

2nd

**International
Scientific
Conference**

1-3 June, 2017
Vrnjačka Banja, Serbia

2

0

1

7

**TOURISM
IN FUNCTION OF DEVELOPMENT
OF THE REPUBLIC OF SERBIA**

**Tourism product as a factor of competitiveness of
the Serbian economy and experiences of other countries**



**THEMATIC
PROCEEDINGS
II**



**UNIVERSITY OF KRAGUJEVAC
FACULTY OF HOTEL MANAGEMENT
AND TOURISM IN VRNJAČKA BANJA**



SUSTAINABLE TOURISM FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT – GENDER PERSPECTIVE REVISITED

Jovana Čikić¹;

Abstract

Sociological researches of sustainable development overcome its narrow environmental orientation and focus on economic and socio-cultural dimensions. The latter refers to the inter/intra-generational and international access to (in)tangible social and cultural resources. Various stakeholders use both types of the resources, in accordance to specific accessibility regimes. Such regimes are influenced by multiple factors, including gender. As contemporary authors speak of sustainable tourism as a part of sustainable social development strategies, we have analyzed needs and obstacles in insisting on and achieving gender equality as one of the pillars of sustainable tourism. We have based our analysis on the relevant references. The aim is to examine are there gendered differences: a) in roles and positions in development of sustainable tourism industry and b) in sustainable tourism benefits. Results could provide an answer whether sustainable tourism could contribute to general gender equality and sustainability.

Key Words: *community development, culture, gender, sustainable tourism, sustainable development*

JEL classification: Z32

Introduction

Since 1990s, sustainable development became one of the most referable scientific paradigms, but also political concepts. The very idea originated from the need to address growing environmental issues. Nevertheless, as environmental issues are socially determined, it has been noted that the

¹ Jovana Čikić, Ph.D., assistant professor, University of Novi Sad, Faculty of Philosophy, Department of Sociology, 21000 Novi Sad, Zorana Đinđića 2, +381642850727, jovana.cikic@ff.uns.ac.rs.

The paper is a part of the research on the project III46006, finances by the Ministry of education, science and technological development of the Republic of Serbia.

new concept could be an umbrella paradigm for various social, economic, and cultural issues. Thus, we usually perceived sustainable development as three pillared. Also, its vast definition made sustainable development receptive for various contexts – from highly developed to underdeveloped countries, from global to local communities, from pre-transitional to post-transitional phases of development, from societies of centre to the societies of periphery. As a result, it was no surprise that sustainable development has become very interesting to the policy makers. It has affirmed mainstream solutions for social development: a) leaning on gradual changes in contemporary production and consumption patterns, b) emphasizing neoliberal concept of self-resourcing and participation, c) balancing between national, regional and local levels of decision-making and policy practicing and d) proclaiming solidarity, security, equality and well-being as basic social values.

Gender is one of the main issues in sustainable development research and practice. Sustainability aims to address gender (in)equalities as an aspect of social (dis)parities. Gender inequalities are essential to understand causes of underdevelopment. Also, gender equalities are one of the main goals and outcomes of sustainable development. According to the Agenda 2030 (UN, 2015), all of the 17 sustainable development goals and 169 targets are aimed to “achieve gender equality and the empowerment of all women and girls. They are integrated and indivisible and balance the three dimensions of sustainable development: the economic, social and environmental” (p. 1). All three pillars of sustainability explore limits and opportunities for gender equality.

Tourism is one of many issues wearing sustainability coat. Interest in sustainable tourism has emerged as negative impacts of tourism industry became more evident. It replaced carrying capacity concept which has lacked both consistent theoretical postulates and empirical background. During the last three decades, references, organizations, journals, policy measures and practices on sustainability overwhelmed tourism industry, aiming to make it more long-term (inter-generationally) feasible and in line with the solutions for the main social problems such as poverty, uneven development, hunger, exploitation, environmental protection, etc. According to UNEP/UNWTO (2005), sustainable tourism is defined as tourism “that takes full account of its current and future economic, social and environmental impacts, addressing the needs of visitors, the industry, the environment and host communities” (p. 11-12).

Recent studies have shown increased interest in researching gender in tourism. Mostly, researches of gender issues aim to address roles and positions of women within tourism industry. However, such perspective could be perceived as simplification of gender analysis as it often forgets masculinity, disabling systematic insight into the male-female relations within tourism system. However, due to the complexity of the gender analysis, we have hereby focused on roles and positions of women in development of sustainable tourism, comparing them to men's whenever possible. We also have aimed to examine are there gendered differences in sustainable tourism benefits. Thus, by analyzing relevant references, we have tried to answer is sustainable tourism gendered and whether it could contribute to general gender equality and sustainability.

(Sustainable) development from the community and gender perspectives

By the end of the 1960's and beginning of the 1970's it was obvious that environmental issues have increased to become threat to the global development. First comprehensive effort to analyze social causes and consequences of environmental problems was report Limits of Growth of the Club of Rome (Meadows et al., 1972). Their quite pessimistic prognosis and proposed model of self-restrained limited growth were an inspiration for the series of forthcoming authors to analyze relations between social, economic and environmental developmental goals. In the 1980's, two major concepts have emerged - theory of ecological modernization and sustainable development. Both of the concepts have emphasized cooperation between economy and environmental protection in terms of ecologization of economy and economization of ecology (Leroy & Tatenhove, 2000). Also, concepts have easily become very popular as they argue gradual social reforms in order to achieve balance between environmental capacity and social requests (Čikić, 2012). Concept of sustainable development emerged as a strategy for enabling resource management in order to increase long-term well-being and wealth. Sustainable development can be interpreted in two ways (Bridger & Luloff, 1999). First, as constrained economic growth - such perception inclines to the theory of ecological modernization focusing on "utility maximization by adding ecological considerations" (p. 378). Second, as environmental resources maintenance, by challenging current production and consumption patterns in order to place "protection of natural resources ... on equal footing with economic considerations" (p. 379). Authors that have argued for sustainable development have also

emphasized that social development cannot be equated with the economic growth as it comprises of economic, but also cultural, institutional, political, environmental, intergenerational and gender dimensions. Thus, concept of sustainable development has a broader impact on different research issues and policies. Regardless the level of practice (from global to local), sustainability is usually linked to the community as a relevant social and spatial framework in researching and achieving it. Community has a growing importance in sustainability analysis and planning as it enables “participation, empowerment and local activism” (Wartburton, 2009, p. 3) which are crucial for eradication of poverty, strengthening social justice and environmental protection. Even though there is often confusion about meaning of the community, it usually refers to the spatial and social entity of organized social functions relevant to its survival and development. It also implies individuals and groups that identify themselves based on community’s characteristics and cooperate in order to achieve common goods. Sustainable community implies certain level of social vitality and resilience in order to face structural and functional challenges throughout integrative and holistic approaches and solutions. According to Kline (1995; cited by: Bridger & Luloff, 1999), sustainable community is an: “ability of a community to utilize its natural, human, and technological resources to ensure that all members of present and future generations can attain a high degree of health and well-being, economic security, and a say in shaping their future while maintaining the integrity of the ecological systems on which all life and production depends” (p. 381).

Three pillars of the sustainable community are: healthy environment, growing economy and social well-being (Power, 2004). The latest “arises from a sense of security, belonging, familiarity, support, neighborliness, cohesion and integration of different social groups” (Power, 2004, p. 7). It also implies certain level of social capital at disposal of community members which enables them to take part in achieving and preserving sustainability. According to Roseland (2012), “decision-making in a sustainable community stems from a rich civic life and shared information among community members. A sustainable community resembles a living system in which human, natural and economic elements are interdependent and draw strength from each other” (p. 27).

In practical terms, linking sustainability to the community enables better understanding of what sustainability means – it facilitates problems’ perception, identification of resources and coordination of activities to be

undertaken. More importantly, sustainability - community relation allows strengthening stakeholders' networks, thus "creating climate much more conducive to the kind of long-term political mobilization" (Bridger & Lullof, 1999, p. 380). Nonetheless, creation of such networks is not an easy task. Communities are consisted of heterogeneous individual, group and institutional stakeholders. They differ in number, roles, statuses, power, information, level of organization, possession of human, financial, social capitals. Gender regime is one of the criteria to be taken into the consideration when analyzing ability of stakeholders to participate in networks and community life.

In section III, chapter 24 of the Agenda 21 (1992), women have been recognized as one of the nine major stakeholders in accomplishing sustainability. Their participation in decision-making is considered not only a basic human right, but precondition of social development overall. In Agenda 2030 (UN, 2015), gender equality is set up as a stand-alone goal, but also all other 16 goals of sustainable development have been gendered. Nevertheless, the issue of gender and development has been raised prior to the sustainability. Since 1970's, concepts of WID (Women in development), WAD (Women and development) and GAD (Gender and development) have questioned equal gendered positions within development processes, but also equal gendered benefits from it (Collier, 1988). WID concept has insisted on improvement of women's social status by enabling them to take part in global economic reproduction. An important boost for women's recognition in research of development was Ester Boserup's book (1970) "Women's Role in Economic Development" in which was proven how specialization in division of labor development weakens the value of women's works. The ideas and conclusions have made quite an impact. The key solution for improvement of women's social status was an improvement of female participation in labor market and their mutual cooperation. Such would have facilitated women to acquire adequate resources and to utilize them more efficiently. Within WID concept, equality is regarded both as intra-household and inter-household issue and its achieving requires an application of wide range of policies (Collier, 1988). WAD concept has emerged in the middle of the 1970s as a critic of WID. The main issue in the concept is relation between patriarchal gender regime and capitalist production. The main difference between WAD and WID is in the perception of women's participation in development – WAD insists on women's continual contribution to the reproduction. However, patriarchal gender regime blocks women's access to both development resources and benefits. Also,

patriarchal gender regime obstructs visibility of women's involvement in development. GAD emerged in the 1980s and it made a significant step forward introducing gender into developmental perspective. It focuses on the gendered participation and benefits from the development. According to GAD concept, there are "socially constructed basis of differences between men and women" and development policies and practice should focus on "the need to challenge existing gender roles and relations" (Reeves & Baden, 2000, p. 3). Furthermore, GAD postulates that gender inequalities are not only visible in economy, but in all other forms of social life, from personal, intimate relations to participation in policy making. Within GAD, women are not perceived *per se* as a research or policy issue - GAD focuses on relations between women and man, where women are seen as oppressed. GAD approach is focused on gendered availability of different power sources and power relations that make members of a certain gender more or less active in development processes: "women are a disadvantaged group compared with men; women and men have differing needs due to their different roles and responsibilities, and in particular their unequal access to and control over resources; women's position of inferiority and subordination is an obstacle to development because it limits the chances and opportunities of half of the world's population" (FAO, 2011, p. 19).

Simultaneously with WID and prior to the actual establishing of sustainable development concept, new debate has appeared – Women, environment and development (WED). It was inspired by the issue of women's participation in environmental management, especially in forestry and agriculture (Tiondi, 2000) whereas women "were portrayed as environmental managers whose involvement was crucial to the achievement of sustainable development" (p. 1). This especially refers to the developing countries/communities. Starting point in WED is gendered division of labor. It explains women's roles, duties and expectation, their access to natural resources, their knowledge about environment and interest in sustainable management of natural resources. According to Sachs (1997), women have respectable knowledge about environment, but it is often underappreciated by official development agencies. According to Tiondi (2000), WED focus have changed over time – "In the early 1980s, women were commonly portrayed as the primary victims of environmental degradation. The degradation of natural resources was seen as an undermining factor in women's ability to perform their sustenance roles and also increased the cost of both their time and energy. In the late 1980s, women came to be seen less as victims and more as

efficient environmental managers and conservers of natural resources... The guiding principles for policy, as formulated by WED, were that women should be incorporated fully into development program activities. The aims of this approach were to ensure that women became direct beneficiaries and that sustainable development projects were not undermined by the exclusion of women, the primary agents of environmental resource management” (p. 6).

WED debate is often linked to the GED (Gender, environment and development) debate. According to GED, control over and use of environmental resources depends on gender regimes. Also, gender regimes determine the accessibility of other resources significant for achieving social status, participation in decision-making, risk of social exclusion and availability of development benefits.

All of the presented concepts have influence gender sensitivity of the sustainability concept. Within the concept, gender aspect has become crucial for addressing the issue of responsibility and efficiency. According to Wart and Koparanova (2012), gender aspect of sustainable development applies to “allocation of resources between women and men” (p. 7), both in intra-generational and inter-generational perspective. Nevertheless, there are gender differences in overcoming obstacles for sustainability and in achieving benefits of sustainable development. Identification of gender gaps is the main step forward sustainability as “by identifying the areas in which women continue to be disadvantaged, it is possible to recognize where empowering measures are most needed” (p. 11). This especially refers to the social sustainability as it is “most politically-sensitive of the three dimensions and thus the hardest to address” (Stevens, 2010, p. 3).

Sustainable tourism in/and sustainable development

Research and also practice of tourism have not long been immune to the “charms” of sustainable development. The concept came as a “prince in the shining armor” in the moment when serious critics of the mass tourism and its negative impacts have emerged among scientists, decision-makers, employees in tourism industry, tourists. Incorporation of the sustainability principles into tourism research and practice has been recognized useful not only for overcoming negative and unwanted consequences of tourism development on environment or its insufficient

economic and social benefits, but for expanding new tourism industry horizons, in terms of new destinations and/or new types of tourism offers.

Definitions of sustainable tourism are various and countless. However, all of them emphasize certain points, synthesized by Faulkner (2001): “safeguards and enhances to natural and cultural assets of the destination; safeguard and enhances the resident population’s quality of life and life opportunities; satisfies the needs and expectations of the tourist market; is economically viable and achieves a return on investment for tourism operators; and achieves equity in the distribution of costs and benefits of tourism between different segments of the community and between the current and future generations. That is, outcomes are considered beyond the relatively short term horizon... and ensure that both inter and intra generational equity is taken into account” (p. 343-344).

The idea of sustainable tourism is often linked to the concept of community development for two main reasons. First, the community is usually the most acceptable layer in researching and achieving sustainability as it enables thorough identification of development issues, but also available resources and stakeholders. In addition, community is quite enough to make possible the analysis of complex sustainability issues. Second, community can be regarded as a tourism destination unit with local population (both recipient and non-recipient), businesses and government as main stakeholders in tourism planning.

Even though useful (to some point), sustainability paradigm in tourism development has often been perceived without necessary critical approach. Liu (2003) has enumerated six major weaknesses of sustainable tourism literature – from devoting excessive attention to resources, their conservation to the lack of appropriate interest in non-economic benefits from tourism. Liu (2003) have also argued that “no due attention has yet been paid to intra-generational equity” (p. 461) which refers to the “fairness of benefits and costs distribution among stakeholders groups of tourism development” (p. 461). Sharpley (2000) have argued similar, emphasizing that “within the context of equity, the concept of sustainable tourism development is both weak and contradictory” (p. 10). In order to correct such limitations, researchers of (social) sustainability in tourism development have been applying stakeholder theory. According to it, tourism system includes various stakeholders whose participation is precondition for system’s sustainability. Poudel, Nyaupane and Budruk (2016) have advocated that relations between stakeholders are “complex

and dynamic as the roles of stakeholders are site-specific, varying in type and extent with time, resources and leadership” (p. 467). According to UNWTO (2005), stakeholders in tourism development include vast list of social agents such as national, regional and local governments, tourism enterprises and employees, tourism educators, tourists, (non)recipient local population on tourism destinations, etc. They are not homogeneous, but differ in possession of available resources and capitals, level of organization, number, power, etc. Such features have shaped power relations between stakeholders, influencing chances for monopolization of benefits. Besides aforementioned, there are several other important division criteria that influence stakeholders` capacity to make decisions and gain benefit from it – gender is one of them.

Gender perspective in (sustainable) tourism development

Even though tourism experience is “grounded in and influenced by our collective understanding of the social construction of gender” (Hall et al., 2003, p. 7), gender issue is of recent interest in analyzing (sustainable) tourism development. First papers on gender issues in tourism have not been published until the 1980`s. Thus, it is no surprise that Figueroa-Domecq et al. (2015) have argued gender-blindness in “development, volume and quality of tourism research” (p. 89).

Table1: *Papers published on gender issues in tourism in relevant scientific journals (in 2015)*

Journal	Total No. of papers	Papers published before 2000 (a), in %	Papers published after 2000 (b), in %	Papers published after 2010 (c), in %	Ratio (c)/(b)
Tourism Management (IF 3.140)	853	14.2	85.8	57.1	0.665
Journal of Sustainable Tourism (IF 2.480)	319	6.6	93.4	63.3	0.667
Annals of Tourism Research (IF 2.275)	656	30.2	69.8	39.9	0.572
Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing (IF 1.741)	536	3.4	96.6	61.0	0.631
Current Issues in Tourism (IF 1.733)	316	1.9	98.1	76.9	0.784

Source: *web sites of selected journals*

Brief analysis of the selected scientific journals on tourism has shown poor interest in gender issues until 2000 (Tab. 1.), with the exception of one journal. *Annals of Tourism Research* dedicated the whole issue (No. 2, Vol. 22, 1995) of 17 papers to the gender – tourism relations and proved to be more gender sensitive. Data have also shown increased interest in gender issues in tourism in the last decade, since majority of the papers has been published since 2010. The similar has been concluded by Figueroa-Domecq et al. (2015). According to bibliometric analysis, the authors have argued “tourism gender research to be marginal”, both in fields of tourism and gender expertise (p. 96).

Attention to gender perspective in (sustainable) tourism research has been drawn from the analyses of the stakeholders` roles within tourism system and their positions within stakeholders` networks. Such have implied different possessions and practices of power in mutual relations, routed in typical gender regimes. “Discovery” of gendered roles, statuses and relations in (sustainable) tourism development has coincided with intensified use of the social context and social categories in explanation of tourism.

Research of gender issues in tourism relies on a basic assumption – all activities within tourism system and between tourism system and other social, economic, cultural, environmental (sub)systems are performed and constructed in gendered society. Thus, there is no role, position, activity or process within tourism system that is immune to specific gender relations. Such relations are represented in a particular gender regime/contract which is spatially and temporally determined. Gender regime implies gendered roles, positions, expectation, criteria of evaluation constructed by gender. The scope of tourism system indicates the span of gender regime to be taken into the consideration. The research of gender in (sustainable) tourism development raises one crucial question: is (sustainable) tourism enough gender sensitive to identify and promote gender equality as a development goal? The answer lies in multiple layers gender – (sustainable) tourism relations. If we apply stakeholder theory in researching gender - (sustainable) tourism relations, than we start our analysis with men and women as main actors in gender cluster. Such cluster is intersected with other clusters in tourism system – tourists/consumers cluster, tourism employees` cluster, local non-recipient population`s cluster, decision-making cluster.

Gender perspective in tourists cluster is focused on the analysis of gendered abilities to travel. It is closely linked to the ability of being mobile. In the era of general mobility, gender determined opportunities to travel are often overlooked. Nevertheless, to be a traveler/tourist has its gendered roots, especially when observed in historical dimension. According to the Robinson (1990; cited by: Richter, 2005), “until the sixteenth century to be a woman, travel and remain respectable one had to be generally either a queen or a pilgrim” (p. 427). Why women were denied the right to travel either for business or pleasure? The answer is in the gender regime characteristics. In traditional societies, gender regimes are dominantly patriarchal, with strict division of gendered roles and corresponding statuses. Women’s dominant social roles were mainly expressive – they were above all (self)recognized as mothers and spouses. Private sphere (family, household) was women’s social space. On the other side, men’s roles have been perceived as instrumental. Men were breadwinners; they represented family members and family before the society. Men’s activities were orientated towards public sphere and public spaces, where ability to be mobile was necessary, desirable and often a matter of prestige. Changes in gender regimes in modern and postmodern societies towards more egalitarian ones have modified gendered ability to travel. Nevertheless, until recently women have not been recognized as a specific group of tourist. Jucan and Jucan (2013) have argued raising influence of women as tourists because they have been “more involved in household spending decisions” (p. 441). Also, women have been become more independent as customers, purchasing goods and using services not only to complete family/household needs, but in order to fulfill their own desires. Such has influenced not only marketing in tourism, but also design of destination image and personality (Beerli & Martín, 2004), type of tourism offer (Anderson & Littrell, 1996), destination choice (Meng & Uysal, 2008), etc.

Second major issue regarding gender – (sustainable) tourism relation is focused on tourism employees’ cluster. According to the UNWTO (2011), gender differences among employees in tourism industry are still significant as “women in tourism are still underpaid, under-utilized, under-educated, and underrepresented” (p. ii). Gendered disparities in employment within tourism industry (hospitality sector, in general) are consequences of the gender regimes” characteristics –they imply subordination of female to male labor. “A key structural concern with gender disparity in HCT (hotels, catering, tourism – N.A.) is that of the significant horizontal and vertical gender segregation of the labour market

within the sector. Women and men are placed in different occupations – women are employed as servers, cleaners, travel agency sales persons, tour guides, (90 per cent of the people in these occupations are women), whereas men are employed as bartenders, porters, gardeners,” maintenance and construction workers. As we will demonstrate, vertically, the typical “gender pyramid” is prevalent - lower levels and occupations with few career development opportunities being dominated by women and key managerial positions being dominated by men”. (Baum, 2013 p. 7-8)

Gendered segregation in tourism labor reflects dichotomy unpaid/female – paid/male labor. It also suggest persistence of traditional labor division whereas women are more involved in doing family/household activities, which makes for them more difficult to balance private and public sphere. Also, dichotomy unpaid/female – paid/male labor implies that women are usually engaged in job position/sector that corresponds with their unpaid household work. Women are more than men engaged in seasonal, poorly paid and part-time jobs with a little or no prospects (Čikić & Jovanović, 2015). That makes them more vulnerable and more exposed to the risk of poverty and social exclusion.

Peeters and Ateljević (2009) argued that female entrepreneurship in (sustainable) tourism is a neglected issue. Also, they wrote that majority of the studies on women entrepreneurs in (sustainable) tourism focus on “positions of women entrepreneurs in the tourism sector that could also be regarded as an extension of traditional domestic roles” (p. 80). However, within policy documents sustainable tourism is often recognized as a new marketing niche, suitable for enhancing women’s entrepreneurial potentials. This especially refers to the women in less developed areas (e.g. remote or rural areas). Analyzing farm tourism in Sweden, Pettersson and Cassel (2014) concluded that women became entrepreneurs in tourism for personal, economic and social reasons, often interconnected. Comparing characteristics of men’s and women’s motivation for entrepreneurship in tourism, McGehee et al., (2007) argued several similar features such as “desire for additional income, to fully utilize existing resources, and to educate the consumers” (p. 288), but also one major difference concerning “consistently higher ranking of all the possible motivations for agri-tourism by women than men” (p. 288) which indicated higher motivation for tourism entrepreneurship among women. However, women more than men face challenges in their entrepreneurial endeavors (Bakas, 2014). There is no consensus on the

consequences of female entrepreneurship in (sustainable) tourism development. The opinions range from optimistic to pessimistic. First ones argue multiple benefits of female entrepreneurship in (sustainable) tourism – greater financial independence of women (Hull & Milne, 1998), lower risks of financial exclusion, strengthening women's social capital, improvement of livelihoods (Getz & Carlsen, 2000). Others are more skeptical about benefits, arguing that female entrepreneurship in (sustainable) tourism is often linked with the inner family/community tensions (Ireland, 1993). Pettersson and Cassel (2014) concluded that even though female entrepreneurship in farm tourism transforms space from “*masculinity*” into “places for a female connoted service production” (p. 499), gendered labor division on farms was “not substantially changed by the women starting tourism businesses” (p. 499).

Development of tourism (even sustainable one) is accompanied by both benefits, but also environmental, economic, cultural, social risks. Researchers have developed instruments to measure perception of potential tourism impacts on community (Lankford, 1994). We might question is there gendered difference in perception of benefits or risks from sustainable tourism development? Such can be assumed in accordance with the gendered exposure to development benefits and risks. Gendered variations in perception of sustainable tourism development's outcomes might derived from different gendered positions to influence development processes and to control their effects. Two major groups are formed on the issue. First one (seems to be dominant) consists of the researchers that have proven no gendered difference in local population's perceptions of tourism development impact (Andereck et al., 2005; Andriotis & Vaughan, 2003). Second one point out gender as a significant variable in formation of residents' perceptions (Mason & Cheyne, 2000). For example, Petrzalka et al. (2005) argued that gender does make a difference in perception of tourism development impact and, consequently, in attitudes towards (rural) tourism development strategies as gender influence occupational identity and perception of rural ideology.

Even though women are majority among tourism industry's employees, survey of the 78 companies in tourism industry (Equality in Tourism, 2013) has shown that women made up only “15.8% of all board members... In 21 of the companies and professional associations surveyed there was not a single female board member” (p. 3). Gender gap at the decision-making level in tourism industry corresponds not only

with the low participation of women in decision-making in general, but also their specific position on tourism labor market. Also, perception of women as more hospitable than men makes them more suitable for frontline positions in tourism industry (Ritcher, 2005) and keeps them away from the management duties. Ferguson (2009) argued that there are two types of gender - tourism development policy relations - implicit ("gender-blind") and explicit ("gender-aware"). However, gender-aware tourism development policies "does not necessarily lead to gender equality and women's empowerment" (Ferguson, 2009, p. 15).

Process of making gender visible and accountable in decision-making in tourism corresponds with the intention to develop, promote and practice responsible tourism, through achieving local empowerment and social cohesion. There are several ways for achieving gender responsible and sustainable tourism (GRT, 2013): promotion of women's engagement in the tourism, support to the rights of female employees, enabling women to have access to various opportunities in tourism development (education, information, financial capital, market), battle against gender-based exploitation, equal benefits from tourism, support female leadership, etc. All of those could be covered by gender mainstreaming as a main instrument of setting the agenda in making sustainable tourism more gender sensitive.

Conclusion

Like any other social phenomenon, sustainable tourism development is gendered. It is a matter of structure and culture. For the sake of development of sustainable tourism, it is crucial to acknowledge its gender dimension. Public recognition of gender dimension in sustainable tourism development among relevant policy makers, practitioners and researchers enables overcoming the gaps and constraints towards achieving equality and improving quality of life.

As we have shown, there are significant gender gaps in various clusters of (sustainable) tourism system – from cluster of employees to the cluster of decision makers. However, we have to agree that there are unquestionable benefits of women's engagement in the tourism/hospitality industry. Gendered sustainable tourism facilitates not only provision of economic benefits for women engaged in the tourism industry, but their general empowerment. The foundation of the process of women's empowerment lies in gender mainstreaming and gender budgeting. Allocation of

resources in terms of making them equally available for women (as for men), along with the networking, are crucial for: a) improvement of female social entrepreneurship in tourism and b) enhancing gender equality and sustainability. As Chant wrote, employment in tourism enables women to act “by themselves, for themselves, to demand fairer treatment in the workplace, the home, and in wider society” (Chant 1997, p. 164-5; according to: Ferguson, 2009, p. 12).

References

1. Andereck K. L., Valentine K. M., Knopf R. C., Vogt C. A. (2005). Residents' Perceptions of Community Tourism Impacts. *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 32, No. 4, 1056-1076.
2. Anderson, L., Littrell, M. (1996). Group Profiles of Women as Tourists and Purchasers of Souvenirs. *Family and consumer science*, Vol. 25, No. 1, 28–56.
3. Andriotis, K., Vaughan, R. (2003). Urban Residents' Attitudes toward Tourism Development: The Case of Crete. *Journal of Travel Research*, Vol. 42, No. 2, 172-185.
4. Bakas, F. (2014). *Tourism, female entrepreneurship and gender: Crafting new economic realities in rural Greece* (doctoral thesis), University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand.
5. Baum, T. (2013). *International Perspectives on Women and Work in Hotels, Catering and Tourism*. International Labor Organization, Geneva.
6. Beerli, A., Martin, J. (2004). Factors influencing destination image. *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 31, No. 3, 657–681.
7. Boserup, E. (1970). *Woman's Role in Economic Development*, George Allen & Unwin, London.
8. Bridger, J., Luloff, A. (1999). Toward an interactional approach to sustainable community development. *Journal of Rural Studies*, Vol. 15, No. 4, 377-387.

9. Čikić, J. (2012) Theory of ecological modernization as a sociological framework for studying environmental problems. *Teme*, Vol. 36, No. 2, 545-560 (In Serbian).
10. Čikić, J., Jovanović, T. (2015). *Diffusion of knowledge and development of rural tourism in Vojvodina*. Faculty of Science, Novi Sad (In Serbian).
11. Collier, P. (1988). *Women in Development - Defining the Issues*. The World Bank - Population and Human Resources Department – policy paper, Washington.
12. Equality in Tourism (2013). *Sun, sand and ceilings: women in the boardroom in the tourism industry*, http://equalityintourism.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/07/Sun_Sand_Ceiling_F.pdf, (13 April 2017).
13. FAO (2011). *Communicating gender for rural development - Integrating gender in communication for development*, Rome.
14. Faulkner, B. (2001). Destination Australia: A Research Agenda for 2002 and Beyond, In: Fredline, L., Jago, L., Cooper, C. (eds.) *Progressing Tourism Research*, Channel View Publications, UK, 343-344.
15. Ferguson, L. (2009). *Analyzing the Gender Dimensions of Tourism as a Development Strategy*. Policy Papers No. 09-03. Instituto Complutense de Estudios Internacionales, Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Madrid.
16. Figueroa-Domecq, C., Pritchard, A., Segovia-Perez, M., Morgan, N., Villacé-Molinero, T. (2015) Tourism gender research: A critical accounting. *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 52, 87-103.
17. Gender Responsible Tourism. (2013). The 6 pillars of gender responsible tourism - A framework for action for the achievement of more gender-equitable forms of tourism, http://www.g-r-t.org/images/stories/pdf/grt_six_pillars.pdf, (13 April 2017).
18. Getz, D., Carlsen J. (2000). Characteristics and goals of family and owner-operated businesses in the rural tourism and hospitality sectors. *Tourism Management*, Vol. 21, No. 6, 547-560.

19. Hall, D., Swain, M., Kinnaird, V. (2003). Tourism and gender - an evolving agenda. *Tourism recreation research*, Vol. 28, No. 2, 7-11.
20. Hull J., Milne, S. (1998). Tourism, gender and the labor process: the case of Quebec's Lower North Shore. *Tourism recreation research*, Vol. 23, No. 2, 13-22.
21. Ireland, M. (1993). Gender and class relations in tourism employment. *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 20, No. 4, 666-684.
22. Jucan, M. S., Jucan C. N. (2013). Gender trends in tourism destination. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, Vol. 92, 437-444.
23. Leroy, P., Tatenhove, J. van (2000). Political Modernization Theory and Environmental Politics. In: Spaargaren, G., Mol, A., Buttel, F. (eds). *Environment and Global Modernity*, SAGE Publications Ltd., London, 187-208.
24. Lankford, S. (1994). Developing a tourism impact attitude scale. *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 21, No. 1, 121-139.
25. Liu, Z. (2003). Sustainable Tourism development: A Critique. *Journal of Sustainable Development*, Vol. 11, Iss. 6, 459-475.
26. Mason, P., Cheyne, J. (2000) Residents' Attitudes To Proposed Tourism Development. *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 27, No. 2, 391-411.
27. McGehee, N., Kim, K., Jennings, G. (2007). Gender and motivation for agri-tourism entrepreneurship. *Tourism Management*, Vol. 28, No. 1, 280-289.
28. Meadows, D. H., Meadows, D. L., Randers, J., Behrens, W. W. (1974). *Limits of Growth*, Naprijed, Zagreb. (In Croatian).
29. Meng, F., Uysal, M. (2008). Effects of Gender Differences on Perceptions of Destination Attributes, Motivations, and Travel Values: An Examination of a Nature-Based Resort Destination. *Journal of Sustainable Development*, Vol. 16, No. 4, 445-466.

30. Peeters, L., Ateljevic, I. (2009). Women Empowerment Entrepreneurship Nexus in Tourism: Processes of Social Innovation, In: Ateljevic, J., Page, S.J. (eds.) *Tourism and Entrepreneurship: International Perspectives*, Butterworth-Heinemann, Oxford, 75 - 89.
31. Petrzalka, P., Krannich, R.S., Brehm, J., Trentelman, C. K. (2005) Rural tourism and gendered nuances. *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 32, No. 4, 1121–1137.
32. Pettersson, K., Cassel, S. (2014). Women tourism entrepreneurs: doing gender on farms in Sweden. *Gender in Management: An International Journal*, Vol. 29, No. 8, 487-504.
33. Poudel, S., Nyaupane, G., Budruk, M. (2016). Stakeholders' perspectives of sustainable tourism development - a new approach to measuring outcomes. *Journal of Travel Research*. Vol. 55, No. 4, 465–480.
34. Power, A. (2004). *Sustainable communities and sustainable development - a review of the sustainable communities plan*. Sustainable Development Commission, London.
35. Reeves, H., Baden, S. (2000). *Gender and Development: Concepts and Definitions*, Institute of Development Studies - University of Sussex, Brighton.
36. Richter, L. (2005). Exploring the Political Role of Gender in Tourism Research, In: Theobald, W. (ed.) *Global Tourism*. Elsevier, Netherlands, 426-439.
37. Roseland, M. (2012). *Toward Sustainable Communities: Solutions for Citizens and Their Governments*, New Society Publishers, Canada.
38. Sachs, C. (1996). *Gendered Fields - Rural Women, Agriculture, and the Environment*, Westview Press, Boulder.
39. Sharpley, R. (2000). Tourism and sustainable development: exploring the theoretical divide. *Journal of sustainable tourism*, Vol. 8, No. 1, 1-19.
40. Stevens, C. (2010). Are Women the Key to Sustainable Development? *Sustainable development insights*, No. 3, 1-8.

41. Tiondi, E. (2000). Women, environment and development: Sub-Saharan Africa and Latin America University of South Florida (Graduate thesis), University of South Florida, Tampa, <http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2548&context=etd> (13 April 2017).
42. UN (1992). *Agenda 21*, <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/Agenda21.pdf> (13 April 2017).
43. UN (2015). Transforming our world: the 2030 agenda for sustainable development, <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/21252030%20Agenda%20for%20Sustainable%20Development%20web.pdf> (13 April 2017).
44. UNEP and UNWTO (2005). *Making Tourism More Sustainable - A Guide for Policy Makers*, Paris.
45. UNWTO (2005). *Report on the WTO Survey on the Implementation of the Global Code of Ethics for Tourism*, <http://cf.cdn.unwto.org/sites/all/files/docpdf/a2110reportoftheworldcommitteetourismethicsadd1en0.pdf> (13 April 2017).
46. UNWTO (2011) *Global Report on Women in Tourism 2010 - Preliminary Findings*, Madrid.
47. Wart, L., Koparanova, M. (2012). *Empowering women for sustainable development* (Discussion paper series), United nations - Economic commission for Europe, Geneva.
48. Warburton, D. (2009). A passionate dialog: community and sustainable development. In: Warburton, D. (ed.) *Community and Sustainable Development: Participation in the Future*, Earthscan, London, 1-39.