

Business and/or Pleasure - Gender (In)Equalities in Rural Tourism in Vojvodina

J. Cikić^{1*}, T. Jovanović², and M. Nedeljković¹

ABSTRACT

Gender gaps limit rural women's entrepreneurial potentials, preventing them to benefit from development activities. In this study, we assumed that there were gendered differences in rural tourism business. To examine this issue, we studied owners and employees in 57 rural tourism enterprises during the 2014 in seven districts of Vojvodina. The questionnaire with open and closed questions was used to examine main characteristics of managers and employees in rural tourism but also their perception of potentials and obstacles in rural tourism development. Results have shown gender differences in rural tourism regarding staff characteristics, motivation, business problems and knowledge, and innovation. Also, results have indicated the necessity of complementary use of qualitative and quantitative methodology in researching gender-tourism relations.

Keywords: Lifestyle entrepreneurship, Micro-entrepreneurship, Rural development, Rural women.

INTRODUCTION

Being closely related to the matters of power, decision-making, and possession of capitals (both in public and private sphere), gender regimes are one of the major issues in rural development. They are socially, culturally, economically, historically, and legally configured set of roles, positions, relations and everyday life practices based on gender affiliation. Gender regimes form gendered stereotypes and expectations. Most importantly, they determine personal and group's risk of social exclusion.

Contemporary rural development policies aim to promote gender mainstreaming (Grigorian, 2007). Its objective is to transform rural gender regimes towards strengthening women's social chances and enabling gender-balanced development

opportunities and outcomes. Rural gender mainstreaming is especially important in (semi)periphery societies such as Serbia. In such societies, rural women are often unemployed and less educated. Their household work and activities in family care are underappreciated. Being formally unemployed, rural women often have no social and retirement insurance. They are more likely to have no personal financial assets of any kind. Thus, rural women lack potentials to participate in both agricultural and rural restructuring (Shortall, 2002). As a result, they are more often exposed to the multiple risks of social exclusion.

Based on GAD (Gender And Development) approach (Reeves and Baden, 2000), rural women are seen as "*agents of change rather than as passive recipients of development efforts*" (Taşli, 2007). Women's activities in rural economy are

¹ Department of Sociology, Faculty of Philosophy, University of Novi Sad, Novi Sad, Republic of Serbia.

² Department of Geography, Tourism and Hotel Management, Faculty of Sciences, University of Novi Sad, Novi Sad, Republic of Serbia.

*Corresponding author; email: jovana.cikic@ff.uns.ac.rs



considered their way out of social exclusion. Being economically active, rural women not only fight poverty, but initiate changes in gender relations. Rural gender mainstreaming is focused specifically on equal employment opportunities, especially in expanding sectors, such as rural tourism.

Women In Rural Tourism – Setting The Research

Researches of gender in rural tourism are of more recent date. Gender issues have been analyzed from both demand and supply side. Researchers have proven gender differences in motivation and activity participation among rural tourists (Xie *et al.*, 2008) and in their perception of quality factors (Peruthova and Ryglova, 2016). Koutsou *et al.* (2009) wrote a profile of women running rural tourism businesses in Greece: “*they are relatively young and educated... active in sectors that do not require large investments and risks*”. Möller (2009) wrote of men being longer within rural tourism than women. She also found that women have social and lifestyle-orientated motivation to start rural tourism business. There is a connection between gender and success in rural tourism whereas women expressed higher perception of business success (Castrillón *et al.*, 2010). Talón Ballesterero *et al.* (2014) stated the existence of “*personal and business-related characteristics that make women more economically dependent on income from the (rural tourism – note of the author (n.a.)) business*”. Garcia-Ramon *et al.* (1995) argued that “*women view this work (in rural tourism – (n.a.)) as an extension of their domestic work, that it is equivalent to taking care of her “extended” family*”. Speaking of female rural entrepreneurship in general, Anthopoulou (2010) pointed out that rural women have fewer business contacts as their “*social networks are in general more kinship-based than men’s, whose networks by contrast tend to be more professionally*

based”. Koutsou *et al.* (2009) have argued that women in rural tourism are not necessarily homogenous group, which also has an impact on their business performance. Accordingly, there is no unique interpretation of the rural tourism impact on rural women’s empowerment. Several studies offered conclusions of positive impact of rural tourism on rural women’s empowerment, especially on their social participation (Lunardi *et al.*, 2015) or economic independence (Rico and Gómez, 2005). However, Bensemam and Hall (2009) found that co-preneurship in rural tourism (as a form of family business whereas couples share ownership and entrepreneurial responsibilities) (Barnett and Barnett, 1989) reflects traditional gender roles in family and household, which can be an obstacle in rural tourism professionalization (Rico and Gómez, 2005). Thus, Smith (1989) emphasized the need to be more careful in assessing the real impacts of rural tourism.

Based on the relevant references, we have assumed that there are gendered differences in rural tourism business manifested in: (a) Staffs’ socio-demographic characteristics and position in organization i.e. women are less educated; they are mainly working staff, less owners and managers; (b) Structure of the business problems i.e. women more frequently state financial problems and obstacles in investing; (c) Motivation for rural tourism i.e. women are less pragmatic in making decision on starting the rural tourism business; and (d) Knowledge and Information assets (K&I) in rural tourism i.e. women have less K&I in rural tourism and are more likely to participate in K&I diffusion.

We have conducted our research in Vojvodina, Northern Province of the Republic of Serbia. Vojvodina comprises $\frac{1}{4}$ of the total area and 27% of the total population of the country. Most of the communities in Vojvodina are rural (Njegovan *et al.*, 2011). Since 1980’s, there is tendency towards rural restructuring. Even though agriculture is traditionally an

important business sector, deagrarianization continues – nowadays, only 14% is farming population (Bogdanov and Babović, 2014).

Rural tourism in Vojvodina has a long tradition. Rural landscape, cultural heritage, and gastronomy are major developmental potentials (Đukić-Dojčinović, 1992; Kalenjuk *et al.*, 2012; Njegovan *et al.*, 2015). Unfortunately, there are no precise and systematic data on rural tourism in Vojvodina. According to the last census, only 1.1% of the total additional profit activities in farms in Vojvodina come from rural tourism. Rural tourism has been facing several significant obstacles: underdeveloped and unutilized capacities (Đurović, Čvejić, 2011), underdeveloped supporting services (Đeri *et al.*, 2014), poor quality of tourism infrastructure, lack of investments, seasonality, the absence of professionalization (Čikić, Jovanović, 2015).

In 2013, provincial government adopted the *Strategy and Action Plan for Improvement of Economic Position of Rural Women in AP Vojvodina 2012-2016*, identifying rural tourism as niche for boosting up rural women's entrepreneurship. Rural women in Vojvodina have low(er) social chances such as education, financial assets, employment, social capital, etc. (Babović and Vuković, 2008; Blagojević, 2010); <http://popis2011.stat.rs/>). They are mostly unemployed or in status of non-formal and low-paid employment with no adequate protection of their labour rights. They are also the majority of non-paid labour on family farms. Limited social resources have negative impact on women's entrepreneurial potentials and social inclusion. Thus, rural women are less exposed to potential benefits from the rural development activities (such as rural tourism) and more likely to be left aside.

In contemporary Serbian society, development policies consider rural tourism to be a magic wand for rural restructuring and empowerment of rural women. This study questions the ability of rural tourism to contribute to the overall wellbeing of rural

women by analyzing their characteristics and positions within tourism enterprises.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The study was conducted during 2014, in seven districts of Vojvodina. We developed a questionnaire to examine main characteristics of managers and employees in rural tourism (target correspondents in a survey), but also their perception of potentials and obstacles in rural tourism development. The questionnaire contained 50 questions divided into five sections. The study population consisted of 139 enterprises in rural tourism, according to the data base of Tourism Organization of Vojvodina (TOV), official provincial organization for promoting and marketing tourism (<http://vojvodinaonline.com/>). Data were collected on a sample of 57 enterprises (41% of total study population) (Table 1). We applied random sampling to provide representative sample that reflects spatial distribution of rural tourism enterprises across the seven provincial districts and their structure by type. According to the official legislation, there are four types of rural tourism enterprises in Vojvodina. *Salaši* are a special type of rural settlements, characteristic for Vojvodina. First *salaši* were formed by the end of the 17th century. After WWII, *salaši* were mainly destroyed. In the last couple of decades, there is a tendency towards renovation of *salaši*, mainly for tourism purposes. Rural tourism households are “*facility or group of facilities providing accommodations, food, and beverage or just food and beverages which is located in rural environment with elements of local characteristics and heritage*” (Tourism Law, Official Gazette RS, 93/2012). Ethno-houses are remains of traditional rural architecture and rural way of life. They also represent multiethnicity and multiconfessionality of Vojvodina. Souvenirs and old crafts manufactures are mainly privately owned enterprises focused on the production of artistic artefacts, based

**Table 1.** Basic characteristics of enterprises in rural tourism in Vojvodina.

Type of enterprise	%	Territorial distribution of enterprises	%
Salaši	29.8	South Bačka district	42.1
Rural households	29.8	North Bačka district	12.3
Ethno-houses	24.6	West Bačka district	7.0
Souvenir and old craft manufactures	15.8	Srem district	17.5
Total	100.0	South Banat district	1.8
		North Banat district	5.3
		Middle Banat district	14.1
		Total	100.0
Number of permanent staff	%	Commitment to rural tourism	%
No permanent staff	54.4	Up to five years	50.0
One to three	31.6	Six to ten years	29.6
Four to seven	5.3	11 years and more	20.4
Eight to ten	0	Total	100.0
Eleven or more	5.3		
Total	100.0		

on local/rural cultural heritage and local materials.

Three types of survey were used. In the first round, we applied on-line survey for the enterprises using an e-mail address. In the second round, we used postal survey for the rest of the rural tourism enterprises. After insufficient return of completed postal questionnaires, we employed face-to-face survey. Basic descriptive statistics, *t*-test for independent samples, and qualitative analysis were applied where appropriate. Data were processed using SPSS 17.0.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Women are the majority of total employees in rural tourism in Vojvodina (54.4%). They are the majority of employees in the old crafts' manufactures (66%), *salaši* (59%) and ethno-houses (53%). This was expected, as services provided in those types of rural tourism enterprises are traditionally considered women's activities. Sixty one percent of women are owners, 29% are staff, and 10% are managers. The results have shown gender parity among owners (1:1), which is unexpected due to the poor entrepreneurial potential of rural women (Babović and Vuković, 2008; Blagojević,

2010) and can thus be regarded more as a result of the social circumstances rather than women's entrepreneurial motivation and available capitals. Ironically, gender parity among owners is a consequence of rural women's previous unemployment (Blagojević, 2010) which puts them at disposal for the family entrepreneurship, such as rural tourism. As rural men are formally employed, women have taken the role of the family businesses' owners. Also, position of owners makes rural women eligible for social benefits (health and retirement insurance), which reduce their risk of social exclusion.

As expected, sex ratio among managers is in favour of men (1.33), whilst there are three times more women than men among the staff. Such gender misbalance is a result of unfavourable position of women on the (rural) labour market. Lack of financial, educational and social capitals makes rural women qualified mostly for non-paid positions (helping members on rural farms) or underpaid and temporary jobs, such as vacancies in rural tourism. Since rural tourism in Vojvodina is still not developed enough to be a consistent part of rural livelihoods (Đurović and Cvejić, 2011), it is mostly seasonal, often part-time, and supplementary economic activity (Erdeji *et*

al., 2013) with significant fluctuation of labour force. That implies lower wages and short-term employment.

The average age of women in rural tourism is 50 years. Only every tenth woman is younger than 35, compared to every fifth man. Those women are the least represented age group, especially among owners (5%). They usually have no or little work experience (Babović and Vuković, 2008). As current rural gender regime emphasizes traditional gender roles (Čikić, 2017), young rural women have to prove themselves as mothers, wives, and housewives. Social roles in biological reproduction and as caregivers and lack of work experience make young rural women less competitive as a labour force.

There is statistically significant difference in length of commitment to rural tourism [$t(56) = 2.011, P < 0.05$ (2-tailed)]. Men are longer in rural tourism business (9.15 years) than women (5.86 years), which also indicates temporality of women's employment.

Women are the majority among staff with primary (100%) and secondary education (68%), while they make minority of employees with tertiary education (41.9%). Lesser educational capital makes rural women suitable mostly for second-rate job positions. Consequently, that implies subordination within power structure and decision-making in rural tourism.

For both male (76.9%) and female (83.8%) respondents, profit from rural tourism is mostly an additional livelihood. Even though rural tourism revenues take only a smaller part in the total family budgets, rural women have a tendency to qualify them as more important for overall livelihood. This could indicate that women are more committed to the rural tourism business (since it is often their only employment) or that they have less access to the total family budget. That makes rural tourism revenues particularly important as poverty reducer.

Female owners and managers have pointed out several major difficulties in enterprises`

operation, especially regarding finances, labour organization and available labour force. Most of the barriers have occurred because of seasonality in providing tourism services. Sixty percent of the enterprises owned/managed by rural women work only on request or in high season (six months per year, at the most). On the contrary, most of the enterprises owned and managed by men are open to tourists all year around. Seasonality causes lower profits and income instability. Therefore, it is no surprise that 60% enterprises owned/managed by women have no permanent employees.

There is a gendered difference in the structure of identified problems in rural tourism businesses. Men have emphasized two major difficulties: lack of business rules, in general, and low demand. The first difficulty has probably derived from insufficient and inadequate legal regulation in rural tourism, corruption, etc. The second, we believe, is a result of low national standard of living. Like men, women in rural tourism business have pointed out low demand as one of the major obstacles. Besides, they have emphasized two other problems: lack of financial capital to invest (because of low demand) and poor cooperation with the local institutions, especially those in the service sector, which have generated a low demand. In addition, women have lower (professional) social capital as only $\frac{1}{3}$ of them (compared to $\frac{1}{2}$ of men) are members of professional organizations in rural tourism.

Results also indicated gender differences in the marketing strategies. Men are focused on three marketing channels: social networks, personal web site, and Tourism organization of Vojvodina (TOV), while women applied more diversified, omnichannel marketing strategy (social networks, TOV, tourism fairs, television, web site, radio). While men are more inclined to use virtual marketing, women tend to utilize more traditional marketing channels and face-to-face marketing. Both men and women considerably rely on TOV as an institutional marketing channel.



Overcoming business difficulties in rural tourism depends on the available resources, but also motivation of the employees. Motivation is greatly determined by the primary reasons for entering the rural tourism business. Results have shown two gendered patterns of motives for starting the business – pragmatic/male and idealistic/female. Men have been more practical in making decision on starting rural tourism business as for $\frac{2}{3}$ of them primary motive was financial benefit (opportunity to expand and diversify (rural) business, solve the unemployment status, or insufficient livelihood). In contrast, rural women tend to consider rural tourism as a business less than men. Their motives are more diversified than men's. They have emphasized enthusiasm, love of rural life-style, and ambition to promote it as their primary motives (*"I wanted to preserve 150 years old rural house type made of reed – trščare – and to educate tourists on rural architecture, customs, culture, traditional gastronomy and rural way of life"* – female owner of ethno-house, 47 years, 6 years in the rural tourism business; *"I just love old crafts and authentic rural way of life"* – female owner of old craft manufacture, 67 years, 20 years in the business). They prefer to consider it as a hobby and an expression of personal interest (*"It is mixture of business and pleasure"* – female owner of *salaš*, 38 years, 7 years in the business). Rural women have also emphasized that engaging in rural tourism has been a way to spend quality time (*"It is me spending some quality time"* – female owner of ethno-house, 45 years, 7 years in the business). An important motive for female entrepreneurship in rural tourism is a return to the genuine and family values (*"I wanted to bring myself and my family to genuine values"* – female owner of *salaš*, 50 years, 4 years in the business). Rural women have also recognized entrepreneurship in rural tourism as means for better coordination of their family/households duties and business aspirations (*"I have worked for 15 years in a completely different business. In the*

meantime, I became a mother of three. Considering the needs of my family, I have decided to become an entrepreneur because I thought that time and activities management must be under my control. In searching for an adequate niche for my entrepreneurial endeavours, it was very important to perceive new business as a challenge, with regards to my character, physical and intellectual potentials, knowledge, skills and social capital I had" – female owner of *salaš*, 45 years, 2 years in the business). Preserving cultural heritage and diversity has also great impact on rural women's decision to start rural tourism business (*"I wanted to promote Romanian cultural heritage, especially folk costumes and customs"* – female owner of ethno-house, 67 years). Every sixth rural woman has pointed out financial motivation as dominant in starting rural tourism business. Similar to men, some of those rural women saw tourism as strategy for livelihood diversification (*"It was an opportunity for additional income"* – female owner of rural household, 50 years, 5 years in the business), while other recognized it as a self-employment scheme (*"I have lost a job and I needed to contribute financially"* – female owner of *salaš*, 54 years, 1 years in the business).

Differences in motivation are indicative of the analysis of gendered investment plans. Both male (43.5%) and female (45.4%) owners and managers in rural tourism testified revenues stagnation in the last fiscal year. Even so, they were planning to invest in business development – men (86.9%) slightly more than women (81.8%). There is a difference in the focus of the investment plans. Women mostly planned to invest in the development of new tourism services and offers which corresponded to their more diversified interests for entering rural tourism business, while men's plans were mainly focused on the construction and renovation of infrastructure (buildings). Interestingly, male owners and managers, even more pragmatic in the primary

motivation, demonstrated a more conservative investment strategy.

Recent researches in tourism have shown a growing interest in knowledge and information (K&I) impact on improvement of the business performances (Hjalager, 2010). Lack of K&I and insufficient channels in K&I's diffusion are considered significant weaknesses in (rural) tourism development (Kazemiyeh *et al.*, 2016; Namdar and Sadighi, 2013; Čikić and Jovanović, 2015). The K&I in rural tourism can be analyzed on at least two levels: (a) (Self)valuation of employees' K&I, and (b) Participation of employees in the diffusion of K&I. In tourism research, there are both evidence that confirm (Costa *et al.*, 2015) and deny gender gap in diffusion of K&I (Castrillon and Cerradelo, 2014). Also, some authors have claimed that women in tourism business are more innovative than men (Brandão *et al.*, 2015). Socio-cultural context plays a vital role in determining gender gap in diffusion of K&I. In societies (or businesses) where gender regimes produce gender inequalities, gender gap in K&I exists. This especially refers to the more traditional and less developed

societies.

Even though there is no statistically significant difference in self-evaluation of women's and men's K&I in rural tourism, more rural women have spoken of not having particular K&I in rural tourism at all. In nine out of 12 skills, women's deficiency in K&I is greater than men's (Table 2).

Rural women particularly emphasized the lack of K&I in advertising, foreign language, and service of food and beverages. Also, women have lacked K&I of guest animation and creation of new tourism offers. Results indicate that women are less confident than men in their K&I in rural tourism, as their average mark on different skills is greater than men's in only three cases (service of food and beverages, preparation of food and beverages, and making souvenirs). This was expected, as those are traditionally female activities.

Both men (70%) and women (74%) strongly agreed that K&I were important factors of rural tourism development. There is a difference in the structure of K&I sources used by men and women (Figures 1 and 2). The most underused sources of K&I for both men and women are rural extension

Table 2. Gendered self-evaluation^a of K&I in rural tourism.

Skills in rural tourism	Men			Women			Index (Women=100)		
	Mean	Not having K&I at all (%)	Excellent K&I (%)	Mean	Not having K&I at all (%)	Excellent K&I (%)	Mean	Not having K&I at all (%)	Excellent K&I (%)
Guest reception	4.50	0	61.5	4.23	6.5	51.6	1.06	-	1.19
Advertising	3.69	11.5	26.9	3.35	22.6	12.9	1.10	0.51	2.0
Foreign language	3.88	3.8	42.3	3.52	16.1	29.0	1.10	0.23	1.46
Local cultural heritage	4.12	0	46.2	3.97	3.2	41.9	1.04	-	1.10
Foods and beverages preparation	4.00	3.8	3.8	3.81	9.7	41.9	1.05	0.39	0.09
Foods and beverages service	3.77	7.7	34.6	3.81	16.1	51.6	0.98	0.48	0.67
Guest animation	3.88	3.8	42.3	3.61	12.9	35.5	1.07	0.29	1.19
Souvenirs manufacture	2.62	34.6	19.2	3.35	16.1	35.5	0.78	2.51	0.54
Work organization	3.73	15.4	42.3	3.65	12.9	25.8	1.02	1.19	1.64
Legal framework	3.54	0	30.8	3.23	9.7	16.1	1.10	-	1.91
Economics	3.65	3.8	26.9	3.10	9.7	16.1	1.18	0.39	1.67
Creation of new services	3.65	3.8	26.9	3.29	12.9	16.1	1.11	0.29	2.09

^a Self-evaluation was conducted on a Likert scale (1= No K&I at all, ..., 5= Excellent K&I).



– 92% male and 71% female respondents have never cooperated with the extension agents. Also, high portions of men (30%) and women (32%) have never used professional literature as K&I source. There were two times more women than men who have never used web sites or personal contacts with the experts as a source of K&I. In addition, men use professional literature four times more than women. There was no woman using professional magazines as a K&I source. Results on gendered K&I structure imply lower human and social capital of women in rural tourism (Figure 1-2).

There was no statistically significant difference between men's and women's general interest in acquiring K&I in rural tourism. Both men and women expressed strong interest in cooperation with the organizations that provide professional assistance in rural tourism development (Figure 3). Nevertheless, their readiness to pay for such assistance significantly decreases. This especially refers to women and can be explained by the low and unsteady income in operating rural tourism micro-enterprises, but also their specific entrepreneurial motivation (Figure 3).

Women have been interested in lectures




Figure 1. Sources of knowledge and information in rural tourism men and women never used.





Figure 2. Sources of knowledge and information in rural tourism mainly used by men and women.



*Evaluation was conducted on a Likert scale (1 = not agree at all, ..., 5= completely agree).

Figure 3. Cooperation with the organizations that provide professional assistance.

and workshops, individual training, and education by traditional media (TV, radio, printed media), more than men. In contrast, men were more interested in education by Internet, which is expected, as they were more frequent users of computers and Internet (<http://popis2011.stat.rs/>). Women had more interest in the diffusion of K&I relating to all the rural tourism skills, especially creation of new services ($M_{men}(26) = 3.92$, $M_{women}(31) = 4.52$, $t = -2.072$, $P = 0.044$) which corresponded to their low self-estimation of current K&I on the issue, but also their investment plans.

CONCLUSIONS

our research has shown gender differences in staff characteristics, structure of business problems, entrepreneurial motivation and self-estimation of K&I. Results regarding staff characteristics differs from the previous researches (Koutsou *et al.*, 2009; Möller, 2009) – women in rural tourism in Vojvodina were older, with less formal education at the ownership positions due to the formal employment of men, not their

own entrepreneurial capacities. Rural tourism facilities owned/managed by women in Vojvodina operate mainly on request or seasonally, which differs from the previous results (Garcia-Ramon *et al.*, 1995). Discrepancy in the results can be explained by particularities of the rural regions where the researches were conducted (their specific rural economies, demographic structure, rural gender regimes), but also research designs (sample size, target population).

On the other hand, results on entrepreneurial motivation correspond with the previous findings (Möller, 2009). Idealistic motivation indicates that women in rural tourism can be regarded as lifestyle entrepreneurs as they combine personal interests, aspiration, and values with a tourism business (Ateljevic and Doorne, 2000), also experience lack of skills (Rowson and Lashley, 2012) and face uncertain economic sustainability (Nilsson *et al.*, 2005). Results also suggest that rural tourism businesses run by women have characteristics of micro-enterprises (Lynch, 1998) and informal business sector (Wahnschafft, 1982). Even though micro-entrepreneurship in rural tourism has



unquestionable benefits (e.g. short-time solution for poverty alleviation, flexibility in time management, promotion of personal lifestyle), it can also lead to the underuse of available resources and, consequently, weaker performances.

Current state of affairs in rural tourism in Vojvodina only partially reduces gender disparities due to the lack of its professionalization (Čikić and Jovanović, 2015). As rural female entrepreneurship in general is mainly integrated with traditional female activities, women's efforts in rural tourism stay underappreciated and under-recognized, by both men and women.

The enhancement of women's entrepreneurial motivation and opportunities is vital for boosting up the positive outcomes of rural tourism on transformation of traditional rural gender regime. Crucial elements in such a process are diffusion of K&I, social networking, and development of positive entrepreneurial climate. By developing skills and building up social capital of rural women, their performance in tourism business has a better chance to be improved and to contribute to reducing the risk of gendered social exclusion.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The paper is a result of the research on the projects III46006, 176020 and 179053 (Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development of the Rep. of Serbia) and project "Extension service of Autonomous Province of Vojvodina and rural tourism development: analysis from the perspective of potential users of extension services" (Secretary for Agriculture, water management and forestry of the Autonomous Province of Vojvodina).

REFERENCES

1. Anthopoulou, T. 2010. Rural Women in Local Agro-Food Production: Between Entrepreneurial Initiatives and Family Strategies. A Case Study in Greece. *J. Rur. Stud.*, **26(4)**: 394-403.
2. Ateljevic, I. and Doorne, S. 2000. Staying Within the Fence': Lifestyle Entrepreneurship in Tourism. *J. Sust. Tour.*, **8(5)**: 378-392.
3. Babović, M. and Vuković, O. 2008. *Rural Women as Helping Members of Family Farms: Position, Roles and Social Rights*. UNDP, Serbia. (in Serbian)
4. Barnett, F. and Barnett, S. 1989. Entrepreneurial Couples. *Fut.* **23(3)**: 50.
5. Bensemman, J. and Hall, M. 2009. Copreneurship in Rural Tourism: Exploring Women's Experiences. *Int. J. Gen. Ent.*, **2(3)**: 228-244.
6. Blagojević, M. 2010. *Rural Women in Vojvodina: Everyday Life and Rural Development*. Provincial Institute for Gender Equality, Serbia. (in Serbian)
7. Bogdanov, N. and Babović, M. 2014. *Labour Force and Activities of Family Farms*. Statistical Office of the Republic of Serbia, Serbia. (in Serbian)
8. Brandão, F., Santos Pereira, C. and Costa, C. 2015. Tourism Innovation: A Gender Perspective of the Innovative Practices of Hospitality Industry Managers. *Proceedings from the Forum Re-Engineering The Tourism Labour Market Through Gender-Aware Research: Interdisciplinary Approaches And Future Trends*, Aveiro, Portugal, PP. 24-25.
9. Castrillón, M. I., Canto, A. G. and Cantorna, A. I. S. 2010. Business Success and Gender in Rural Tourism. *Tour. Manag. Stud.*, **6**: 82-93. (in Spanish).
10. Castrillon, I. D. and Cerradelo, L. B. 2014. Gender Gaps in the Process of Internet Diffusion in Rural Tourism. *Rev. Tour. Desen.*, **5(21-22)**: 243-244.
11. Čikić, J. and Jovanović, T. 2015. *Diffusion of Knowledge and Rural Tourism in Vojvodina*. Faculty of Sciences, Serbia. (in Serbian).
12. Čikić, J. 2017. Biological Reproduction of Family Farms: From the Rural Gender Regime Perspective. *Sociologija*. **59(1)**: 103-123. (in Serbian).
13. Costa, C., Bakas, F., Costa, R., Breda, Z., Duraõ, M. and Pinho, I. 2015. '50 Shades of Gender' within Portuguese Tourism Innovation, Internationalization and Networks. *Proceedings from the Conference Challenges of Europe: Growth,*

- Competitiveness and Inequality*, Split, Croatia, PP. 1-6.
14. Đeri, L., Armenski, T., Jovanović, T. and Dragin, A. 2014. How Income Influences the Choice of Tourism Destination? *Acta Oec.*, **64(2)**: 219-237.
 15. Đurović, D. and Cvejić, S. 2011. *Rural Tourism as a Factor of Rural Development*. SeCons – UNDP, Beograd, Srbija. (in Serbian)
 16. Đukić-Dojčinović, V. 1992. Rural Tourism and Development in Vojvodina: The Animation of Tourism-Cultural Relationships. *World Futures*, **33(1-3)**: 189-197.
 17. Erdeji, I., Gagić, S., Jovičić, A. and Medić, S. 2013. Development of Rural Tourism in Serbia. *J. Settel. Spat. Plann.*, **4(2)**: 309-315.
 18. Garcia-Ramon, D., Canoves, G. and Valdovinos, N. 1995. Farm Tourism, Gender and the Environment in Spain. *Ann. Tour. Res.*, **22(2)**: 267-282.
 19. Grigorian, H. 2007. Impact of Gender Mainstreaming in Rural Development and Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). *Proceedings from the Conference UNDP Gender Mainstreaming Annual Conference*, Islamabad, Pakistan, PP. 1-32.
 20. Hjalager, A. M. 2010. A Review of Innovation Research in Tourism. *Tour. Manage.*, **31(1)**: 1-12.
 21. Kalenjuk, B., Tešanović, D., Škrinjar, M. and Đeri, L. 2012. The Importance of Authentic Food in the Development of the Culinary Tourism in Vojvodina. *First Belgrade International Tourism Conference 2012: Contemporary Tourism - Wishes and Opportunities*, March 22-24, 2012, College of Tourism, Belgrade, PP. 293-300.
 22. Kazemiyeh, F., Sadighi, H. and Chizari, M. 2016. Investigation of Rural Tourism in East Azarbaijan Province of Iran Utilizing SWOT Model and Delphi Technique. *J. Agr. Sci. Tech.*, **18(4)**: 911-923.
 23. Koutsou, S., Notta, O., Samathrakakis, V., Patalidou, M. 2009. Women's Entrepreneurship and Rural Tourism in Greece: Private Enterprises and Cooperatives. *Sout. Eur. Soc. Pol.*, **14(2)**: 191-209.
 24. Lunardi, R., De Souza, M. and Perurena, F. 2015. Participation and Decision in Rural Tourism: An Analysis from a Gender Perspective. *Turismo em Anàlise*, **26(2)**: 334-357.
 25. Lynch, P. 1998. Female Microentrepreneurs in the Host Family Sector: Key Motivations and Socio-Economic Variables. *Hosp. Man.*, **17(3)**: 319-342.
 26. Möller, C. 2009. *Transforming Geographies of Tourism and Gender: Exploring Women's Livelihood Strategies and Practices within Tourism in Latvia* (Dissertation). Karlstad University Studies, Sweden.
 27. Namdar, R. and Sadighi, H. 2013. Investigation of Major Challenges of Rural Development in Iran Utilizing Delphi Technique. *J. Agr. Sci. Tech.*, **15(3)**: 445-455.
 28. Nilsson, P.A., Petersen, T. and Wanhill, S. 2005. Public Support for Tourism SMEs in Peripheral Areas: The Arjeplog Project, Northern Sweden. *Ser. Ind. J.*, **25(4)**: 579-599.
 29. Njegovan, Z., Pejanović, R., Bošković, O. and Njegovan, N. 2011. Vojvodina between Rural and Urban Society: Methodological and Practical Aspects of Rural Regionalization. *Tranzicija*. **12(25-26)**: 184-193. (in Serbian)
 30. Njegovan, Z., Demirović, D., Radović, G. 2015. Management of Sustainable Development of Rural Tourism in Vojvodina. *Business School*, **1**: 69-79. (in Serbian)
 31. Peruthova, A. and Ryglova, K. 2016. Gender Differences in Perception of the Quality of Rural Tourist Destination. *Conference ICoM 2016*, Brno, Czech Republic.
 32. Reeves, H. and Baden, S. 2000. *Gender and Development: Concepts and Definitions*. Institute of Development Studies, Brighton.
 33. Rico, M., Gómez, J. 2005. The business participation of women in rural tourism initiatives in Castilla y León. *Est. Turíst.*, **166**: 97-113 (in Spanish).
 34. Rowson, W. and Lashley, C. 2012. Lifestyle Entrepreneurs: Insights into Blackpool's Small Hotel Sector. *High. Learn. Res. Commun.*, **2(4)**: 54-70.
 35. Shortall, S. 2002. Gendered Agricultural and Rural Restructuring: A Case Study of Northern Ireland. *Soc. Rur.*, **42(2)**: 160-175.
 36. Smith, M. 1989. *Behind the Glitter: The Impact of Tourism on Rural Women in the Southeast*. Southeast Women's Employment Coalition, Lexington.
 37. Statistical Office of the Republic of Serbia. 2017. <http://popis2011.stat.rs/> (last access: 26.10.2017).



38. Talón Ballester, P., Abad Romero, P. and González Serrano, L. 2014. Entrepreneurship by Women in the Rural Environment: Tourism as a Spur to Development. *Esic Mar. Ec. Bus. J.*, **45(3)**: 553-578.
39. Taşlı, K. 2007. *A Conceptual Framework for Gender and Development Studies: From Welfare to Empowerment*. Österreichische Forschungsstiftung für Entwicklungshilfe (ÖFSE), Wien, Austria.
40. Tourism Organization of Vojvodina. 2017. <http://vojvodinaonline.com/> (Last Access: 26.10.2017).
41. Wahnschafft, R. 1982. Formal and Informal Tourism Sectors: A Case Study in Pattaya, Thailand. *Ann. Tour. Res.*, **9(3)**: 429-451.
42. Xie, H., Costa, C. and Morais, D. 2008. Gender Differences in Rural Tourists' Motivation and Activity Participation. *J. Hosp. Leis. Market.*, **16(4)**: 368-384.

کسب و کار و/ یا لذت: (نا) برابری جنسیتی در گردشگری روستایی در منطقه Vojvodina

ج. شیکیش، ت. جوانویک، و م. ندلجکویک

چکیده

فاصله (شکاف) جنسیتی باعث محدودیت در استعداد کار آفرینی زنان می شود و از برخورداری آنان از منافع فعالیت های توسعه جلوگیری میکند. در این پژوهش فرض ما این بود که در شغل گردشگری روستایی اختلاف های جنسیتی وجود دارد. برای آزمون این فرضیه، در سال ۲۰۱۴ تا ۵۷ مالک و کارمند کسب و کار گردشگری روستایی را در ۷ ناحیه Vojvodina بررسی کردیم. به این منظور، برای بررسی ویژگی های مدیران و کارمندان شاغل در گردشگری روستایی و نیز دریافت نگرش آنها از استعداد ها و موانع توسعه گردشگری روستایی، پرسشنامه ای حاوی سوالات باز و بسته مورد استفاده قرار گرفت. نتایج پژوهش از وجود اختلاف های جنسیتی در زمینه ویژگی های کارمندان، انگیزه ها، مسایل و دانش شغلی، و ابتکارها حکایت میکند. همچنین، نتایج اشاره داشت که در پژوهشهای رابطه جنسیت- گردشگری استفاده تکمیلی از روش های کمی و کیفی ضرورت دارد..