Pergamon

Annals of Tourism Research, Vol. 22, No. 2, pp. 247-266, 1995
Copyright © 1995 Elsevier Science Ltd
Printed in the USA. All rights reserved
0160-7383/95 $9.50 + .00

0160-7383(94)00095-6

GENDER IN TOURISM

Margaret Byrne Swain
University of California, Davis, USA

INTRODUCTION

A prospective contributor to this Special Issue on *Gender in Tourism* asked " . . . is it about gender relations or just about women?" Ignoring the "just," it is not surprising the person asked. The same arguments waged in the founding of university Women's Studies Departments and in the past 30 years of the feminist movement are applicable to this collection of articles. A feminist approach to research is based in an understanding of gender, used in this essay to mean a system of cultural identities and social relationships between females and males, as a significant variable in any study of human relations. Gender is, therefore, quite distinct from biological differences between the sexes, and is the basis of both women's subordination and potential change toward equality between women and men (Eisenstein 1983:xii–xiv).

As feminism is overtly a political as well as a scholastic theoretical base, women-only scholarship (by and about women) has had a "remedial" function, giving women scholars voice, portraying the often neglected issues of women in many male biased or dominated disciplines, and bringing a body of knowledge into some measure of information equity. The majority of scholars writing about gender issues continue to be women, as seen in this Special Issue. There has been a danger that a "women only" approach marginalizes women as a peculiar species (Elson 1991:1). However, studies just about women or men can be written from a gender perspective putting the subject into the context of gendered society. Thus, the answer to the query is that this Special Issue is about gender, and some of the articles focus specifically on women.

Tourism, as leisured travel (Kinnaird, Kothari and Hall 1994:11) and the industry that supports it, is built of human relations, and thus impacts and is impacted by global and local gender relations. In tourism social science research, distinctions among kinds of people and their behaviors in demand and supply roles as leisured consumers (guests) and working producers (hosts) have become basic units of analysis (Smith 1976). Historically, Graburn and Jafari (1991:2) note,

---

Margaret Byrne Swain, Anthropologist at the University of California, Davis (Davis CA, 95616, USA. E-mail: "mbswain@ucdavis.edu") first published on "sex roles in tourism" in the 1976 edition of *Hosts and Guests: The Anthropology of Tourism* (University of Pennsylvania Press). Gender and ethnicity analysis predominates her current work in Southwest China.

the term *tourist* for the guest role was coined in Europe by the mid-1700s to describe participants, usually young men, in "tours" or pleasurable educational journeys. The term later came to include the bourgeoisie, large groups, and women. Relationships within and between groups of hosts and guests can be analyzed by focusing on a number of characteristics including gender, class, age, ethnicity and race, and nationality. These distinctions intersect and affect each other, and form the complex populations studied by tourism researchers (Ireland 1993). For social scientists engaged in tourism research, gender is thus a fundamental category useful in human resource studies, economic development projects, marketing strategies, site and infrastructure planning, and policy development.

When plans for *Gender in Tourism* began in 1991, it was in response to growing interest and new work appearing in various disciplines (Baretje and Bouteille 1992). Much of the literature extant had been descriptive or indirect. Very recent gender scholarship in tourism and leisure studies makes it possible to compare three reviews: an introduction to a collection on tourism development studies and associated gender issues (Kinnaird, Kothari and Hall 1994); a chronicle of the uses of feminist theories in leisure studies (Henderson 1994b); and an imaginative romp (Vijola and Jokinen 1994) among tourism theorists charting directions in qualitative, personal voice research essential to furthering an understanding of the meaning of gendered tourism. Themes developed and critiqued from these three sources are then related to the articles in this Special Issue of *Annals* and to future research directions. Thinking is stimulated about tourism issues as gendered relationships between individuals, groups, social categories, types of tourism, and nations in First/Third Worlds. The articles published here document commonalties and distinctions in gendered tourism experiences, asking how to explain these dimensions over time.

GENDER ISSUES IN TOURISM

In one of the first published collections on the topic of gender in tourism, Vivian Kinnaird and Derek Hall (1994) take on the task of defining the subject from a tourism development perspective. Their introductory chapter starts with a discussion of tourism (Kinnaird, Kothari and Hall 1994: 2–8) as an important aspect of modern consumerism, which can be fruitfully analyzed from a gender perspective. Gender is used as an understood, undefined term without citing the general feminist literature. While clearly a theoretical stance, the concept is not elaborated in the same way that various definitions of tourism are critiqued. The authors focus on tourism development processes as signifiers of social change and embodiments of social practices. Tourism is seen as a vehicle of economic development in both economically developed and developing nations. Domestic and international tourism industries continue to expand in response to growing markets stimulated by consumers' increased leisure time and relative wealth. Tourism then as a vehicle of economic development is ripe for gender analysis, following the lead of the literature on gender and development. Furthermore, tourism practices reflect representational issues of

identity and nationhood in the marketing and consuming processes between hosts and guests (Kinnaid et al 1994), as discussed by Cohen, Cone, and Scott in this issue of *Annals*.

Three issues are central to the conceptual framework for understanding gender in tourism (Kinnard et al 1994:5). First tourism processes are constructed from gendered societies ordered by gender relations. Second, gender relations over time inform and are informed by the interconnected economic, political, social, cultural and environmental dimensions of all societies engaged in tourism development. Third power, control, and equality issues are articulated through race, class, and gender relations in tourism practices. Kinnaird et al ask their readers to consider how gender relations in tourism are constructed; how they change over time; and how they inform issues of inequality and control. Citing works on imperialism and political economy analysis at the global, national, and local levels of tourism development and underdevelopment, the authors concur: " . . . that tourism involves processes which are constructed out of complex and varied social realities and relations that are often hierarchical and unequal. All parts of the process embody different social relations of which gender relations are one element" (1994:6). Women and men are thus involved differently in the construction and consumption of tourism. Gendered "realities" shape tourism marketing, guests' motivations, and hosts' actions. Particular sets of stereotypes and hierarchies, for example, shape sex tourism in societies where historical custom intersects with modernization and global capitalism (Hall 1994; Kelsey 1994; see also Leheny in this issue). Another related dimension not noted by the authors is tourism host-guest sexual relations, as articulated in articles by Meisch and Pruitt and LaFont in this volume.

Kinnaird et al (1994:8–15) takes up the problem of defining tourism within the context of development. Dismissing simple statistical accounts of tourism activity as apolitical, they turn to a view of tourism as social interaction. The authors, citing the work of Smith (1989), Urry (1990), Graburn (1989), Rojek (1985), and others, make a serial commentary on various definitions of tourism. From the tourist's perspective, tourism is a part of leisure time and activity distinct from work and home that " . . . enables individuals to spend a period of time in a new place or places" (Kinnaird et al 1994:11). Another dimension is the tourist's quest for the unique or extraordinary, which is played out in hierarchical relationships of class and global political economy. The quest is responded to by the host industry manipulation of signs and experiences for their consumers. Referring to this mythical quality of tourist perceptions (MacCannell 1989) and ideological features in Western culture, the authors turn their essay toward gender by noting the predominant tourism brochure representations of men associated with action, power, and ownership, while women are associated with passivity, availability, and being owned. From this perspective, uses of women, sexual imagery, and exotic markers in the tourism industry to market destinations are seen to often reinforce stereotypes and hierarchical divisions of labor (Enloe 1989). Host societies differentiated by race/ethnicity, colonial past, or social position from the consumer societies are sold with feminized images. The tourism prod-

uct—as a combination of services, culture, and geographic location—is consumed *in situ*, in various transactions from tourist gazing to the selling of otherness.

Recent theoretical studies of tourism process and the social relations it embodies (e.g., Urry 1990) have not dealt with gender issues in any substantial way. But these analyses of tourism activity as a sphere of social practice characterized as "modern" and bound up with major transformations of paid work leads Kinnaird et al (1994:14) to ask some fundamental questions about the division of labor, paid and unpaid labor, and the gender implications for both hosts and guests. Host populations have gendered employment opportunities and control of waged work. For guests it is meaningful to ask who has leisure from what work in the sexual/gender division of labor.

In a literature review, Kinnaird et al (1994) then focus on case studies in tourism development that have considered gender relations from the perspectives of economic development and sociocultural change, and raise the issue of gender and the environment. Some tourism research on economic development (Monk and Alexander 1986; Levy and Lerch 1991) has investigated the kinds and effects of employment generated, either reinforcing the gender division of labor along sex-segregated lines, or perhaps transforming it by developing new work and income opportunities. Kinnaird et al (1994:17–18) concur that tourism employment is overtly gender biased, reflecting local and trans-national norms of "women's work."

How this might change is a focus of research on sociocultural impacts of tourism development. In studies of the commoditization of culture, the paradoxical push for "tradition" as images of the Other and authentic goods and experiences (Cohen 1988) contrasts deeply with the inherent modernity of tourism. Furthermore the interaction of race/ethnicity, class and gender hierarchies in state societies are at work shaping the actual impacts of cultural commoditization on the producers and consumers (Swain 1993).

Tourism development influences changing value systems as hosts and guests identify with each other, and their profoundly gendered interactions shape each other's perceptions and behavior. The demonstration effect, acting like the other, (Harrison 1992, Moore in this issue) is one way of identifying this impact. Another possibility is changing self-perception in reaction to interacting with tourists (Cone in this issue). Change in value systems due to the proliferation of global sex tourism practice also has widely varied effects.

Tourism development has been linked with family system change and is seen as a vehicle if not *modus operandi* of modernity in recently developing societies. Birth rates go down, women headed households go up, and there are changes in the political status of people by age as younger people gain economic power through tourism work (Kinnaird et al 1994:21–22).

Environmental issues in tourism development are a distinct area of research ripe for gender analysis. However, Kinnaird et al found no studies in the literature on host/guest environmental perceptions, uses, or consumption driven protection that included a gender dimension. Links between gender, changing environmental perceptions and prac-

tices by the providers of tourism services in rural Spain are addressed in a pioneering paper by Garcia-Ramon, Canoves and Valdovinos in this issue.

The final essay section of Kinnaird et al leads back to theoretical frameworks, but does not seem clearly thought out. The failure to label gender theory for what it is seems a curious omission when striving for a "gender-aware framework" for the study of tourism development. In their proposed three-part framework (1994:5,24), the bottom line is that the tourism industry is built on relations between people, all of whom are gendered. Gender underlies political relations and power allocations in the household, community, and societal levels; is expressed in motivations, desires, traditions and perceptions; and is therefore a factor in all tourism development and underdevelopment. What are the predictive or organizational strengths of this framework? All discussion of feminist theory, of personal or individual dimensions of tourism development; or of sexuality as a social phenomenon have been avoided. The authors' lack of a definition of gender leads to a lack of a coherent understanding of how the interlocking dimensions of gender as identity and social relations work in their framework. It is only when the book turns to its case studies that theoretical issues are explored. In the first two cases, tourism employment is analyzed as part of "prevailing capital and patriarchal structures" (1994:25). Three subsequent chapters drawing on theories of gender in development investigate how gender in tourism structure boundaries between work and leisure, impact family systems and social values, and shape commoditization of local culture. Another study shows how complex gender and race hierarchies in a regional political economy drive sex tourism. A reading of tourism promotion of a region's heritage explains how it is profoundly structured by gender, sexuality, and ethnicity imagery. In the last study, the nature and historical significance of women travelers' experience in relation to the gender hierarchies of their day are explored. Relevant chapters are specifically referred to in discussion of this Special Issue's articles below.

In their collection's conclusion, Kinnaird and Hall (1994:210–216) call for analysis of four dimensions: (a) gendered tourists, problematizing a work/leisure dichotomy in contemporary society, and researching motivations to travel, behavior socialized by gender, and marketing to specific spheres (Harvey, Hunt and Harris; Anderson and Littrell; Pruitt and LaFont; Meisch in this issue); (b) continued analysis of gendered hosts, as seen in work on tourism development (Cone; Garcia-Ramon, Canoves and Valdovinos; Moore; Scott; Wilkinson and Pratiwi in this issue), especially who is doing the work, what are historically constructed practices, and what are the ways is which patriarchal power relations are articulated; (c) gendered tourism marketing, focusing on sexuality and gender relations (Leheny in this issue); and (d) gendered tourism objects as activities and landscape (Cohen; Creighton in this issue). To achieve this, the authors propose five future gender research agendas: one, case studies of the interrelationships in tourism development and the social, economic, political, environmental, and cultural aspects of societies; two, analyses of the social construction of environments; three, study of intragender differences

and the construction of power relationships among men and among women, articulating class, race/ethnicity, and sexuality in tourism practices; four, Charting how gender relations are altered due to societal change for both host and guest populations; and five, comparing changing gender relations by type of tourism market (mass, ethnic, special interest, eco-tourism). The Introduction and Conclusion of *Tourism: A Gender Analysis* (Kinnaird and Hall 1994) has set a stage, reviewing some of the past work on gender in tourism studies, presenting new case studies in the body of their book, and leaving the way open for a needed infusion of gender theory in tourism studies.

Besides general feminist writings, the literature in development studies, and in specific social science disciplines, another place to find gender theory that complements the efforts of Kinnaird et al (1994) is in the growing body of feminist literature being produced in leisure studies. Leisure and recreation scholars often contribute to tourism literature (Smith and Godlbey 1991:93–94), because of complementary research interests. One may use the work of a preeminent practitioner in this field, Karla Henderson, who has recently edited a volume of the *Journal of Leisure Research* on women and leisure (1994 a) and published an essay tracing gender in the historical development of leisure studies (1994b) . Her extensive feminist writings are on both theory and method, promoting qualitative methodologies in her field. She defines gender (1994b:119) as " . . . a set of socially constructed relationships which are produced and reproduced through people's actions, . . . [and] a potential analytic framework for the study of women, and the behavior of females as well as males." This framework is further useful for understanding the " . . . implications that 'difference' makes in conducting research" (1994b:120). Henderson gives a thoughtful review of feminism as expressions of a worldview that recognizes women's subordination documented by the study of gender relations, and an awareness of the diversity and differences among women in terms of relative power and disadvantage. From this feminist perspective, she notes, myriad feminisms with specific goals, politics, and methods have developed.

Distinguishing the term sex from gender in current usage can also be confusing. What was called "sex roles" in the United States through the 1970s became "gender roles" in the 1980s (for example, compare Swain 1976 to Swain 1989). Furthermore, a British English "sexual division of labor" (Kinnaird et al 1994:14) is often labeled an American "gender division of labor." Some authors have chosen to refer to a society's "sex-gender system." Henderson notes that this distinction is " . . . often blurred. One's biological sex results in a lifetime of relationships and expectations based on and experienced as gender" (1994b:121).

Each scholar's experiences as a gendered person provides a rich basis to interpreting what one studies. Henderson is committed to acknowledging the personal voice in analyses. This reflexivity goes beyond writing in the first person, to a feminist awareness of how individual selves shape what is focused on. In studying questions of gender, there is also an issue of biases framing each discipline's assumptions. In tourism studies, McCannell (1989:xvii) has alerted the discipline to the masculinity of the abstract "tourist" subject.

Henderson (1994b:129–130) warns leisure researchers to combat the impact of gender behavior in their own discipline by keeping women a primary focus in their studies using the ideological lenses of feminism and the theoretical structures of gender. Her work includes study of "leisure constraints" by gender, the limitations imposed by gender relations on the ranges of activities open to women and men. While Henderson uses the word "culture" liberally in writing about gender, her actual definition of the term does not convey the ideological significance of gender as cultural construction and social relation (Morgan 1989:8). This is a natural critique from an anthropologist, but a distinction that clarifies Henderson's remarks (1994b:121) about gender as a dynamic process, not an inborn trait, signifying relationships of power, expressed in perceptions, learned behaviors and expectations of what is feminine and masculine. It can be seen as the interaction of mutable ideology feeding back into social relationships that are studied as gender, in contrast to biologically determined scripts.

Drawing from the work of other scholars on stages in feminist research, Henderson (1994b:122) develops a five phase framework to analyze the past 30 years of leisure scholarship. One, the invisible (i.e., "womanless") results from an assumption that male experience was universal. Two, compensatory (i.e., "add women and stir") was an outgrowth of the women's movement in the 70s that stimulated a new phase in the social science literature analyzing exceptional women who could be judged by men's standards. Three, dichotomous difference (i.e., "sex differences") focused on difference between males and females. Henderson (1994b:124–125) agrees that this focus has documented cases of oppression but argues it is also potentially divisive, implying hierarchy (male superiority) or deficiency when a situation is actually much more complex. "The acknowledgment of differences can lead our research into new directions IF differences become the stepping-off point for further inquiry and not the explanation of results" (1994b:125). Four, the feminist (i.e., "women-centered") studying of women has generated new ideas, interpretations, and understanding of women's experiences, which have validated and empowered women. One danger here has been the construction of an essentialist universal female experience as a converse to the universal male, without taking into account race, ethnicity, age, education, and other characteristics of individual women. Such an approach has limited use beyond generalized description, while gender studies promises an understanding of how relationships work and change. Five, true gender scholarship, moves to an interactional view of human expectations, behavior, and power relationships. From a gender perspective, researchers may study only one or both sexes together, theorizing how behaviors and roles are given gendered meanings, how labor is divided to express gender and gendered differences symbolically, and how social structures incorporate gender values and convey gender advantages in hierarchical relationships. Explanations developed in current leisure research on gender reviewed by Henderson (1994b:128–129) include theories of patriarchy, gender archetypes, models of gender stereotyping, gender equity theory, theory of gender domination or power and resistance, socialization theory, and gender identity theory.

Although an in-depth analysis is well beyond the scope of this essay,

applying this schema of research phases to tourism studies appears to show fairly similar patterns. By simply looking at the cumulative (1973-1994) indexes of the *Annals of Tourism Research* a few generalizations can be drawn: Phase 1 (no women) was the only perspective for just a few years, when the first articles on women in tourism appeared in Volumes 4-8 (1977-1981). Smith (1979), for example, wrote on "women, the taste makers" who made the choices for married couple's vacations. This signaled inception of phase 2 (add women), phase 3 (descriptive differences), and phase 4 (women centered) scholarship over the following years. As in *Leisure Studies*, there is no chronological trajectory, rather various authors take distinct "mid-phase" perspectives. Gender scholarship or phase 5, was first indexed in *Annals* in 1984. In all, 49 papers and reports are indexed under "sex-gender" index categories in the past 21 volumes of *Annals* with citations for sex (20%), sex tourism/prostitution (26%), women (39%), and gender (15%). Percentages are given due to cross-referencing of 10 citations. In a case of unsigned hegemony, it is worth noting that the category "men" is not indexed, only the different, women, are signed in the works cited. Clearly this Special Issue on gender adds significantly to the study of differences, including race, ethnicity, age and class, now engaged in this journal.

One can also compare *Leisure, Recreation and Tourism Abstracts Annual Index*—Volume 1 (1976) to 18 (1993)—to show a change in focus. In Volume 1, there are very few index categories about people, such as youth, women (1 citation), social stratification, and retirement. In Volume 18, there are at least fifteen categories including men (5 citations), and gender relations (30 citations), with women (73 citations) as one of the largest people designations. In both the journal and abstracts indexes, the number of papers on gender topics was relatively small (not quantified by totals), and papers on women were more common than on gender *per se*.

In tourism publications other than periodicals, a similar trend is evident. There was some mention of "women" in major published collections of the 70s: de Kadt's (1976) studies on tourism and development describes impacts on women's employment, social position and changing sexual mores in several nations, and Smith's (1976) articles included one on women and sex roles in a host society. As Kinnaird et al (1994) show in their literature review, subsequent writing on gender in tourism encompasses a number of issues, but various "phases" of scholarship have not been analyzed. Two examples from a political economy perspective published in 1989 can illustrate the wide range of approaches to gender issues in tourism. Crick (1989:317-326), for example, who subtitled his general review of international tourism studies "Sun, Sex, Sights, Savings and Servility," did not address gender *per se* as a primary variable, but subsumed it under issues of race/ethnicity and class, linking prostitution and drug problems with racial exploitation. He finds the hegemonic drive of transnational corporations to be built on colonial era imperialism, fostering sexual subordination in Third World tourism development (1989:323).

Crick stresses the force of stereotypes in shaping tourism interactions, and the lack of local host voices in tourism studies, which are

needed to gain insight into local perceptions (1989:338). While Crick points the way toward more refined analyses stressing class and racial/ethnic groups as units of analysis, another increasingly cited author stresses gender as the primary variable in her feminist political economy analysis of international politics (Enloe 1989). In her chapter "On the Beach, Sexism and Tourism," Cynthia Enloe (1989:40–41) concludes that tourism is profoundly gendered, based in . . .

> ideas about masculinity and femininity—and the enforcement of both—in the societies of departure and the societies of destination. . . . The very structure of international tourism *needs* patriarchy to survive. Men's capacity to control women's sense of their security and self-worth has been central to the evolution of tourism politics.

Enloe believes there is potential for change through feminist action from the providers and consumers of tourism. Stewardesses to passengers, prostitutes to wives of businessmen can act politically in their response to these controls. While Enloe does address class and race/ethnicity dimensions in other sections of her book, they are not developed in her writing on tourism. This then is the next step, complex analyses reflecting complex situations, hearing gender voices as well as class and racial/ethnic groups in distinct power relationships.

Henderson identifies the following four themes for future gender research in leisure studies, complementing the research agenda for tourism studies by Kinnaird and Hall (1994:210–216). One, the context of gender, should locate gendered actors within social landscapes, investigating circumstances and relationships that shape their choices of gendered behavior. Two, the construction and deconstruction of gender, illustrated by an observation that Mother Theresa and Madonna are both women but embody gender in different ways, focusing on how people interpret, challenge and/or submit to ideological messages in society about appropriated behavior for women and men. Three, the treatment of differences should differentiate between bases of oppression such as racism and sexism, and bases for diversity enriching social life. Henderson, for example, has contributed to the study of gender in constraints on leisure practices. Moving away from essentialist dichotomies as answers, researchers may find pluralisms, rather than dualisms when explaining leisure behavior and investigating avenues for change. Four, inclusive theorizing, Henderson's fourth theme, is a perceived need for multiple theories giving a range of explanations for varied circumstances. In this way, scholars are able " . . . to examine how the common biological characteristic of being female or male is experienced by different groups of women and men in different social and historical circumstance" (1994b:130–135).

In the tourism literature of the 90s, texts continue to vary widely in their treatment of gender dimensions. For example, in a collection on human resources issues in international tourism, only one chapter on Canada (Haywood and Pickworth 1993:129) offers substantial information from census data on gender and occupation in tourism employment. They find (but do not explain) that, no matter what the job, males average higher annual incomes than females. In contrast, a

geographical survey of tourism issues by Shaw and Williams (1994) weaves references to gender throughout their analyses of the availability of leisure time and income for the consumer and opportunities for the workforce in global tourism. The authors address occupational segregation and women's "dual careers," giving a possible explanation for the problem of higher male income in that " . . . managers have used the social construction of women's work as one element in the structuring of the internal labor markets in tourism" (1994:xx).

Gender is an unevenly represented but expanding focus in tourism studies. Current publications, including Kinnaird and Hall's (1994) collection and this Special Issue, all point to a growing awareness and use of gender perspectives in tourism research. A brief overview of an inventive example of this new scholarship will close this section.

"The Body in Tourism" by Veijola and Jokinen (1994) takes their readers on a working holiday, interacting with select tourism theoreticians in imagined conversations with their writings. In their highly crafted narrative, the heroines engage in a series of dialogues and observations, pushing for theoretical inclusion of difference, distinct life experiences, and times in an evolving understanding of tourism. There is no escaping the authors' gender nor its significance in how they theorize tourism. Their culturally constructed socially contained femininity raises the questions they pose to their fictionalized companions on a Finnish style vacation in Mallorca. For Veijola and Jokinen, "the body" is emblematic of what is missing in universalizing social sciences theories in general and in tourism studies specifically. In arguing for inclusion of the body, they take their readers on a tour of ideas by Krippendorf (1987), MacCannell (1989), Urry (1990), Löfgren (1985), and Rojek (1993), contrasted to Game (1991) and Butler (1990), and a host of Others developing a critique of tourism studies ranging from evocations of post modernism to gender trouble.

Krippendorf's (1987:23) focus on the motivation for traveling in the West has led him to see it as escape from the monotony of everyday life—in wage labor and the home—as the primary factor, not travel in itself. Veijola and Jokinen (1994:126–127) take exception to this view, evoking the nonroutinizing tasks of childcare requiring varied response to even little proto-capitalists as a type of labor that Krippendorf has clearly not considered (see Kinnaird et al 1994:14 for a critique of similar ideas). When Krippendorf (1987:127) calls for investing holiday desires and finances back into everyday life for genuine happiness, the narrators find little use for this back to the womb strategy other than as a masculinist fantasy. Krippendorf has no body.

Moving on to an imagined excursion with Dean MacCannell, Veijola and Jokinen (1994:128–131) ask if a more complex understanding of "the tourist," beyond middle-class sightseeing, might be possible to thematize a multiplicity of differences, embodiment, sex and sexuality, and "radical Otherness" in tourism? Yes, McCannell has written a new introduction to his famous study, where he has analyzed connections between the tourist and the postmodern (1989:x–xv). He questions if tourism is a "utopia of differences or a prison of signs," while the narrators contemplate if one should investigate the structure of difference, " . . . who differs from whom, who has defined the difference,

what is the subjectivity of the different . . . " (Veijola and Jokinen 1994:130, see also Kinnaird et al 1994:14). MacCannell has no body, but his epistemology is close to what the narrators are seeking.

In a section of his introduction not cited by Veijola and Jokinen, McCannell draws a similarity between a type of feminist scholarship and an emphasis in his own work " . . . specifying the *modus operandi* of the hegemonic drive at the cultural level (1989:xvii-xviii)." This kind of feminist analyses drawing on semiotics, psychoanalysis, and discourse theory focuses on ideologies of gender as the site of sexual politics. A significant discovery of feminist scholarship has been " . . . the way power hides itself in order to operate more universally and effectively. . . . The most common procedure used to accomplish this hiding is to shield it behind the principle of genderlessness of power which is always really male . . . " (1989:xx).

Moving on to a new encounter with a theorist, Veijola and Jokinen (1994:132-134) meet up with Urry at a Pork Feast. Asking "what are you gazing at," they evoke a response from Urry that departing from everyday routine, the tourist engages with a contrasting set of activities and signs: "[b]y considering the typical objects of the tourist gaze one can use these to make sense of elements of the wider society with which they are contrasted" (1990:2). The narrators are quite restive, asking in response " . . . isn't it rather the tourist body that breaks with established routines and practices? We gaze at dance performances and museums at home, don't we? . . . Here [as tourists] we know it in our conscious bodies that are temporarily united in an utterly physical ritual" (Veijola and Jokinen 1994:xxx). Urry has no body, and he escapes. Although not in bodily terms, it should be added here that Urry (1990:140-141) has noted interconnections of generation, gender, ethnicity and class in tourist practice and inequalities.

In a later scenario, Urry joins Löfgren and Rojek for discussion on representations of the body in tourism practice. The narrators overhear what the three men say. Löfgren (1985) takes his fascination with the complementarity of the banal and cultivated into an examination of vulgar and scenic postcards he has brought along. His analysis prompts a wail of frustration from Veijola and Jokinen (1994:136) about the men's preoccupation with the tourist gaze. They want to situate this gaze with experience, context. Next, Urry (1990:101) weighs in with observations about how there is an almost carnival spirit of abandon in Western tourist consumption. Rojek, who catalogues the bourgeoisie's attempts to escape from everyday life, focuses on the beach scene in front of them, and comments on links between the sexual themes of many postcard subjects and potential for the public beach to be " . . . a place of bodily disclosure . . . [where] women are incontrovertibly the paramount objects of display" (1993:189). Tearing their own gaze away from the gorgeous male next to them, Veijola and Jokinen move on from these "genderless" masculine perspectives to find several women theorists to chat with and about.

They find Game (1990:177-180)who spins semiotic speak around "the body," talking about desire and sensuality, making not a mention of vulgarity. The narrators hear references to context, to participation in ways that " . . . perhaps points to a sensual experience that escapes

tourist discourse" (Veijola and Jokinen 1994:180). From these musings they move on to other ideas concerned with the essentialized body, mind, and body/mind division. Butler's (1990) writing on gender and resignifying in terms of bodily surface politics gives Veijola and Jokinen food for thought: "[t]he task is not whether to repeat, but how to repeat or, indeed, to repeat and, through a radical proliferation of gender, to displace the very gender norms that enable repetition itself" (Butler 1990:148).

At the end of their trip, after all this talk about consuming tourists, their escapism, fascination with differences, gaze, representations, desires, gender interpretations and body politics, they think for a moment about tourist interactions with Others. On the plane home, they meet Castaneda (1991) whose interest in tourists, anthropologists and the ethnographic objects of their quest has led him to write about contrasting bodies produced by tourists as they redefine themselves in response to and in interactions with the Other. Beyond the options from cultural imperialism to going native for the tourist, this exercise points to another side of tourism, the host/provider/producer whose "Other" is the tourist.

In a clear summary, evocative of many a feminist position (Henderson 1994b; Nicholson 1990) Veijola and Jokinen outline the problem they have engaged in tourism studies—the absence of the body:

> [T]he tourist has lacked a body because the analyses have tended to concentrate on the *gaze* and/or structures and dynamics of *waged labor societies* . . . Furthermore . . . the analyst himself has, likewise, lacked a body. Only the pure mind, free from bodily and social subjectivity, is presented as having been at work when analyzing field experiences, which have taken place from the distance required by so-called *scientific objectivity*. . . . We have *rewritten* the chosen texts into tourist events and encounters, into durations of time and sexed body, into being and writing there, in the temporal space of tourism (1994:149).

THIS SPECIAL ISSUE

A full definition of gender as it is used in this Special Issue has evolved from the original call for papers, the contributing authors' responses, and a literature review. The call focused on two main parameters of gender relations in tourism: ideologies of masculinity and femininity in host and guest populations; and social divisions of labor, power, and sexuality. From this, two dimensions have been elaborated. First, the division of labor is seen to be linked to a "division of leisure": ideas and structures in the gendered use of time and concepts of work (and play) drawn especially from the writings of Henderson (1994a,1994b). Secondly, the notion of social sexuality, drawn from the work of Connell (1987), moved into the forefront as an issue both in gender studies and in the study of tourism. Framing social sexuality as a primary variable in gender relations is a useful way to develop an understanding of the dynamics of gender in tourism. Gender then is used here to mean a system of culturally constructed identities, expressed in ideologies of masculinity and femininity, interacting with

socially structured relationships in divisions of labor and leisure, sexuality, and power between women and men.

Over 30 abstracts were submitted to this Special Issue, proposing papers to investigate a very wide range of subjects. It is noteworthy evidence of a growing interest in the topic of gender in tourism that many articles published here draw from recently completed PhD dissertations (Anderson and Littrell, Moore, Pruitt and LaFont) or doctoral research in progress (Harvey et al, Leheney, Meisch, Scott).

Papers in this collection may be grouped in a number of ways, ranging from geographic or disciplinary base, to their fit within the agendas proposed by Kinnaird et al (1994), Henderson (1994b), and Veijola and Jokinen (1994). These agendas can be combined in the following manner with reference to tourist consumers (guests) or providers (hosts), and to interactions between them: case studies focused on the context of gender relations over time; the construction, deconstruction or differentiation of gender identity; the treatment of differences and boundaries in power relationships, hierarchies, or opportunities for change in leisure and labor relations; and expressions and uses of "social sexuality" as a dimension of gender relations.

This last concept was not developed by Kinnaird et al (1994), or Henderson (1994b), although they included sexuality in their discussions of gender in tourism and leisure. Conceptualizing social sexuality with a clearly articulated definition of what they meant by "gender" would have linked several articles in Kinnaird et al (1994:27), which seemed to the authors " . . . somewhat of a departure from the other chapters in the volume." In Connell's (1987) theorizing on gender, the social structures of gender relations are understood to be divisions of labor, power, and social sexuality or cathexis—the investment by society and individual members of emotional significance, attachments, and desires to objects (people, things, places). Articles published here explore this dimension in the commodification of sex, expressions of nationhood and romantic liasons formed in tourism transactions. The concept of "the body" (Veijola and Jokinen 1994) is useful for explaining difference or variation in the experiences and social practices of tourism and leisure behavior embedded in sexuality and gender hierarchies: from exotic-desire or romantic marketing to prostitution; from emotional attachments or somatic boundaries to sexually transmitted disease. The sexed body and social sexuality are significant dimensions of gender in tourism investigated (though not necessarily named) by a number of authors in the following articles.

Finally, in tourism scholarship there has been little personal voice of the subject or the identified experience of the researcher, locating the analyst as part of the analysis. With respect to gender in tourism and feminist research goals, these approaches as well as qualitative research strategies (Wilkinson and Pratiwi in this issue) are particularly important to pursue. Furthermore, inclusive theorizing, finding multiple explanations for the complex issues of gender in tourism research is evident in this collection of articles. All of the papers may be read in distinct ways, those proposed by the authors, and other perspectives brought by the readers.

These papers are contextualized case studies, and all of them address

multiple research agendas as outlined above. A helpful schema for organizing this Special Issue has been Linda Richter's (1993) observation that gender (much like race/ethnicity, class, and age) can be analyzed as an independent variable influencing tourism and as a dependent variable responding to tourism activity. Gender is primarily a dependent variable for tourism producers (hosts) in the papers of this Special Issue by Wilkinson and Pratiwi, Garcia-Ramon et al, Moore, and Cone, responding to the political economy and impact of tourism development with change in the gender divisions of labor and leisure, in gender relations of relative power, expressions of sexuality, and gender ideology. These changes are signaled by realignments of family and work, environmental perceptions, consumption patterns, self identity, empowerment, and sexuality.

Wilkinson and Pratiwi provide an insightful summary of gender and tourism issues in general before focusing on the socioeconomic impacts of domestic tourism development on gender roles and relations in a Javanese fishing village. Villagers provide local tourism services and sites. In their case study, conducted during participation in a joint Indonesian-Canadian research program on development and the environment, the authors used qualitative research methods in a gender analysis framework. Their goal was to elicit an understanding of recent changes in employment patterns, income, family structure and functions and child-rearing related to tourism development. The difficulty of separating out tourism impacts from other aspects of modernity, and the need to view tourism development as part of a total political-economy cross-cutting class and gender hierarchies are well illustrated in this study. From a feminist perspective, the lack of regional development programs aimed specifically at improving women's conditions of life and basis for power is a need that should be addressed in future development programs.

Farm tourism development in the rural postproduction economy of Spain is analyzed by Garcia-Ramon, Canoves, and Valdovinos, for its impact on gender roles and environmental perceptions. Despite regional distinctions in the natural and cultural landscape, and economic conditions in the two study areas of Catalonia and Galicia, this type of domestic tourism development is shown to have similar effects specifically on women providers. The commoditization of domestic work to provide services for tourists has constituted a valuable alternative for women (Shaw and Williams 1994:236–239). Some income and support for continuation of the family farm is possible without major changes to the gender division of labor. Tourism work, however, seems to contribute to ideological shifts as the women become more integrated with the "outside world" and more concerned about conservation of their landscapes, which have become important to their livelihood. The authors provide an interesting case that could be interpreted using Urry's (1990) gaze paradigm applied to the providers rather than the tourist.

Gender ideologies of appropriate leisure behavior are central to Moore's investigation of domestic and international tourisms' impacts on local alcohol consumption in a small Greek town. This "division of leisure" response clearly illustrates how distinct groups of tourists as

agents of change affect gender relations in the local community. International tourism's influence is shown to be mainly on men's drinking patterns, while more recent domestic tourism has modeled new alcohol consumption patterns for women, raising issues of modernity and national gender norms. Boundaries between work and leisure, hosts and guest, and women and men shift in response to the impacts of tourism (Leotidou 1994).

Opportunities for encountering outsiders created by tourism is also important in the intimate portrait by Cone of two Highland Maya craftswomen in Mexico. This article gets to the heart of individual difference and response to tourism impacts. Distinctions in craft, gender relations, types of community ties and personalities leads to distinct gender identities: one woman constructs a hyper-indigenous-ethnic self, while the other crafts a more national-modern self. The women express in their own words how and why they have made choices and adaptations as they negotiate changes in their lives stimulated by participation in tourism work. As van den Berghe (1994:144–145) has noted, indigenous women are the producers and sellers of their handicrafts in Chiapas tourism, and, therefore, control new income. This income is often critical for family support. Because both women in this study are unmarried and outside of conventional patriarchal relationships, their independence is all the more marked.

Gender is primarily an independent variable in papers by Creighton, Meisch, Pruitt and LaFont, Cohen, Scott, Leheny, Harvey et al, and Anderson and Littrell, shaping the production and consumption of tourist sites, goods, and experiences. These papers explore gender ideology in consumption practices, gender perceptions of tourism development, gender identity, sexuality and nationalism, gender in the political economy of tourism, gender relations between tourism consumers and providers, and the reframing of gender ideology using tourism leisure practice.

Moving from the handicraft producers (Cone) to the consumers, Anderson and Littrell have studied tourist souvenir purchases by a fairly homogenous middle-class population in Iowa, USA. Previous research by the authors has documented that a "gender division of leisure" designates souvenir consumption as a woman's activity. Their finding serves as a basis for this article's analysis of gender ideology and life-course patterns in the research sample. The authors focus on two extremes, "cultural" and "liberal," in gender ideology, and two age cohorts: early Adulthood and middle adulthood. While they found distinct patterns in shopping behavior by age, the authors found little correlation with gender ideologies as defined. Further work with a more nuanced understanding of gender ideology may confirm their original idea that a range in self-concepts of appropriate gender behavior influence tourist behaviors and consumption.

Determining if host perceptions of tourism development vary by gender is the focus of the study by Harvey, Hunt, and Harris in rural Idaho, USA. As the authors note, past research indicates in general that women and men do not benefit equally from tourism, yet the results of a factor analysis of their research showed no differences in gender perceptions. When gender research results present a null-set, it

is likely that a distinction can be made between the research questions and the overall situation. In this case, the authors note that items analyzed separately do show some differences by gender. Graham Dann (1992:176) in a study of tourist predispositions toward home visits in Barbados, found no discernible trend with respect to gender differences, although the anecdotal information from informant interviews is enriched by indications of respondents' sex. It is likely that in other dimensions of tourism, gender is a factor for the hosts or guests in these studies, while the cases in point clearly show that gender is a variable factor. In the Idaho study, the authors are continuing to develop qualitative measures to complement their qualitative methods to analyze gender perceptions.

The ramifications of gender ideologies and hierarchical relations within and between the host and guest societies from the practice of sex tourism has been well documented, especially in Asia (Hall 1994). Leheny adds to this literature by analyzing a particular case, a drop in the demand side from Japanese society for the supply of Thai sex tourism. He argues that changes in Japan's gender ideology and practices promoting greater women's rights and voice have resulted in marketing and investment shifts to meet the preferences of Japanese tourists. Japanese women tourists have become an important consumer force who tend to avoid Japanese male sex tourism destinations. While Japanese women vary their touristic experiences from domestic weaving (Creighton) to international pursuit of the male Other (Kelsey 1994), depending in part on their life course, it is clear that the tourism industry responds to their consumer power. Japanese women consumers may also factor into the structural position and occupation choices of some Thai women, affecting the tremendous gender inequality of power fueling prostitution trade.

The sex trade is just one aspect of tourism development in Turkish Cyprus analyzed by Scott. She builds from theoretical ideas about culture, boundaries, and women's bodies as boundary markers to explain how constructions of gender and sexuality act as boundary maintenance in a contested region. Foreign Russian and Rumanian women who migrate to engage in tourism work are impacted by local Cypriot gender ideologies at the workplace and in their living arrangements. These "Natashas" who may or may not be prostitutes, function both as members of the workforce in a gender and ethnically stratified division of labor, and also are symbols of the "outsider." Local women tourism workers as "insiders," at the margins, have distinct culturally appropriate jobs. De Kadt (1976:29) noted that before partition, national identity was an issue in Cypriot tourism employment. Legislation mandated that only local staff should be employed. Now in a different time, gender is an active dimension in tourism defining Cypriot identity.

In the British Virgin Islands, Cohen analyzes the dynamics of gender in the representation of nation for both international tourist and local citizen consumption in this British dependent territory. Marketing for closely controlled cruise tourism draws on strong globalizing themes in masculine terms of nature, difference, and sexual desire signed by the remarkable name "Virgin." From the internal dynamics

of local gender relations, images of the British Virgin Islands as nation are generated for the homeland. Contrasting these two sets of images presented in various media, Cohen portrays a configuration of gendered material and practices in tourism promotion and in national projects (Edensor and Kothari 1994) producing a masculinized vision of possession.

Nearby in the Caribbean, gender is grounded in the "romance tourism" frame in Jamaica by Pruitt and LaFont. Ethnic/racial stereotypes, of "Rasta man" and Euro-American women played out in sexual relationships beyond a one-time encounter. Rather than analyzing this "Rent-a-Dread" commodification of Rasta culture as male prostitution (Momsen 1994), the authors contend that romantic meanings to the actors themselves in these relationships create a distinct phenomenon. Domestic gender relations and ideologies in Jamaica contrast with Euro-American ideals, but similarities are also evident. Euro-American tourist and Jamaican woman may both hold economic power in their relationships with Jamaican men, but these men assert control from their gender repertoire of masculinity for two distinct sets of expectations: at home in their local community where they should pay their own way, and with their exotic lovers from abroad who will provide for their local companion. Economic support is a paramount uni-directional factor here, while it is a much more fluid factor in the following study of tourist romancing.

Gender shapes tourism experience in Meisch's lively account of trysts or romantic liaisons between touring Otavaleños and Gringas, fuled by the tropes or stereotypes of the Native American and Euro-American Other. It is not a simple equation of women travelers having temporary local affairs in Ecuador, but rather a complex postmodern dynamic of traveling Indigenous men from Otavalo and Euro-American women forming relationships across each other's boundaries. The gender ideologies and role expectations these men and women bring from their own communities to their relationships at times complement and confound one another. Meisch argues that this is neither an expression of patriarchy nor the First World domination of Third or Fourth World people. It is the brave new world of cross-gender-culture intimate tourism relations.

Finally, in a piece well suited for a coda, Creighton looks at a specific case of Japanese domestic tourism that illuminates many dimensions of the Japanese construction of gender. In a seamless presentation of the motivations and experiences of women participants in residential weaving vacations, Creighton gives us a gender analysis of a "women's" activity, delving into issues of leisure time, appropriate experience, and agency. This is decidedly not "women only" scholarship, but a contextualized reading of how gender ideology and relations shape this type of tourism. It is highly instructive for readers interested in Japan's gender system, as well Japan's tourism industry. By eliciting the participants' own interpretations of their involvement, Creighton substantiates her argument that these women's activities are a form of agency enacted against hegemonic gender constructions, metaphorically liberating the Crane Wife of Japanese legend.

CONCLUSIONS

In summary this Special Issue is part of a process that is incorporating gender analysis into mainstream tourism research. As such it leaves many questions unaddressed and many issues unanswered. The articles and related research notes in this Issue explore a number of research agendas. They specifically add to the literature on gender in tourism development; a focus on gendered leisure; and on the sexuality dimension of gender relations in tourism transactions. In accord with the ideas expressed in the introduction, the study of gender is a project open to anyone. It is both a scholastic and political endeavor. There are inequalities in tourism development, and one of the avenues to understanding the dynamics and promoting change toward equality is through the study of gender relations. There is also rich diversity in tourism experience, and one dimension to acknowledge is gender in behaviors, perspectives, knowledge, and tastes, useful in tourism planning from marketing strategies to environmental impacts. Gender, as ideology and as relationships between the sexes, is a primary factor in human interactions, and is thus an important aspect of future tourism social science. □□

REFERENCES

Bartije, Rene, and S. Bouteille
1992 La Femme, Les Loisirs et le Tourisme: Essai Bibliographique. Tome 1, Essai No. 493. Aix en Provence: Centre de Hautes Etudes Touristiques.

Butler, Judith
1990 Gender Trouble: Feminism and Subversion of Identity. London: Routledge.

Castaneda, Quetzil
1991 An Archaeology of Chichén Itza: Discourse, Power and Resistance in a Maya Tourist Site. Ph.D. dissertation in Anthropology, State University of New York at Albany, USA.

Cohen, Erik
1988 Authenticity and Commoditization in Tourism. Annals of Tourism Research 15:371-386.

Connell, Robert
1987 Gender and Power: Society, the Person and Sexual Politics. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Crick, Malcolm
1989 Representations of International Tourism in the Social Sciences: Sun, Sex, Sights, Savings, and Servility. Annual Review of Anthropology 18:307-344.

Dann, Graham
1992 Predisposition Toward Alternative Forms of Tourism Among Tourists Visiting Barbados: Some Preliminary Observations. *In* Tourist Alternatives: Potentials and Problems in the Development of Tourism. Valene Smith and William Eadington, eds. pp. 158-179. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

de Kadt, Emanuel
1976 Tourism: Passport to Development? Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Edensor, Tim and Uma Kothari
1994 The Masculinisation of Sterling's Heritage. *In* Tourism: A Gender Analysis. Vivian Kinnaird and Derek Hall, eds., pp. 164-187. Chichester: Wiley.

Eisenstein, Hester
1983 Contemporary Feminist Thought. Boston: G.K. Hall.

Elson, Diane, ed.
1991 Male Bias in the Development Process. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Enloe, Cynthia
1989 Bananas, Beaches and Bases: Making Feminist Sense of International Politics. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Game, Ann
1991 Undoing the Social: Towards a Deconstructive Sociology. Buckingham: Open University Press.
Graburn, Nelson H. H.
1989 Tourism, the Sacred Journey. *In* Hosts and Guests: The Anthropology of Tourism, 2nd. ed. Valene Smith, ed., pp. 21-36. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
Graburn, Nelson H. H., and Jafar Jafari
1991 Introduction: Tourism Social Science. Annals of Tourism Research 18:1-11.
Hall, C. Michael
1994 Gender and Economic Interest in Tourism Prostitution: The Nature, Development and Implications of Sex Tourism in South-east Asia. *In* Tourism: A Gender Analysis. Vivian Kinnaird and Derek Hall, eds., pp. 142-163. Chichester: Wiley.
Harrison, David
1992 Tourism and the Less Developed Countries. London: Belhaven.
Haywood, Michael, and Jim Pickworth
1993 Canada. In Human Resources Issues in International Tourism, Tom Baum, ed., pp. 125-146. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.
Henderson, Karla
1994a Broadening an Understanding of Women, Gender, and Leisure. Journal of Leisure Research 26:1-7.
1994b Perspectives on Analyzing Gender, Women, and Leisure. Journal of Leisure Research 26:119-137.
Ireland, Michael
1993 Gender and Class Relations in Tourism Employment. Annals of Tourism Research 20:666-684.
Kelsey, Karen
1994 Intimate Ideologies: Transnational Theory and Japan's "Yellow Cabs." Public Culture 6:465-478.
Kinnaird, Vivian, and Derek Hall
1994 Conclusion: The Way Forward. *In* Tourism: A Gender Analysis. Vivian Kinnaird and Derek Hall, eds., pp. 210-216. Chichester: Wiley.
Kinnaird, Vivian, Uma Kothari, and Derek Hall
1994 Tourism: Gender Perspectives. *In* Tourism: A Gender Analysis. Vivian Kinnaird and Derek Hall, eds., pp. 1-34. Chichester: Wiley.
Krippendorf, Jost
1987 The Holiday Makers: Understanding the Impact of Leisure and Travel. Oxford: Heinemann.
Leotidou, Lila
1994 Gender Dimensions of Tourism in Greece: Employment, Sub-cultures, and Restructuring. *In* Tourism: A Gender Analysis. Vivian Kinnaird and Derek Hall, eds., pp. 74-104. Chichester: Wiley.
Levy, Diane, and Patricia Lerch
1991 Tourism as a Factor in Development: Implications for Gender and Work in Barbados. Gender & Society 5:67-85.
Löfgren, Orvar
1985 Wish You Were Here! Holiday Images and Picture Postcards. Ethnologica Scandinavia 1985: 90-107.
MacCannell, Dean
1989 The Tourist: A New Theory of the Leisured Class (2nd ed). New York: Schoken.
Momsen, Janet
1994 Tourism, Gender and Development in the Caribbean. *In* Tourism: A Gender Analysis. Vivian Kinnaird and Derek Hall, eds., pp. 106-120. Chichester: Wiley.
Monk, Janice, and C. Alexander
1986 Freeport Fallout: Gender, Employment and Migration on Margarita Island. Annals of Tourism Research 13:393-413.

Morgen, Sandra
1989 Gender and Anthropology: Introductory Essay. *In* Gender and Anthropology: Critical Reviews for Research and Teaching, Sandra Morgen, ed., pp. 1-20. Washington DC: American Anthropological Association.
Nicholson, Linda
1990 Introduction. *In* Feminism/Postmodernism. Linda Nicholson, ed. London: Routledge.
Richter, Linda
1993 Gender and Race: Neglected Variables in Tourism Research. *In* Gender in Tourism, Richard Butler and Douglas Pearce, eds., London: Routledge.
Rojek, Chris
1985 Capitalism and Leisure Theory. Andover: Tavistock.
1993 Ways of Escape: Modern Transformations in Leisure and Travel. London: Macmillan.
Shaw, Gareth and Allan Williams
1994 Critical Issues in Tourism. Oxford: Blackwell.
Smith, Valene, ed.
1976 Hosts and Guests: The Anthropology of Tourism. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
Smith, Valene
1979 Women: The Taste Makers in Tourism. Annals of Tourism Research 6:49-60.
1989 Introduction. *In* Hosts and Guests: The Anthropology of Tourism, (2nd ed). Valene Smith, ed., pp. 1-17. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
Smith, Stephen and Geoffrey Godlbey
1991 Leisure, Recreation, and Tourism. Annals of Tourism Research 18:85-100.
Swain, Margaret Byrne
1976 Cuna Women and Ethnic Tourism: A Way to Persist and an Avenue to Change. *In* Hosts and Guests: The Anthropology of Tourism, Valene Smith, ed., pp. 71-82. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
1989 Gender Roles in Indigenous Tourism: Kuna Mola, Kuna Yala and Cultural Survival. *In* Hosts and Guests: The Anthropology of Tourism (2nd ed.). Valene Smith, ed., pp. 83-104. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
1993 Women Producers of Ethnic Arts. Annals of Tourism Research 20:32-51.
Urry, John
1990 the Tourist Gaze: Leisure and Travel in Contemporary Societies. London: Sage.
van den Berghe, Pierre
1994 The Quest for the Other: Ethnic Tourism in San Cristóbal, Mexico. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
Veijola, Soile and Eeva Jokinen
1994 The Body in Tourism. Theory Culture and Society 11:125-151.