional-power from a person's location within the institutional hierarchy (Roscigno et al, 2007). Thus, white male professors (who are the majority within tourism and academia more broadly) have both status- and positional-power. In this context the unequal treatment of women and minority groupings within the academy can be justified by cultural and ideological stereotypes of women (such as being 'emotional') and of racial minorities (such as being 'lazy'). Sometimes these stereotypes are drawn on explicitly and manifest in incidents of GBH and discriminatory practices and behaviours. For example, that women do a disproportionate amount of academic administration and emotional labour is well documented (Berry & Cassidy, 2013).

Besides racist or sexist harassment practices, the chilly climate experienced by women and minorities allows for attributional ambiguity, a concept related to social prejudice (Crocker & Major, 1989). This happens when "members of groups that experience social stigma find it challenging to determine whether the feedback they receive is based upon their personal deservingness or if it is discrimination against them because of their social identity" (Fatima, 2017:147). As a result, victims of those micro-aggressions described above find themselves facing psychological dilemmas with no clear resolution. Micro-aggressions have serious consequences for the mental and physical health of the targets (Rhodes et al., 2010) and victims of mobbing can exhibit symptoms of post-traumatic stress disorder (Laymann, 1996). These abusive acts produce "anger and frustration, deplete psychic energy, lower feelings of subjective well-

being and worthiness, produce physical health problems, shorten life expectancy, and deny... [victims] equal access and opportunity" (Sue, 2010:6). Whilst privileged individuals have the affirmation of everyone around them and are confident in their version of 'the truth' (Fatima, 2017), their targets are in a position where they are 'damned if they do' (confront the perpetrator) and 'damned if they don't' (do nothing) (Sue, 2010: xvii). Speaking up often results in privileged groups accusing minorities and other marginalised groups of being over-sensitive and there are attempts to silence them by offering alternative explanations, which cast doubt on their testimony and cause self-misgivings.

In these circumstances, victims are powerless to respond to intimidation, humiliation and emotional distress yet perversely are subject to additional forms of subtle aggression, including scapegoating, unfair performance pressure, name-calling and mobbing. Mobbing, which pits members of a team against each other to exact revenge against a perceived slight by the target, is a form of workplace collusion accompanied by a fear of reporting and of investigating. In highly competitive workplaces such as universities, where employees are subjected to explicit evaluations, individuals seek protection by joining the 'leader', in the belief that this person is in control of the workplace, as a puppet master (Babiak & Hare, 2006). The harm visited on a competent employee through mobbing is often the result of a zero-empathy organiser who directs attacks intended to increase the target's stress, reduce their social status, and create the conditions for their possible exit.

Targets of mobbing are usually those who stand out from the organisational norm as more respected, competent, intelligent, resilient, empathic and/or attractive and tend to be women, aged 32 to 55. Conscientious, and well-liked, they are concerned with others' distress and have a higher group social status, are more outspoken and challenge the status quo (Stout, 2006). Victims of the politics of envy, jealousy and covetousness, known in Australasia as the 'tall poppy syndrome' (Mouly, & Sankaran, 2000), their presence in the workplace is offensive to zero-empathy employees, who often feel threatened and this leads them to seek existential vengeance (Stout, 2006). Mobbing takes away a person's safety in the world, dignity, identity and belonging and damages her mental and physical health. The effects also radiate outward toward the target's partner, family and friends. Because an employee is being targeted and criticized, she may be regarded as a "troublemaker" by former allies and thus be ignored and left socially

isolated. Gossip is spread before the target is aware of what is happening, as previously loyal co-workers are enlisted to substantiate damaging rumours (Leymann & Gustafsson, 1996).

Academic impacts on those who experience harassment include: loss of access to teaching or workspaces; changing department or research project because of feeling unsafe at work; loss of confidence and networks; exiting an academic career. Health impacts include: depression, anxiety, feeling suicidal, or post-traumatic stress disorder, often exacerbated by the institutional response. Financial impacts include: loss of earnings; legal fees; paying for counselling (Bull & Rye, 2018: p. 4). Being involved in an investigation is time-consuming, exhausting, and emotionally draining for victims, and has severe effects on their mental and physical health, as well as on their academic work. Internal tribunal hearings are often lengthy, resulting in further openings to 'gaslight' or attack the complainant by spreading malicious rumours about her, to engage in academic retaliation, or to physically threaten her. Sadly, it is unsurprising that it is often the female victims who are forced to leave academia reporting GBH and discrimination and who receive fewer internal retention offers than their male counterparts (Martinez, O'Brien & Hebl, 2017).

Organisational Collusion in Harassment

Organisations like universities, that are driven by bureaucracy, often provide the most toxic environments, in which violence, collusion and silencing become normalised. They have defined procedures and policies to ensure a safe workplace, yet these may create the very conditions in which harassment can flourish. Moreover, when bullying is redefined as 'personality conflicts', 'banter', or 'girlie squabbles', such policies offer no protection and bad behaviour is tolerated and escalates (Duffy & Sperry, 2013). GBH in universities remains an under-reported and 'airbrushed' issue as HE's institutional and legal frameworks are used to "enable sexism to remain out of sight, to conceal behaviour and return the institution to a normalised state of affairs" (Whitley & Page, 2015: 52). UK universities spent almost £90m during 2017-19 on payoffs to victims, who were silenced through non-disclosure agreements (NDAs) (Croxford, 2019). The prevalence of these secretive agreements suggests institutional mishandling of harassment and discrimination and even the concealment of criminal conduct. They aim to avoid institutional reputational damage and obscure the minimal action taken by universities

to prevent the recurrence of misconduct, thereby exposing others to abuse by the same perpetrator (Croxford, 2019). Shockingly, institutions are more likely to act on academic than sexual misconduct and there is a severe lack of redress for women failed by institutional processes; universities are left to self-regulate, with minimal oversight or legal challenge (NUS, 2018).

NDAs are just one way in which universities silence victims since their reporting mechanisms relocate the burden of harassment to the complainants (Whitley & Page, 2015), who are constructed as 'the problem' (Bessant, 1998). Victims, mostly women, are treated as agents of institutional brand damage and left vulnerable to further harassment or retaliation (Ahmed, 2017). Victims have been isolated and gaslighted by the managers to whom they reported complaints whilst others have been pressured to make their complaints informal by investigators or HR. Since many universities do not record informal complaints, this leads to under-reporting and makes it challenging to escalate subsequent complaints about the same perpetrator (Standing & Atkinson, 2018). In fact, an urgent issue for HE institutions is serial offenders as many employ abusers, whose behaviour occurs over years without being challenged (Bull & Rye, 2018).

Where Next?

To address GBH in the tourism academy, the problem has first to be made visible (Page, Bull & Chapman, 2018). As we noted above, its scale is unknown as researchers have yet to truly examine 'the dark side' (Linstead, Maréchal, & Griffin, 2014) of academic organisation. With few data about GBH in academia, and specifically tourism, it is unclear whether the problem is escalating (Agarwala, 2018). It may be that the #Metoo movement has encouraged reporting and has spurred managers to act on complaints but there remains major difficulty in overcoming invisibility and in reporting covert harassment. One coping strategy is the crowdsourcing of women's experiences in academia. The public exposure of micro-aggression is not the result of unreasonable feelings of victimhood, but the result of minorities and other marginalised communities, feeling safe to "crowdsource our experiences and express solidarity with each other" (Fatima, 2017:152). Sue (2010) makes use of the 'vignette' to enable victims to express their position and perpetrators and bystanders to gain a different view of the situation, whilst Munar et al. (2017) use vignettes of GBH to highlight intersectionality in the

tourism academy. Such crowdsourcing is also employed by the Everyday Sexism initiative (http://everydaysexism.com/), which includes academics' stories.

Vignettes as a writing form help us to understand that GBH is typically found in the everyday interactions of academic life. It is the enactment and embodiment of these daily life interactions, which form our understanding of self and others (Butler, 1999) and we need to pay attention to the relevance of the mundane and taken-for-granted that often goes under the radar of critical consciousness. A key strategy to deal with GBH in academic contexts is to consider micro-aggression incidents not only as 'individual cases' but as part of what often are larger structures of discrimination. We acknowledge that solutions might very well incorporate a range of options such as (re)training and unconscious bias workshops and/or the creation of new policies, which have led to some very positive change. However, our central goal in presenting this chapter is to acknowledge the true complexity of the issue rather than proposing a draft of unachievable solutions.

GBH is inextricably linked to culture and addressing it necessitates organisational cultural change, which requires time, perseverance, and commitment from senior management. One of the first steps universities can take to protect staff is to address all forms of GBH. This approach acknowledges that individuals may experience more than one form of abuse, at different times, and contextualises GBH within wider structural inequalities (McCullough, McCarry & Donaldson, 2017). Simply amending HR policies is insufficient to instigate meaningful change. Research suggests that the underrepresentation of women in the workplace leads to an increased incidence of GBH (Kabat-Farr & Cortina, 2014). To change individual behaviour and workplace culture there must be gender parity in senior management, and leaders who model and support acceptable behaviour: civility, respect, fairness and trust. Thus, organisations should strive for gender balance throughout their structures and especially at senior level as employees in organisations with female senior leaders are more likely to report harassment and to confront those engaging in it (American Psychological Association, 2018). In many cases, employees' reluctance to speak up stems from a fear that it will be held against them, so organisations must have clear and effective reporting procedures, and assurances that reporters will not suffer retaliation when coming forward. But speaking up is just one side of the story. If reporters' concerns are not listened to and

acted on, it will dissuade others from coming forward – proliferating a culture in which GBH is tolerated.

Typically, current efforts to prevent GBH rely on a standard policy coupled with one-time or annual training. This is a narrow, compliance-based approach that primarily serves to limit the organisation's legal liability. Work to both prevent and respond to harassment, violence and hate crime against students, and to support them more appropriately must now be extended to academic staff. Workplace training must go beyond 'unconscious bias' to mandatory gendered and 'racial justice' training for academics and senior managers, which addresses patriarchy, "white privilege, power and racial microaggressions" (Rollock, 2019:37). These and other actions can de-isolate women in the (tourism) academy, who have suffered from GBH and serve to reassure victims that their cases are not unique. They can also create a reference point for resistance and recovery for women subjected to GBH, which may help them to name and share their experiences. Above all however, what is clear is that we need much greater and more nuanced understandings of those experiences and how women have dealt with them.

CONCLUSION

In this chapter we have sought to spotlight GBH in higher education in general and specifically in tourism academia, where research on this subject is especially under-researched and under-theorised. There remains a pressing need to translate our emerging awareness of GBH in the tourism academy into practical solutions and organisational change but first we need to understand, raise the visibility of and map the problem. We therefore need more narratives, which unpick the extent of the issue, challenge the dominant organisational discourses of collusion and silencing, and allow women's voices to emerge. We have deliberately not offered HR management-based solutions and recommendations focused on individuals or departments and instead have argued that GBH is an organisational issue (Twale, 2017). Indeed, it has even been said that the managerial paradigm and components of HR may foster an environment in which bullying can remain unchallenged, allowed to thrive or is indirectly encouraged. Thus, policies may become a source of bullying and may be used against its victims (Lewis & Raynor, 2011). We need to exercise caution when ascribing GBH to particular academic work environments or to inadequate leadership. Those who comment critically on the

topic argue that we must consider the political and managerial ethos operating in the workplace, as without understanding this, we can never appreciate GBH as an organisational phenomenon, nor learn how to address it effectively (Lewis & Raynor, 2011).

As indicated above, the dearth of GBH-specific research in tourism academia suggests that further explorations of the topic must include empirical studies, which seek to unpack GBH issues across a range of faculty positions, to include junior, mid-career and senior positions. In addition, these studies need to unpick intersectionality (e.g. between race and gender) so that tailored strategies and interventions can be developed for particularly marginalised groups. Our chapter has focused on Western contexts and it is important for future investigations to explore GBH in non-Western contexts, where the effects and affects might be different based on unique cultural, social, economic and political circumstances. Work in general is required on the range of forms which GBH takes, including expanding study of harassment of female scholars online (see Veletsianos, Houlden, Hodson, & Gosse, 2018) to examine how social media has become a technology of academic workplace violence through digital mobbing. Finally, research should further theorise the meaning of women's silence in the face of GBH and violence. This silence is both a centripetal and centrifugal force (Montoya, 2000); in other words, "silence may be a product of oppression or it may be a means of resistance against oppression" (Roberts, 2000:344). Here, we have intimated that the silence of women in (tourism) academia is not an effective form of resistance to harassment (Roberts, 2000). Rather, we suggest that silence is violence and such 'tyrannies of silence' must be resisted by women, regardless of their personal, cultural or political identifications, as ultimately, the silence of women in (tourism) academia in the face of GBH and violence offers no protection (Lorde, 2017).

References

Agarwala, T. (2018). Bullying and career consequences in the academy: experiences of women faculty, pp.241-255 in Broadbridge, A.M. and Fielden, S.L. (Eds.) *Research Handbook of Diversity and Careers*. Oxford: Edward Elgar.

Ahmed, S. (2017, August 9th) A Complaint Biography [Blog post] Retrieved from: https://feministkilljoys.com/2017/08/09/a-complaint-biography/

American Psychological Association (2018). Workplace sexual harassment: are employers actually responding? Available from http://www.apaexcellence.org/assets/general/2018-sexual-harassment-survey-results.pdf

Analyse & Tal F.M.B.A (2018). Undersøgelse af uønsket seksuel adfærd rettet mod studerende på de danske universiteter https://dkuni.dk/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/rapport-om-unsket-seksuel-adfrd-mod-studerende-p-danske-universiteter.-analyse-og-tal-2018.pdf

Ateljevic, I., Pritchard, A., & Morgan, N. (Eds.) (2007). *The Critical Turn in Tourism Studies: Innovative Methodologies*, Oxford: Elsevier.

Babiak, P. and Hare, R.D. (2006). *Snakes in suits: When psychopaths go to work* (Vol. 12). New York, NY: Regan Books.

Badruddoja, R. (2016). Sexual Violence At The Sociology Conference, https://conditionallyaccepted.com/2016/08/31/sexualviolence-sociology/

Basurto-Barcia, J. & Ricaurte-Quijano, C. (2017). Women in tourism: gender (in)equalities in university teaching and research, *Anatolia*, 28:4, 567-581, DOI: 10.1080/13032917.2017.1370781

Bessant, J. (1998). Women in academia and opaque violence, *Melbourne Studies in Education*, 39:2, 41-67, DOI: 10.1080/17508489809556317

Berdahl, J.L. (2007). Harassment Based on Sex: Protecting Social Status in the Context of Gender Hierarchy. *The Academy of Management Review* 32 (2), 641-658

Berry, K. E. & Cassidy, S. F. (2013) Emotional labour in university lecturers: considerations for higher education institutions *Journal of Curriculum and Teaching* 2(2), 22-36.

Biggs, J., Hawley, P.H. & Biernat, M. (2018). The Academic Conference as a Chilly Climate for Women: Effects of Gender Representation on Experiences of Sexism, Coping Responses, and Career Intentions, *Sex Roles* 78 (5-6): pp 394–408, https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-017-0800-9.

Brink, M. van den, M. Brouns & S. Waslander. (2006). Does Excellence have a Gender? A National Research on Recruitment and Selection Procedures for Professorial Appointments in the Netherlands. *Employee Relations*, 28(6) pp.523-539.

Buchanan, N.T. & Ormerod, A.J. (2002). Racialized sexual harassment in the lives of African American women. *Women and Therapy* 25(3-4), 107-124

Buchanan, N.T., & Fitzgerald, L.F. (2008). Effects of racial and sexual harassment on work and the psychological well-being of African American women. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology* 13(2), 137-151

Bull, A., & Rye, R. 2018. Silencing Students. Institutional responses to staff sexual misconduct in UK higher education.

Butler, J. (1999), *Gender trouble : feminism and the subversion of identity*, Routledge, Abingdon.

Chambers, D., & Rakić, T. (2018). Critical considerations on gender and tourism: An introduction. *Tourism, Culture and Communication*, 18, 1-8.

Chambers, D., Munar, A.M., Khoo-Lattimore, C. & Biran, A. (2017). Interrogating gender and the tourism academy through epistemological lens, *Anatolia* 28 (4), downloaded from: http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/13032917.2017.1370775 retrieved 31 December 2017.

Christou A. & Janta, H. (2019). Affecting Solidarities: Bringing Feeling into Feminism, Empathy in Employment and Compassion in Academic Communities of Crises. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 30, 232–239.

Collinson, M., and Collinson, D. (1996). 'it's only Dick': the sexual harassment of women managers in insurance sales. *Work, Employment and Society* 10(1), 29-56

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.

Crenshaw, K. (1992). Race, gender and sexual harassment. *Southern California Law Review* 65(3), 1467-1476.

Crocker, J. & Major, B. (1989), "Social stigma and self-esteem: The self-protective properties of stigma.: EBSCOhost", *American Psychological Association*, Vol. 96 No. 4, pp. 608–630.

Croxford, R. (2019). UK universities face 'gagging order' criticism. Available from https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/education-47936662

Dziech, B. W., & Hawkins, M. W. (2012). *Sexual Harassment and Higher Education: Reflections and New Perspectives*. Routledge.

Duffy, M. & Sperry, L. (2013). *Overcoming Mobbing: A Recovery Guide for Workplace Aggression and Bullying*. USA: Oxford University Press.

Einarsen, S., Hoel, H., Zapf, D., & Cooper, C. L. (Eds.) (2011). *Bullying and harassment in the workplace: Developments in theory, research, and practice*, London: Taylor & Francis.

Ek, R. & Larson, M. (2017). Imagining the Alpha male of the tourism tribe, *Anatolia* 28 (4) available from:

http://www.tandfonline.com/action/showCitFormats?doi=10.1080%2F13032917.2017.1370778 retrieved 20 December 2017.

Fatima, S. (2017), "On the Edge of Knowing: Microagression and Epistemic Uncertainty as a Women of Color", in Cole, K. and Hassel, H. (Eds.), *Surviving Sexism in Academia: Feminist Strategies for Leadership.*, Oxford: Routledge, pp. 147–157.

Fernando, A. and Prasad, D. (2019) Sex-based harassment and organizational silencing: how women are led to reluctant acquiescence in academia. *Human Relations* 72(10, 1565-1594

Fisher, B., Daigle, L.E. & Cullen, F. T. (2010). *Unsafe in the Ivory Tower: the sexual victimization of college women*. Los Angeles: Sage Publications

Fitzgerald, L.F. & Cortina, L.M. (2017). Sexual harassment in work organizations: A view from the twenty-first century. In J.W. White & C. Travis (Eds.), *Handbook on the Psychology of Women*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Flood, M, Martin, B. & Dreher, T (2013) Combining academia and activism, *Australian Universities Review*, 55(1), 17-26.

Griffin, R. W., & O'Leary-Kelly, A. M. (2004). *The dark side of organizational behaviour*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Griffin, R. W., & Lopez, Y. P. (2005). 'Bad behavior' in organizations: A review and typology for future research. *Journal of Management*, 31, 988–1005

Habermas, J. (1984). The Theory of Communicative Action, Volume One, Reason and the rationalisation of society, T. McCarthy (transl), Beacon Press, Boston.

Harvey, M., Treadway, D., Heames, J.T. and Duke, A.. (2009). Bullying in the 21st century global organization: An ethical perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *85*(1), 27-40

Kabat-Farr, D., & Cortina, L.M. (2014). Sex-based harassment in employment: new insights into gender and context. *Law and Human Behaviour* 38(1), 58-72

Keashly L. (2019). Workplace Bullying, Mobbing and Harassment in Academe: Faculty Experience. In: D'Cruz P., Noronha E., Keashly L., Tye-Williams S. (eds) Special

topics and particular occupations, professions and sectors. *Handbooks of Workplace Bullying, Emotional Abuse and Harassment*, vol 4. Springer, Singapore.

Law, R., Leung. R. & Buhalis, D. (2010) An analysis of academic leadership in hospitality and tourism. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research*, 34 (4), pp.455-477.

Leymann, H. & Gustafsson, A. (1996). Mobbing at work and the development of post-traumatic stress disorders. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology* 5 (2), 251-275.

Leathwood, C. & V. Hey. (2009). Gender/ed Discourses and Emotional Sub-Texts: Theorising Emotion in UK Higher Education, *Teaching in Higher Education*, 14 (4), 429–440. doi: 10.1080/13562510903050194.

Lewis, D. & Raynor, C. (2011). Bullying and Human Resource Management. A wolf in sheep's clothing? In Einarsen, S., Hoel, H., Zapf, D., & Cooper, C. L. (Eds.). *Bullying and harassment in the workplace: Developments in theory, research, and practice*, London: Taylor & Francis, pp. 370-401.

Lieberman, M. et al. (2007). Putting Feelings into Words: Affect Labelling Disrupts Amygdala Activity in Response to Affective Stimuli. *Psychological Science*, 18(5):421-428.

Lim, S. and Cortina, L.M. (2005). Interpersonal mistreatment in the workplace: The interface and impact of general incivility and sexual harassment. *Journal of applied psychology*, 90(3), 483-496

Linstead, S., Maréchal, G., & Griffin, R. W. (2014). Theorizing and researching the dark side of organization. *Organization Studies*, *35*(2), 165-188.

Lipinski, J. & Crothers, L.M. (Eds.) (2014), *Bullying in the workplace: Causes, symptoms, and remedies*. New York: Routledge.

Lorde, A. (2017). *Your silence will not protect you*. UK: Silver Press.

Mair, J., & Frew, E. (2018). Academic conferences: a female duo-ethnography. *Current Issues in Tourism*, *21*(18), 2152-2172.

Martinez, L. R., O'Brien, K. R., & Hebl, M. R. (2017). Fleeing the ivory tower: Gender differences in the turnover experiences of women faculty. *Journal of Women's Health, 26*(5), 580-586. doi:10.1089/jwh.2016.6023

May, R., Peetz, D. & Strachan, G. (2013). The casual academic workforce and labour market segmentation in Australia, *Labour and Industry*, 23, 3: 258-275.

McCullough, A., McCarry, M. & Donaldson, A. (2017). *Rapid Review of Scottish Higher*

Education Responses to Gender Based Violence, Equally Safe in Higher Education project report, Glasgow: University of Strathclyde, https://core.ac.uk/reader/84146740.

Montoya, M. (2000). Silence and silencing: their centripetal and centrifugal forces in legal communication, pedagogy and discourse. *University of Michigan Journal of Law Reform* 33(3), 263-328

Morgan, N. & Pritchard, A. (2018). Gender Matters in Hospitality Research, Education and Employment. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 76; pp. 38-44.

Mouly, V. S., & Sankaran, J. (2000). The tall poppy syndrome in New Zealand: An exploratory investigation. *Transcending boundaries: Integrating people, processes and systems*, *285*.

Munar, A.M., Biran, A., Budeanu, A., Caton, K., Chambers, D., Dredge, D., et al (2015). *The Gender Gap in the Tourism Academy: Statistics and Indicators of Gender Equality*. While Waiting for the Dawn, Copenhagen

Munar, A.M., Caton, K., Eger, C., Jeffrey, H., Khoo-Lattimore, C, Lynch, P., et al. (2017) *The beauty and the abuse: a handbook on relationships and emotions in academia.* Available at: https://research-api.cbs.dk/ws/portalfiles/portal/58521193/ TheBeautytheAbuse_Dec2017.pdf

National Union of Students, 2018. Power in the Academy: staff sexual misconduct in UK higher education https://www.nusconnect.org.uk/resources/nus-staff-student-sexual-misconduct-report.

National Union of Students (2010) Hidden Marks: A study of women students' experiences of harassment, stalking, violence and sexual assault. London: NUS.

O'Brien, T. & Guiney, D. (2019). *Staff Wellbeing in Higher Education: A Research Study for Education Support Partnership*, https://www.educationsupport.org.uk/sites/default/files/staff_wellbeing_he_research.pdf.

Page, T., Bull, A., & Chapman, E. (2018). Making power visible: 'Slow activism' to address staff sexual misconduct. *Violence Against Women* https://doi.org/10.17863/CAM.38871.

Percy, A. & Beaumont, R. (2008). The casualisation of teaching and the subject at risk, *Studies in Continuing Education* 30(2), 145-157.

Phipps, A. (2017). (Re) theorising laddish masculinities in higher education. *Gender and*

Education, *29*(7), 815-830.

Popp, J. (2017). Social Intelligence and the Explanation of Workplace Abuse. *SAGE Open*. https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244017715076

Pritchard, A. (2014). Gender and feminist perspectives in tourism research. *The Wiley Blackwell companion to tourism*, 314-324.

Pritchard, A. (2018). Predicting the Future of Tourism Gender Research, *Tourism Perspectives, 23, pp.144-46.*

Pritchard, A. & Morgan, N. (2017) Tourism's Lost Leaders: Analysing Gender and Performance, *Annals of Tourism Research,* 63 pp.34-47.

Ram, Y. (2019) MeToo and Tourism: A systematic review, *Current Issues in Tourism*, https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13683500.2019.1664423?journalCode=rcit20&.

Rhodes, C., Pullen, A., Vickers, M.H., Clegg, S.R. and Pitsis, A. (2010) 'Violence and Workplace Bullying: What Are An Organization's Ethical Responsibilities?', *Administrative Theory and Praxis*. 32(1): 96-115.

Roberts, D.E. (2000). The paradox of silence: some questions about silence as resistance. *University of Michigan Journal of Law Reform* 33(3), 343-358.

Rollock, N. (2019). Staying power: the career experiences and strategies of UK Black Female Professors. London: UCU

Roscigno, V.J.; Mong, S., Byron, R. & Testerm G. (2007). Age discrimination, social closure and employment. *Social Forces* 86(1), 313-334

Ryan, S. 2012. Academic Zombies: A failure of resistance or a means of survival? *Australian Universities Review*, 54 (2); pp. 3-11.

Sennett (1998). Corrosion of Character: The Personal Consequences of Work in the New Capitalism. New York: W.W. Norton and Co.

Sian, K. (2019). *Navigating Institutional Racism in British Universities*, Palgrave MacMillan.

Sivertsen B, Nielsen MB, Madsen IEH, et al. Sexual harassment and assault among university students in Norway: a cross-sectional prevalence study. BMJ Open 2019; 9:e026993. doi:10.11

Small, J., Harris, C., Wilson, E. (2017). Gender on the agenda? The position of gender in tourism's high-ranking journals, *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 31, pp.114-117).

Small, J., Harris, C., Wilson, E., & Ateljevic, I. (2011). Voices of women: A memory-work

reflection on work-life dis/harmony in tourism academia. *Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sport & Tourism Education*, 10(1), 23-36.

Standing, K.E. and Atkinson, K.Y.M. (2018). 'Changing the Culture' – A feminist academic activist critique. Violence Against Women, available from: http://researchonline.ljmu.ac.uk/9733/.

Stout, M., 2006. *The sociopath next door: The ruthless versus the rest of us*. Harmony.

Sue, D. W. (2010) Microaggressions in everyday life: Race, gender and sexual orientation, Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Thornton, M. (2013). The Mirage of Merit: Reconstituting the 'Ideal Academic', *Australian Feminist Studies* 28(76), 127–143. doi: 10.1080/08164649.2013.789584.

Twale, D. J. (2017). *Understanding and preventing faculty-on-faculty bullying: A psycho-social-organizational approach*. Oxford: Routledge.

Universities UK (2016) Changing the Culture: Report of the Universities UK Taskforce examining violence against women, harassment and hate crime affecting university students, London: Universities UK.

Valls, R., Puigvert, L., Melgar, P. and Garcia-Yeste, C. (2016), "Breaking the Silence at Spanish Universities: Findings From the First Study of Violence Against Women on Campuses in Spain", *Violence Against Women*, Vol. 22 No. 13, pp. 1519–1539.

Veletsianos, G., Houlden, S., Hodson, J., & Gosse, C. (2018). Women scholars' experiences with online harassment and abuse: Self-protection, resistance, acceptance, and self-blame. *New Media & Society*, *20*(12), 4689-4708.

Vickers, M.H. (2001). Bullying as unacknowledged organizational evil: A researcher's story. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 13(4), 205-217.

Whitley, L. and Page, T. (2015) Sexism at the Centre: locating the problem of sexual harassment, *New Formations*, 86, 35-53 10.3898/NEWF.86.02.2015.

Wilson, F., and Thompson, P. (2001). Sexual harassment as an exercise of power. *Gender, Work and Organization* 8(1), 61-83

About the authors

Dr Jocelyn Finniear is an academic with management and leadership experience on senior departmental teams and in retail management. Currently Deputy Head (People & Organisation) in Swansea University's Business Department she researches intersections between human relationships, mobilities and work; precarious/flexible work; community identity and belonging.

Professor Nigel Morgan is Head of Surrey University's School of Hospitality and Tourism Management. In his academic, voluntary and advisory roles he works to promote inclusive and socially responsible tourism research, education, policy and academic community engagement. His research is encapsulated in two entwined strands: place marketing, power and identity; inclusion and wellbeing (particularly related to gender, age and disability).

Professor Donna Chambers is Chair of the Research Institute of the Faculty of Business, Law and Tourism at the University of Sunderland. She also convenes the university's interdisciplinary research network on race, class and ethnicity. Her main research interests focus on representations of people and places in tourism drawing on postcolonial and decolonial theories; intersectionality in tourism particularly between gender and race; and critical approaches to tourism research.

Ana María Munar is Associate Professor at Copenhagen Business School, Denmark. With research interests in epistemology, higher education, gender, and tourism, her latest publications focus on postdisciplinarity, desire and gender in academia. Her scholarship is characterized by philosophical and genre experimentation. Ana has served on several national and international boards and networks such as the Diversity and Inclusion Council at Copenhagen Business School, Critical Tourism Studies and Women Academics in Tourism.