Article

Gaining Insight into Violence from Gender Stereotypes and Sexist Attitudes in the Context of Tourism

Gonzalo Díaz-Meneses [1,*], Neringa Vilkaitė-Vaitonė [2] and Miriam Estupiñan-Ojeda [1]

[1] Department of Economics and Business, University of Las Palmas de Gran Canaria,
    35017 Las Palmas de Gran Canaria, Spain; miriam.estupinan101@alu.ulpgc.es
[2] Department of Management, Vilnius Gediminas Technical University, 10223 Vilnius, Lithuania;
    neringa.vilkaite-vaitone@vgtu.lt
[*] Correspondence: gonzalo.diazmeneses@ulpgc.es

check for updates

Abstract: It is difficult to identify, but there is a type of harassment grounded in gender stereotyping in the context of tourism. It would be useful to discover the hidden relationships between gender harassment and certain beliefs about women as travellers, tourism professionals and sex objects in the field of hospitality. Methodologically, a survey was carried out reaching a sample of ±684 units by means of a convenience sampling procedure. The measuring instruments consisted of a structured questionnaire divided into two kinds of Likert beliefs scales comprising general statements and statements related to tourism. The survey respondent data were also gathered as regards sociodemographic characteristics. This paper presents empirical evidence to identify the causal factors of gender violence by considering general and particular stereotyping in tourism. Firstly, by performing three exploratory factor analyses, three female stereotyping dimensions were labelled in the field of tourism (occupational sexism, ambivalent sexist discrimination, and sex as a commodity), as well as three general prejudices about women (dysfunctional romantic relationships, ethically challenged presumptions, and aesthetical manners conventions) and the gender harassment factor. Secondly, a linear regression analysis was carried out to demonstrate that both general stereotyping related to a broader "life" framework and sectorial prejudices in tourism cause gender harassment. Finally, this research proves that general stereotyping determines sectorial prejudices in the field of tourism. The practical implications could be to enhance gender equality and combat gender harassment by revealing unintentional and unobserved prejudices that occur in a general life setting and in the tourism sphere against women as neglected professionals, under the subtle and ambivalent condition of travellers, and even as objects of consumption.

Keywords: gender; tourism; harassment; belief; segmentation

1. Introduction

Individual gender prejudice is not as ostensible as the inhumanity of its wider injustices, but it encompasses multiple facets. Consequently, much of the research has not explored how these underlying predispositions towards gender harassment relate to the most visible expression of behavioural prejudice—that is, gender violence.

On the one hand, as gender prejudice against women is considered unacceptable by society, it remains hidden. Although the legitimacy of the stereotyping of women is contested by the most advanced and educated societies, we hold these sorts of beliefs tacitly, and so they remain unnoticed. For this reason, they are considered innocuous, which is why potential research has neglected them.

On the other hand, there are many forms of gender prejudice. Multiple reactions are adopted in different fields of development that depend on personal circumstances. Therefore, research into forms of gender denial hidden behind gender stereotypes is research [1].

This diversity generates a complexity that was examined in depth, but without indicating how this variety manifests diverse expressions in different sectors—such as tourism—that not only relate to common components, but also lead to physical violence [2]. In this vein, tourism represents a particular environment in which we should increase the studies of gender [2–4], since we need to gain further insight into the particularly detrimental experiences of women [1]. There is a lack of research into the role of women in the workplace in the tourism sector [5], with special reference to how women are discriminated against [6], as well as the embodied sexualisation of the female tourist experience [7,8]. Gender equality is unsolved in tourism [9].

Without any doubt, the interconnection between general and gender stereotyping in tourism is relevant to understanding the underlying connections of prejudices in different contexts, as well as potentially helping to explain violence against women. Although needed to reveal the hidden meanings and the silent and invisible power relations associated with different contexts [1,10], the study of gender stereotyping and its relationship with violent behaviour is under-researched [11].

On this basis, this paper sets out three research objectives. Firstly, to pin down and classify gender stereotyping by assuming that there exist at least two distinctive categories—namely, general life settings and the tourism sector. Secondly, to deduce and measure how general gender stereotyping influences particular gender stereotyping in tourism. Thirdly, to gain a better understanding of how gender violence responses are rooted in general and sectorial prejudices and stereotyping.

With these aims in mind, the current paper is divided into four sections. In the review of the literature, we explain general and sectorial prejudices and how they play a significant role in inducing gender violence, and put forward three hypotheses. The methodological part describes the survey and the measuring instruments. The analysis of the results clarifies the obtained empirical evidence and contrasts the hypotheses. The conclusions section discusses the significance of the main contributions, provides several practical implications, highlights new lines of research, and acknowledges the paper's limitations.

2. Review of the Literature

As a topic matures, there is a corresponding growth in the knowledge base, and it is common for new terms to appear that shed light on the research. Thus, as a starting point, and in order to provide a better understanding, it is necessary to carry out an initial and preliminary conceptualisation of the basic concepts of gender. To do this, we first use the approach to gender that Swain [12] used in the mid-1990s for tourism studies. She says that gender is used to refer to a set of identities that have been constructed in terms of the culture expressed under ideologies of masculinity and femininity, which socially interact under the terms of pleasure, work, power, and sexuality [12].

This gendered approach—a key to understanding the relations between men and women—facilitates the theoretical visibility of gender harassment, sexism, gender-based violence, stereotypes, and prejudices (see Table 1).

Despite how similar the previous topics may seem, they differ slightly in their aspects, resulting in big differences as far as behaviours are concerned. We refer to gender harassment and sexism. The first one means any repeated behaviour that is manifested against one's dignity in order to create an environment of hostility, while sexism is based on the simple belief that one sex is better than another. Accordingly, sexism is determined by attitudes that promote the differentiated treatment of people based on their sex. Thus, sexist attitudes are expressed much more frequently towards women, considered inferior on many occasions [13].

In addition, we define different stereotypes and prejudices. Gender stereotypes involve commonly accepted ideas or opinions—positive or negative—that are used to explain the behaviour of men and women. Thus, they provide general information on the characteristics that define each gender.

Otherwise, gender prejudices are unfair evaluations, usually negative towards another gender, that are given individually, by someone who has not had a real or direct experience. Even though they are different, in many cases stereotypes greatly influence and provide a justification for prejudiced attitudes [14].

Table 1. Gender concepts.

Concept	Definition
Gender harassment	Any form of bad behaviour (verbal and non-verbal conducts) that conveys intimidating and discriminating attitudes about any person or group of people based on their gender.
Gender prejudice	Negative attitudes that are taken without prior knowledge aimed at a particular gender.
Gender stereotypes	Oversimplified beliefs or preconceptions about how women and men are like or how they should be and act simply because they are male or female.
Gender-based violence	Any kind of physical or psychological violence directed towards others based on their sexual orientation or gender identity.
Sexism	Behavioural traits associated with discriminatory attitudes aimed at other people based on their sex.

Gender stereotypes are varied and combine beliefs that refer to a group as though its members were not individuals with specific values dissociated from their sex [15,16]. Stereotyping represents a problem insofar as it attributes inherently inferior qualities to a person when she, or he, is female or male, respectively. It also creates unfavourable vertical and horizontal segregations, such as that between tourist and professional, chiefly against women [6,17]. Women are vertically segregated as explained by the glass ceiling theory, since they are often denied a promotion [18,19], making it difficult for them to advance within organisations [20]. Similarly, women are horizontally discriminated against insofar as they are ostracised from certain occupations and tasks, as elucidated by the power relationship and subordination theories [19]. Needless to say that this unfavourable gender discrimination also occurs in the tourism industry [9]. Therefore, every so often, gender stereotyping comes down to gender prejudice against women.

Not only does general stereotyping have much in common with gender stereotyping in tourism, but general gender prejudices are also predictors of gender prejudices in tourism [19,21–23]. This leads to an added complexity, seeing that general gender stereotyping against women is related to, but distinct from, gender stereotyping against women in tourism [6,24–26]. Therefore, a better understanding of general gender prejudices can assist in understanding prejudice in the field of tourism [19,22,23]. In this vein, gender prejudices against women in general are sources of prejudice against women in tourism [6]. We tend to assume, for example, that men are brave, rational, egocentric, daring, dominant, and good, whereas women are thought of as sensitive, intuitive, fussy, whiny, "naggy", and artistic [16]. Beliefs in those general prejudices argue that women, tending towards being more emotional, are inferior, thus providing a justification for underrating the value of women as professionals [19,27]. Similarly, it is believed that women are more ethically challenged, and so one finds ground for controlling them [28,29]. For example, as one thing leads to another, women deserve less trust when they are ready to take on responsibilities as hospitality managers, pilots, and drivers [19,23,30,31]. Instead, there is a tendency for women to hold positions in very specific areas of tourism companies, such as human skills and resources, marketing, housekeeping etc. [31–33]. Even though there are women in executive roles in tourism organisations, this trend is usually predominant in micro-sized companies [34]. Equally, it is assumed that women are less gifted with technology and machinery, as well as being physically less capable, and, consequently, can hardly be trusted to repair, for example, a broken-down boiler in a hotel [35–38]. Such stereotypes, due to their deep unconscious inveteracy, have for a long time been accepted as a non-questionable norm [31]. On this basis, we assert that general stereotyping sustains

particular prejudices and generates discrimination that fuels hidden discourses in the tourism sector. Thus, we put forward the first hypothesis as follows:

Hypothesis 1 (H1). *general gender stereotypes influence gender stereotypes referring to tourism professionals.*

Hypothesis 2 (H2). *general gender stereotypes influence gender stereotypes referring to travellers.*

Although gender prejudice is not synonymous with gender harassment, the latter is based on the former [39,40]. Gender prejudice is more than a stereotype; more than an injustice. Gender prejudice might be masked violence and could even turn to murder in the most extreme cases [41,42]. Funny thoughts and ironical comments in which femininity and work are related are viewed as inoffensive, when in reality they are triggering gender harassment and effective violence [34].

Tourism turns others into an object of consumption and projects particular views of gender onto people and places [10]. Nonetheless, since freedom, justice, and happiness are values in and of themselves for human beings, the marketisation of women and men becomes problematic [43]. When there is an appraisal of people as if they were objects of consumption, it functions as a disregard for human nature and basic human rights [44,45]. In the domain of prostitution, the distinction between instrumental and end values is dehumanised, since the woman's body is used as a commodity to de traded [34]. Offering sex as an appealing channel of experiences is evidence of the poor performance of that destination [46–49], because it is not sustainable and exposes the whole tourism structure to illegal threats [50,51].

What is more, compared to masculinity, femininity is more frequently abused due to the different sexual responses inherently associated with being a man or a woman [43]. For example, female hotel receptionists are frequently the targets of sexual objectification [34]. When the existence of women's values is denied, ridiculed, and disregarded, women are harmed [1]. If femininity is under a dominion where masculine models, stereotypes, and symbols are prioritised, women are reduced and maltreated [1]. The relationship between sex and violence has been amply demonstrated, although prejudices and discrimination do not always lead to physical violence [34]. Consequently, we put forward the second hypothesis as follows:

Hypothesis 3 (H3). *general gender stereotypes cause gender harassment.*

Why must gender stereotypes in the field of tourism be gentler than in other life settings? If general prejudices drive violence, it is reasonable to expect that particular prejudices within the tourism sector can provide a vehicle for performing violence [34,52]. There are many forms of violence. Violence can be psychological and implicit, as in the case of blackmail, artificial victimisation, and subtle negative reinforcements within a couple during a holiday and between colleagues at a company [34]. Equally, there is a sexualisation of the tourism space. There are individuals whose schedule and placement makes them highly visible, which can be a vulnerability for women, as it often leads to unseen harassment. They are gazed at as a desirable object, transferring their sexuality to a public space, which can often make them feel uncomfortable [8]. The bodies of female tourists are represented as symbols of sexual liberation and can be seen by some as attractions, denigrating both the repressed, local women and foreign, commoditised women [53].

Nevertheless, violence can also be manifested verbally, for example, if one person menaces another, throws insults and is disdainful in personal or professional settings. Similarly, in the field of tourism, gender harassment can appear within personal relationships during a trip [54], as well as at work, and high-risk conditions can provide the setting for broadly accepted expressions of violence in the professional sphere [2]. In the workplace, gender harassment can be found in certain verbal attacks and in physical aggression, as well as in the atmosphere, if it is intimidating and negative. To be specific, gender harassment includes comments about physical appearance, indecent observations, sexual demands, and humiliation [2].

In addition to the existence of a wide range of types of violence, there can be a strong association between gender stereotyping and violence if women feel more restrained, embarrassed, fearful, and guilty than men in the professional context [55,56]. The first feminist studies centred on analysing the constraints to the leisure of women [57]. Not only do prejudiced beliefs build up the glass ceiling in the professional sphere and fertilise unfair power relations in personal settings, depending on whether one is a man or a woman, but they also perpetuate subordinate conditions for women [5,19]. Taking into account all of this, we put forward the third hypothesis as follows:

Hypothesis 4 (H4). *gender stereotypes referring to tourism professionals cause gender harassment.*

Hypothesis 5 (H5). *gender stereotypes referring to travellers cause gender harassment.*

3. Materials and Methods

This research encompasses a survey and was carried out between March and September 2016 in Gran Canaria. It employed a structured questionnaire to gather information about general stereotyping related to gender, gender stereotypes in tourism, and gender harassment. The universe was made up of individuals who were in Gran Canaria when the survey took place. All of them had to have had travel experience within the last five years and were 18 years old or older. The respondents were contacted randomly by following non-probabilistic sampling procedures—more specifically, convenience and snowball sampling procedures. So, the respondents were contacted in a wide variety of places: at home, at work, and during leisure time. We understood travellers to be individuals who had travelled to any other place other than Gran Canaria, regardless of their profession. However, to guarantee the proportionality of the general characteristics of the universe, we considered sex, age, and education. Therefore, it would seem logical to think that the number of tourism professionals that were contacted must be similar—or slightly higher, given the sector in question and the survey takers' characteristics—to the general population profile. The survey was administered by students of a market research course, who explained to those surveyed that their anonymity was guaranteed and that there were neither correct nor incorrect responses if the answers were honest. The final sample comprised 684 units, after eliminating 30 cases for various reasons (see Table 2).

The questionnaire comprised three questions in Spanish, English, and French. The scales measuring *general stereotyping of gender, gender stereotypes in tourism,* and *gender harassment* were 7-point Likert scales. Obviously, there were also questions about sociodemographic characteristics such as sex, age, education, job, nationality, and religion. We used SPSS version 25 to perform the statistical analysis.

Table 2. Sample profile.

Sex		Age		Education	
Male	46.6%	18–24	31.7%	None	3.4%
Female	53.4%	25–34	30.7%	Primary	21.1%
		35–49	19.3%	Secondary	28.1%
		50–64	15.1%	Graduate	41.1%
		>65	3.2%	Postgraduate	6.3%
Job		**Nationality**		**Religion**	
Employee	27.9%	Spanish	96.5%	Agnostic	2.6%
Free lancer	58.9%	Foreign	3.5%	Atheism	34.8%
No occupation	13.2%			Christian	60%
				Others	2.6%

These scales were developed by carrying out a qualitative technique consisting of an in-depth interview with 10 individuals and two brainstorming groups, whose output was complemented by reviewing the literature on gender roles, gender prejudices, and gender harassment [58,59].

While the in-depth interviews were held in the main researcher's office and in the respondents' homes, the brainstorming groups took place in two different classrooms with the students and the respondents. The latter were not tourism professionals, but rather three students, five employees, and two non-working people who belonged to the main researcher's social circle. As the research objective was not simply to gain insight into the respondents' life and sentiments, but also to identify the context and expressions related to the macho values and beliefs that these interview respondents were aware of, we recruited participants whose projections did not make them feel personally embarrassed and who were diverse in terms of sex, age, and education. For the brainstorming groups, we explained the need to find out as many language expressions from professional settings and the wider context, wherein the average person manifests their hidden and explicit sexist stereotypes. Therefore, it was not their own sexism that mattered most, but rather the students' projections and experiences dealing with people in society. In this way, we were able to identify forty-four expressions whose contents enriched the final version of the questionnaire, in the form of twenty-five items.

4. Results

Before testing the hypotheses, we checked the reliability and validity of the scales through several Cronbach tests and exploratory factor analyses. The three scales showed acceptable values, and seven components were identified.

4.1. Preliminary Analyses

Three dimensions were extracted from the general stereotyping scale, after carrying out an exploratory factor analysis. The first factor is labelled "dysfunctional romantic relationships", since it assumes that intimate relationships between men and women are plagued by possessiveness, jealousy, and a desire to control. The second factor is named "ethically challenged presumption" because it upholds that women are less ethical and more manipulative than men. Finally, the third factor is called "aesthetical manners conventions", since it assumes certain prejudices about the greater importance of appearance and emotional expressions, as well as the greater necessity for women to watch their language (see Table 3).

Table 3. Exploratory factor analysis of the general stereotyping scale.

	Rotated Component Matrix			
Cnality	**Items**	**Components**		
		1	**2**	**3**
0.700	Jealousy is a good indicator of love	0.786	0.271	0.089
0.653	If my partner is jealous, I feel more appreciated	0.764	0.107	0.241
0.556	It's important to know at every moment what my partner is doing and where they are	0.696	0.235	0.128
0.485	It's normal for people in love to send more than 10 text messages or call their loved one more than 10 times	0.665	0.205	0.033
0.726	Generally, women are more devious than men	0.184	0.802	.220
0.664	Generally, women are more troublesome than men	0.150	0.781	0.177
0.630	Generally, men are nobler than women	0.322	0.706	0.168
0.610	Generally, men are more intelligent, but women are more manipulative	0.302	0.664	0.279
0.724	Generally, women should take more care of how they look than men	0.223	0.196	0.798
0.611	Generally, I think men shouldn't be more discreet when expressing their feelings than women	0.454	-0.007	0.636
0.542	Generally, I feel more disgusted hearing swearwords from women than from men	0.163	0.374	0.613
0.438	Generally, women have to be dressed better than men	−0.113	0.299	0.580

Cronbach: 0.851; KMO: 0.887; Bartlett: 2962.625, DoF: 66; sig: 0.000; Explained variance: 61.166.

As shown in Table 4, the exploratory factor analysis with *Varimax* rotation of the stereotyping in tourism scale identified three dimensions whose explained variance goes above 68%. The first factor is termed "occupational sexism discrimination", since it refers to the belief that women are less valuable than men in certain jobs related to tourism, such as pilots, bus drivers, and mechanics. The second factor is titled "ambivalent sexism", given that, according to some respondents, women can take advantage of their gender to get more advantages when they travel, e.g., when getting a taxi. Finally, the third factor is designated "sex commodity", since it makes reference to the monetary value of sex and beauty as female resources in different service contexts. It goes without saying that while the first factor refers to women as tourism professionals, the second and third factors concern women as travellers.

Table 4. Exploratory factor analysis of the stereotyping in tourism scale.

Rotated Component Matrix				
Cnality	Items	Components		
		1	2	3
0.803	I'd feel safer having a male pilot than a female	0.881	0.139	0.084
0.783	I'd rather have a male bus driver than a female	0.870	0.146	0.069
0.766	To repair vehicle breakdowns, men are better mechanics than women	0.849	0.183	0.108
0.539	As a tour guide, I prefer a woman to a man	0.659	0.233	0.225
0.660	When a female tourist gets lost, she receives more help than a male	0.204	0.786	0.025
0.609	The more beautiful a woman is, the easier it is for her to stop a taxi	0.173	0.754	0.105
0.576	There's no doubt that sex can be used to get some advantages when travelling to some places	0.130	0.741	0.102
0.788	I consider it logical that tickets for night clubs are more expensive for men than for women	0.141	−0.061	0.875
0.669	I consider it logical that, when going on a night out, the most attractive women get more invitations to drinks	0.145	0.357	0.721

Cronbach: 0.816; KMO: 0.824; Bartlett: 2190.556, DoF: 36; sig: 0.000; Explained variance: 68.816.

Table 5 shows that in the case of the scale for violence, one factor was obtained. This factor is labelled as "gender violence" because it includes not only manifestations of gender harassment such as insulting and vilifying, but also physical aggression in the context of gender.

Table 5. Exploratory factor analysis of the gender violence scale.

Rotated Component Matrix		
Cnality	Items	Component 1
0.696	Sometimes I give my partner a small slap, but it's no big deal	0.834
0.688	In extreme circumstances, I have discredited my partner	0.830
0.625	In extreme situations, I've used a small amount of violence when arguing with my partner	0.791
0.566	I have insulted and verbally abused my partner as a response to his/her attitude	0.753

Cronbach: 0.805; KMO: 0.765; Bartlett: 948.417, DoF: 6; sig: 0.000; Explained variance: 64.387.

4.2. Analyses to Contrast the Hypotheses

Before carrying out the linear regressions to empirically contrast the three hypotheses, we assessed the collinearity and autocorrelation. On the one hand, we assert that the independent variables of the models are free of collinearity, since they were obtained by a *Varimax* procedure, that their level of correlation is low, and that the t and determination coefficients show correct values, as well as the variance influence factor. On the other hand, it can be stated that the residuals are not auto-correlated, as the Durbin Watson tests show.

Thanks to a linear regression analysis, it has been possible to demonstrate that *general gender stereotypes* influence *gender stereotypes* in tourism (see Table 6). Firstly, the ethically challenged presumptions against women cause both *occupational sexism* and ambivalent *sexist discrimination*. Secondly, the *aesthetical manners conventions* determine all the stereotyping dimensions in tourism. Thirdly, *sex commodity* and occupational sexism *prejudices* in tourism are dependent on *dysfunctional romantic relationship* beliefs. On this basis, it can be stated that Hypotheses 1 and 2 are strongly supported.

Table 6. Multiple regression results and standardised coefficients to contrast Hypotheses 1 and 2.

Independent Variables (General Stereotyping)	Dependent Variables (Stereotyping in Tourism)								
	f1 Occupational Sexism			f2 Favourable Sexist Discrimination			f3 Sex Commodity		
	VIF	Beta	t-Value	VIF	Beta	t-Value	VIF	Beta	t-Value
f1 dysfunctional romantic relationship	1	0.139	4.300 ***	1	0.056	1.559	1	0.312	8.656 ***
f2 Ethically challenged presumption	1	0.379	11.682 ***	1	0.269	7.456 ***	1	0.049	1.371
f3 Aesthetical manners conventions	1	0.349	10.766 ***	1	0.194	5.364 ***	1	0.131	3.621 ***
R^2		0.285			0.113			0.117	
Adjusted R^2		0.282			0.109			0.113	
F change		90.291 ***			28.931 ***			29.975 ***	
D-W		1.643			1.919			1.834	
Maximum correlation		0.379 ***			0.269 ***			0.312 ***	

*** $p < 0.001$; sample size = 684.

Moreover, as the results of the linear regression show, *general gender stereotypes* cause gender harassment (see Table 7). To be more specific, it might be claimed that *sex commodity* and *occupational sexism* have a significant effect on gender violence. Furthermore, *ambivalent sexist discrimination* plays a significant role in triggering this non-desirable conduct. Thus, Hypothesis 3 is accepted.

Table 7. Multiple regression result and standardised coefficients to contrast hypothesis 3.

Independent Variables (General Stereotyping)	Dependent Variables (Gender Violence)		
	VIF	Beta	t-Value
f1 dysfunctional romantic relationship	1	0.481	16.047 ***
f2 ethically challenged presumption	1	0.358	11.946 ***
f3 aesthetical manners conventions	1	0.177	5.900 ***
R^2		0.390	
Adjusted R^2		0.387	
F change		145.011 ***	
D-W		1.622	
Maximum correlation		0.481 ***	

*** $p < 0.001$; sample size = 684.

Finally, the results of the linear regression also indicate that gender stereotypes in tourism cause gender harassment insofar as the prejudicial beliefs of *sex commodity* and *occupational sexism* significantly determine gender violence. In addition, to a minor extent, *ambivalent sexist discrimination* stimulates gender violence (see Table 8). Therefore, Hypotheses 4 and 5 are confirmed.

Table 8. Multiple regression result and standardised coefficients to contrast Hypotheses 4 and 5.

Independent Variables (Gender Stereotyping in Tourism)	Dependent Variables (Gender Violence)		
	VIF	Beta	t-Value
f1 occupational sexism	1	0.229	6.356 ***
f2 ambivalent sexist discrimination	1	0.108	2.985 **
f3 sex commodity	1	0.229	6.357 ***
R^2		0.117	
Adjusted R^2		0.113	
F change		29.908 ***	
D-W		1.411	
Maximum correlation		0.229 ***	

*** $p < 0.001$; ** $p < 0.01$; sample size = 684.

5. Discussion

Until now, harassment and violence against women have only been studied in the field of tourism from a sexual maltreatment approach, within studies on sexual demand and the impact of sexual tourism [3]. Nevertheless, this research shows that sexual issues are not the most relevant for explaining gender violence, but rather general prejudices and stereotyping in tourism. What is more, this research is centred on analysing explicit gender harassment behaviours instead of merely examining prejudices, stigmas, and other hidden gender responses [11]. Finally, beyond wide-ranging assertions, this research pushes the literature forward by indicating which specific prejudices and precise stereotypes in tourism are causing gender harassment.

On this basis, we can suggest important practical implications. Firstly, *ethically challenged presumptions*, *aesthetical manners conventions*, and *dysfunctional romantic relationships* should be spotted as the key gender responses to combat gender harassment. This is consistent with the literature, since there is authentic street harassment present in "catcalls" and "wolf-whistling" [60]. Similarly, the valuation of women by their appearance hides a sort of hostile sexism [37,61]. Likewise, there is a significant association between romantic jealousy and partner violence because these sentiments might be clinical, embody frustration, and imply anger [62]. Secondly, *sex commodity*, *occupational sexism*, and *ambivalent sexist discrimination* should be considered as the most dangerous stereotypes taking place in tourism when fighting gender harassment. This is supported by the literature on gender violence. To be specific, if women are objectified, they are dehumanised and degraded as a commodity and, hence, maltreatment is legitimised [61]. Equally, job segregation is an occupational hazard [63], and thus its unfairness is a form of harassment in itself. Finally, there is no doubt that *ambivalent sexism* leads to dependent relationships that inhibit social change [64] and represents a kind of subtle sexism that undermines the chance of a fairer society [65].

We learnt that there is vertical and horizontal gender discrimination against women in the tourism sector and that it is caused by prejudices, stereotypes, and unfair policies [19,66]. Moreover, we confirmed that gender stereotypes in tourism are deeply rooted in general stereotypes [9,58]. Considering this and moving forward, we have revealed the existing and specific connections between general gender prejudices and gender stereotypes in tourism. At this point, important practical implications can be deduced by pointing out that workplace-based sexism and sexist discrimination in tourism should be tackled by questioning all ethically challenged presumptions. Kruse and Prettyman [67] claim that society is still re-editing the wicked witch stories whose message questions the ethical leadership of many women. Similarly, *occupational sexism*, *ambivalent sexist discrimination*, and *sex commodity* stereotypes in tourism should be confronted by attacking *aesthetical manners conventions*. According to Uribe [61], when women are objectified, they are treated as nothing more than bodies under hostile sexism, the consequences of which drive the justification for occupational segregation, mistreatment, and maltreatment. Finally, *sex commodity* and *occupational sexism* stereotypes might be criticised by arguing against any *dysfunctional romantic relationship*, since not only are morbid romantic relationships insane and prescribe maladaptive forms of cohabiting and intimacy [68],

but romantic jealousy and partner violence are also linked [69]. Herold et al. [70] demonstrate that romance and sex tourism are more similar than they are different as categories, depending on the female and male profile of the tourists, respectively.

6. Conclusions

This research work demonstrates empirically that there exist hidden gender stereotypes in the field of tourism whose prejudices and inequalities not only denigrate women as travellers and professionals, but also give rise to gender violence. It is true, up to a point, that we already knew that general stereotyping and stereotyping in tourism were closely related as prejudices and misconceptions with the same root. Nevertheless, the genuine contribution of the current paper consists in highlighting that all the general misconceptions of women tend to be more destructive for women as tourism professionals than as travellers. Paradoxically, the more formal context of the professional sphere is the one that is more under attack. This may be because women have emerged more recently in this context. However, for this same reason, policymakers and the tourism industry should prioritise change.

Another contribution of this paper consists in pinning down the twofold origins of gender violence. On the one hand, gender violence can be traced back to general stereotyping insofar as some seemingly inoffensive comments work as a wolf in sheep's clothing. For example, aesthetical conventions such as the idea that women should take more care of how they look than men, that men should repress their feelings more than women, and that women have to be better dressed than men are producing real gender violence. On another hand, as this research work proves that dysfunctional romantic relationships are the main exogenous determinant of gender violence, it is advisable to bring into focus how people understand love and partnership. Finally, it is worth noting that conceiving of women as "sex commodity" travellers and shoddy tourism professionals by nature engenders the spectre of gender violence. No doubt, there are femininities in the field of tourism under gender-based harassment and violence [71,72]

This research shows several limitations. Firstly, as we prioritised anonymity and sincerity in a context of snowball sampling procedures, the exact job of the survey respondents was not identified, and, hence, we were not able to distinguish the exact proportion of tourism workers in the sample. Nonetheless, as the survey takers were successful in keeping the basic sociodemographic proportionality of the sampling units, we assume that there is not a significant bias due to an excess of tourism workers. Consistently, it makes sense that future lines of research should explicitly consider the prejudices, stereotypes, and misconceptions by distinguishing between mere travellers and tourism practitioners. Secondly, although this paper sheds light on violence from gender stereotypes and sexist attitudes in the context of tourism, it has not kept any longitudinal track on how this emerging and volatile subject matter is evolving in society. In other words, perhaps this research work attempted to gain insight into violence at a time when the reality was much worse than it is now. Therefore, we have no choice but to recommend that future researchers adopt a longitudinal approach in order to shed light on how this contentious issue has changed after so many social marketing campaigns having been launched in recent years.

Author Contributions: The three authors have contributed to the paper. Firstly, M.E.-O. has focused on reviewing the literature by defining the key concepts, discussing the obtained results with her colleagues, and editing the whole paper. Secondly, N.V.-V. has reviewed the literature, drawn the conclusions and enriched the discussion after fruitful meetings with the other authors. Finally, G.D.-M. has taken part in the whole process by devising the project, carrying out the survey, reviewing the literature, analysing the results, and thoroughly discussing with his co-authors the obtained evidence and conclusions. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

References

1.　Broadbridge, A.; Simpson, R. 25 years on: Reflecting on the past and looking to the future in gender and management research. *Br. J. Manag.* **2011**, *22*, 470–483. [CrossRef]

2.　Ineson, E.M.; Yap, M.H.; Whiting, G. Sexual discrimination and harassment in the hospitality industry. *Int. J. Hosp. Manag.* **2013**, *35*, 1–9. [CrossRef]

3.　Figueroa-Domecq, C.; Pritchard, A.; Segovia-Pérez, M.; Morgan, N.; Villacé-Molinero, T. Tourism gender research: A critical accounting. *Ann. Tour. Res.* **2015**, *52*, 87–103. [CrossRef]

4.　Mooney, S.K.; Harris, C.; Ryan, I. Long hospitality careers–a contradiction in terms? *Int. J. Contemp. Hosp. Manag.* **2016**, *28*, 2589–2608. [CrossRef]

5.　White, A.; Jones, E.; James, D. There's a nasty smell in the kitchen! Gender and power in the tourism workplace in Wales. *Tour. Cult. Commun.* **2005**, *6*, 37–49. [CrossRef]

6.　Cave, P.; Kilic, S. The role of women in tourism employment with special reference to Antalya, Turkey. *J. Hosp. Mark. Manag.* **2010**, *19*, 280–292. [CrossRef]

7.　Hall, D.; Swain, M.B.; Kinnaird, V. Tourism and gender: An evolving agenda. *Tour. Recreat Res.* **2003**, *28*, 7–11. [CrossRef]

8.　Jordan, F.; Aitchison, C. Tourism and the sexualisation of the gaze: Solo female tourists' experiences of gendered power, surveillance and embodiment. *Leis. Stud.* **2008**, *27*, 329–349. [CrossRef]

9.　Kogovsek, M.; Kogovsek, M. Hospitality and tourism gender issues remain unsolved: A call for research. *Quaestus* **2015**, *6*, 194.

10.　Aitchison, C. Theorizing other discourses of tourism, gender and culture: Can the subaltern speak (in tourism)? *Tour. Stud.* **2001**, *1*, 133–147. [CrossRef]

11.　Fiske, S.T. Stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination at the seam between the centuries: Evolution, culture, mind, and brain. *Eur. J. Soc. Work* **2000**, *30*, 299–322. [CrossRef]

12.　Swain, M.B. Gender in tourism. *Ann. Tour. Res.* **1995**, *22*, 247–266. [CrossRef]

13.　Moya, M. Sexist Attitudes and New Forms of Sexism. In *Psychology and Gender*; Barberá, E., Martínez, I., Eds.; Pearson: Madrid, Spain, 2004; pp. 271–294. ISBN 84-205-3725-X.

14.　Crandall, C.S.; Bahns, A.J.; Warner, R.; Schaller, M. Stereotypes as justifications of prejudice. *Personal. Soc. Physchol. Bull.* **2011**, *37*, 1488–1498. [CrossRef] [PubMed]

15.　Nelson, T.D. *Handbook of Prejudice, Stereotyping, and Discrimination*; Psychology Press: New York, NY, USA, 2009; ISBN 0-203-49199-8.

16.　García-Retamero, R.; Müller, S.M.; López-Zafra, E. The malleability of gender stereotypes: Influence of population size on perceptions of men and women in the past, present, and future. *J. Soc. Psychol.* **2011**, *151*, 635–656. [CrossRef]

17.　Mooney, S.K. Holding out for a hero: Female management role models in hotels. In Proceedings of the 22nd Anzam Conference, University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand, 2–5 December 2008; AUT University Auckland, School of Hospitality and Tourism: Auckland, New Zealand, 2008.

18.　Mooney, S.K.; Ryan, I. A woman's place in hotel management: Upstairs or downstairs? *Gend. Manag.* **2009**, *24*, 196–210. [CrossRef]

19.　Carvalho, I.; Costa, C.; Lykke, N.; Torres, A. Beyond the glass ceiling: Gendering tourism management. *Ann. Tour. Res.* **2019**, *75*, 79–91. [CrossRef]

20.　Mooney, S.K. Gender research in hospitality and tourism management: Time to change the guard. *Int. J. Contemp. Hosp. Manag.* **2020**, *32*, 1861–1879. [CrossRef]

21.　Weber, A.; Zulehner, C. Competition and gender prejudice: Are discriminatory employers doomed to fail? *J. Eur. Econ. Assoc.* **2014**, *12*, 492–521. [CrossRef]

22.　Dilay, F.; Hasan, B.; Tugba, U.; Burcu, S.; Yildiz, G. The effects of discrimination against women in places of business: A report on the tourism industry. *Rev. Bus.* **2016**, *37*, 56–71.

23.　Carvalho, I.; Costa, C.; Lykke, N.; Torres, A. Agency, structures and women managers' views of their careers in tourism. *Womens Stud. Int. Forum* **2018**, *71*, 1–11. [CrossRef]

24.　Sirakaya, E.; Sonmez, S. Gender images in-state tourism brochures: An overlooked area in socially responsible tourism marketing. *J. Travel Res.* **2000**, *38*, 353–362. [CrossRef]

25.　Chhabra, D.; Andrereck, K.; Yamanoi, K.; Plunkett, D. Gender equity and social marketing: An analysis of tourism advertisements. *J. Travel Tour. Mark.* **2011**, *28*, 111–128. [CrossRef]

26. Richards, T.N.; Reid, J.A. Gender stereotyping and sex trafficking: A comparative review of research on male and female sex tourism. *Howard J. Crime Justice* **2015**, *38*, 414–433. [CrossRef]

27. Rydzik, A.; Pritchard, A.; Morgan, N.; Sedgley, D. Humanising migrant women's work. *Ann. Tour. Res.* **2017**, *64*, 13–23. [CrossRef]

28. Mama, A. The challenges of feminism: Gender, ethics and responsible academic freedom in African universities. *J. Higher Ed. Afr.* **2011**, *9*, 1–23.

29. Peris-Ortiz, M.; Rueda-Armengot, C.; Osorio, D.B. Women in business: Entrepreneurship, ethics and efficiency. *Int. Entrep. Manag. J.* **2012**, *8*, 343–354. [CrossRef]

30. Jucan, M.S.; Jucan, C.N. Gender trends in a tourism destination. *Procedia Soc. Behav. Sci.* **2013**, *92*, 437–444.

31. Segovia-Perez, M.; Figueroa-Domecq, C.; Fuentes-Moraleda, L.; Munoz-Mazon, A. Incorporating a gender approach in the hospitality industry: Female executives' perceptions. *Int. J. Hosp. Manag.* **2019**, *76*, 184–193. [CrossRef]

32. Mooney, S.K. Jobs for the Girls? Women's Employment and Career Progression in the Hospitality Industry. In *Handbook of Human Resource Managament in the Tourism Hospitality Industries*; Burke, R., Christensen Hughes, J.M., Eds.; Edward Elgar Publishing: London, UK; New York, NY, USA, 2018; pp. 23–43, ISBN 9781786431363.

33. Mohanty, P.; Swain, S.; Besra, S. Women at work: Exploring the issues and challenges of women employees in travel and tourism. *Indian J. Econ. Dev.* **2018**, *6*, 1–5.

34. Morgan, N.; Pritchard, A. Gender matters in hospitality (invited paper for 'luminaries' special issue of International Journal of Hospitality Management). *Int. J. Hosp. Manag.* **2019**, *76*, 38–44. [CrossRef]

35. Wang, M.; Degol, J.L. Gender gap in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM): Current knowledge, implications for practice, policy, and future directions. *Educ. Psychol. Rev.* **2017**, *29*, 119–140. [CrossRef] [PubMed]

36. He, J.; Freeman, L.A. Are men more technology-oriented than women? The role of gender on the development of general computer self-efficacy of college students. *J. Inf. Syst. Educ.* **2019**, *21*, 203–212.

37. Rydzik, A.; Ellis-Vowles, V. 'Don't use "the weak Word": Women brewers, identities and gendered territories of embodied work. *Work Employ. Soc.* **2019**, *33*, 483–499. [CrossRef]

38. Yishay, A.B.; Jones, M.; Kondylis, F.; Mobarak, A.M. Gender gaps in technology diffusion. *J. Dev. Econ.* **2020**, *143*, 102380. [CrossRef]

39. Bucchianeri, M.M.; Gower, A.L.; McMorris, B.J.; Eisenberg, M.E. Youth experiences with multiple types of prejudice-based harassment. *J. Adolesc.* **2016**, *51*, 68–75. [CrossRef]

40. Eisenberg, M.E.; Gower, A.L.; McMorris, B.J.; Rider, G.N.; Coleman, E. Emotional distress, bullying victimization, and protective factors among transgender and gender diverse adolescents in city, suburban, town, and rural locations. *J. Rural Health* **2019**, *35*, 270–281. [CrossRef]

41. Evzonas, N. Jealousy as a driving force for murder. *Psychoanal. Rev.* **2018**, *105*, 257–277. [CrossRef]

42. Riley, J. Depictions of murder in Maine: The dominant ideology thesis. *Deviant Behav.* **2019**, *40*, 417–434. [CrossRef]

43. Pritchard, A.; Morgan, N.J. Privileging the male gaze. Gendered tourism landscapes. *Ann. Tour. Res.* **2000**, *27*, 884–905. [CrossRef]

44. Chiweshe, M.K. Wives at the market place: Commercialisation of Lobola and commodification of women's bodies in Zimbabwe. *Orient. Anthropol.* **2019**, *16*, 229–243. [CrossRef]

45. Akena, F.A. The "Miss Curvy Uganda" pageant: Representation, commodification and exploitation of women's bodies. *Soc. Semiot.* **2020**, 1–16. [CrossRef]

46. Prideaux, B.; Agrusa, J.; Donlon, J.G.; Curran, C. Exotic or erotic—Contrasting images for defining destinations. *Asia Pac. J. Tour. Res.* **2004**, *9*, 5–17. [CrossRef]

47. Avraham, E.; Ketter, E. Destination marketing during and following crises: Combating negative images in Asia. *J. Travel Tour. Mark.* **2017**, *34*, 709–718. [CrossRef]

48. Sroypetch, S.; Caldicott, R.W.; Carr, N. Visitor and non-visitor images of Thailand as a backpacking destination: An Australian perspective. *Int. J. Cult. Tour. Hosp. Res.* **2018**, *29*, 278–281. [CrossRef]

49. Sroypetch, S.; Neil, C. Backpacker perceptions of Thailand's image: Positives, problems and potential opportunities. *E Rev. Tour Res.* **2018**, *15*, 503–511.

50. Fardin, M.; Milani, A.; Rasekh, M.M.; Beiranvand, M. Sexual crimes against immature people with an emphasis on sex trafficking, sex tourism, pornography and sexual slavery. *Publicando* **2018**, *5*, 429–450.

51. Nandi, A. Profile of Cuban women involved in sex tourism—A financial perspective. *Lib. J.* **2018**, *5*, 1–20. [CrossRef]

52. Devine, J.; Ojeda, D. Violence and dispossession in tourism development: A critical geographical approach. *J. Sustain. Tour.* **2017**, *25*, 605–617. [CrossRef]

53. Sampaio, S. Tourism, gender and consumer culture in late-and post-authoritarian Portugal. *Tour. Stud.* **2017**, *17*, 200–217. [CrossRef]

54. Calafat, A.; Hughes, K.; Blay, N.; Bellis, M.A.; Mendes, F.; Juan, M.; Lazarov, P.; Cibin, B.; Duch, M.A. Sexual harassment among young tourists visiting Mediterranean resorts. *Arch. Sex. Behav.* **2013**, *42*, 603–613. [CrossRef]

55. Phillips, J.P. Workplace violence against health care workers in the United States. *N. Engl. J. Med.* **2016**, *374*, 1661–1669. [CrossRef] [PubMed]

56. Jafree, S.R. Workplace violence against women nurses working in two public sector hospitals of Lahore, Pakistan. *Nurs. Outlook* **2017**, *65*, 420–427. [CrossRef] [PubMed]

57. Aitchison, C. Feminist and gender perspectives in tourism studies: The social-cultural nexus of critical and cultural theories. *Tour. Stud.* **2005**, *5*, 207–224. [CrossRef]

58. Cejka, M.A.; Eagly, A.H. Gender-stereotypic images of occupations correspond to the sex segregation of employment. *Personal. Soc. Psychol. Bull.* **1999**, *25*, 413–423. [CrossRef]

59. Raver, J.L.; Nishii, L.H. Once, twice, or three times as harmful? *Ethnic harassment, gender harassment, and generalized workplace harassment. J. Appl. Psychol.* **2010**, *95*, 236. [CrossRef]

60. Kissling, E.A. Street harassment: The language of sexual terrorism. *Discourse Soc.* **1991**, *2*, 451–460. [CrossRef]

61. Uribe, M. An Exploration of the Relationship between Young Women's Body Esteem, Stigma Consciousness, and Ambivalent Sexism. Bachelor's Thesis, University of Central Florida, Orlando, FL, USA, 2019.

62. Fehr, B.; Baldwin, M.; Collins, L.; Patterson, S.; Benditt, R. Anger in close relationships: An interpersonal script analysis. *Personal. Soc. Psychol. Bull.* **1999**, *25*, 299–312. [CrossRef]

63. Jordan, F. An occupational hazard? Sex segregation in tourism employment. *Tour. Manag.* **1997**, *18*, 525–534. [CrossRef]

64. Kende, A.; Shnabel, N. Benevolent Sexism and Cross-Gender Helping: A Subtle Reinforcement of Existing Gender Relations. In *Intergroup Helping*; Van Leeuwen, E., Zagefka, H., Eds.; Springer: Berlin/Heidelberg, Germany, 2017; pp. 23–43. [CrossRef]

65. Rhode, D.L. The subtle side of sexism. *Colum. J. Gend. L.* **2007**, *16*, 613.

66. Campos-Soria, J.A.; Marchante-Mera, A.; Ropero-García, M.A. Patterns of occupational segregation by gender in the hospitality industry. *Int. J. Hosp. Manag.* **2011**, *30*, 91–102. [CrossRef]

67. Kruse, S.D.; Prettyman, S.S. Women, leadership, and power revisiting the Wicked Witch of the West. *Gend. Educ.* **2008**, *20*, 451–464. [CrossRef]

68. De Silva, P. Jealousy in Couple Relationships. *Behav. Change* **2004**, *21*, 1–13. [CrossRef]

69. Yüzügülen, A.; Raman, S.H. The Role of Gender, Romantic Jealousy and Intimate Partner Violence on Relationship Satisfaction during Young Adulthood. Master's Thesis, Eastern Mediterranean University, Famagusta, North Cyprus, 2016.

70. Herold, E.; Garcia, R.; DeMoya, T. Female tourists and beach boys: Romance or sex tourism? *Ann. Tour. Res.* **2001**, *28*, 978–997. [CrossRef]

71. Vizcaino, P.; Jeffrey, H.; Eger, C. *Tourism and Gender-Based Violence: Challenging Inequalities*; CABI (Centre for Agriculture and Biosciences International): Wallingford, UK, 2020.

72. Porter, B.A.; Schänzel, H.A. *Femininities in the Field: Tourism and Transdisciplinary Research*; Channel View Publications: Bristol, UK, 2018.